A mule can kick and still be a mule,
A man can kick and still be a fool—
Unless he kicks to a purpose.

W. F. Ries,  TOLEDO, OHIO.
More than a million copies of this book sold in five months.
My massa had a working man; he also had a mule;
To save my life I couldn't tell which was the biggest fool,
He fed the man on liver, he fed the mule on hay,
He cussed the man and kicked the mule and worked them every day.
—From Moyer's "Songs of Socialism."

W. F. RIES

TOLEDO, OHIO
PREFACE

Never before in the history of the nation has there been such a general discussion of political questions.

Every thoughtful person realizes that we are on the eve of some great change. This has been an age of great progress, and of unparalleled inventions, yet the people are neither happy nor contented. On one hand we have immense wealth, and on the other, distressing poverty.

A feeling of unrest, distrust and uncertainty is everywhere felt. Every paper is filled with accounts of strikes, riots, lock-outs and bloodshed.

Our poorhouses, penitentiaries and asylums are increasing three times faster than our population, and are filled to overflowing.

Dun and Bradstreet inform us that 97 per cent of the business men fail. Isn't it strange that in this country, with natural resources sufficient to support a population ten times greater than we now have, with machinery capable of producing many times more than we consume, our society should be in its present distracted condition?

Hundreds of remedies have been suggested for these ills, and many tried. Among them, temperance legislation, single-tax, gold-standard, income-tax, bi-metallism, high-tariff, low-tariff, labor laws, independent parties, Populism and other quack remedies, without relief.

I believe that, not the rich, but the present competitive system is to blame for the deplorable condition of society. The many with their votes perpetuate this system which enables the rich to keep a large portion of what the masses create. Therefore the masses and not the rich are solely to blame. My quarrel is not with men but with methods, since the wealthy are as much the victims of the system as the poor.

I herein aim to present the real cause and cure for the financial ills of our present society in as few words as possible. I realize the average worker as well as the average business man is so nearly exhausted when his day's work is done, that neither will peruse a more extended treatise.

The mission of this booklet is to secure for the workers of the world the full product of their labor and much needed leisure. That this may be accomplished is the sincere desire of the author.

W F R.
A PREDICTION.

Leslie M. Shaw, Secretary of the United States Treasury under Theodore Roosevelt, made the following statement in an address to the students of Chicago University on March 1, 1907:

“When our manufactories grow bigger than the United States, then there will be war, the bloodiest war in the history of mankind.” * * * “The time is coming when the manufactories will outgrow the country, and men by the hundreds of thousands will be turned out of the factories. That of itself is not so bad, but when we realize that we pay out in wages as much as all the rest of the world put together, we begin to see the seriousness of the situation.”

“The factories are multiplying faster than our trade, and we will shortly have a surplus, with no one abroad to buy, and with no one at home to absorb it, because the laborer has not been paid enough to buy back what he created.” * * * “What will happen then? Why, these men will be turned out of the factories. Thousands of them,—hundreds of thousands. They will find themselves without food. Then will come the great danger to the country, for these men will be hard to deal with.”

“The last century was the worst in the world’s history for wars. I look to see this century bring out the greatest conflict ever waged in the world. It will be a war for markets, and all the nations of the world will be in the fight as they are all after the same markets for the surplus of their factories.” * * * “One great source of danger is in the unearned increment of our wealth. I admit that I have profited by that source myself, but I realize now that it is all wrong. I remember the first time I was guilty of getting something for nothing. I bought a piece of land in Iowa and sold it in a short time for a large advance. I admit that those dollars ‘looked good’ to me then. Now I know that no lasting good can come from the possession of wealth that is not earned.”

Had this been uttered by a rampant soap-box orator you would endeavor to have him locked up. But instead, it was uttered by an ex-governor of Iowa, a banker, and a former member of Roosevelt’s Cabinet.

His prediction is certainly a dark picture of the future. There are economic causes for this predicted panic which, in fact, has already begun. To this our bank failures testify.

In the following pages I offer an explanation of the cause and give the cure.
At the St. Louis World’s Fair I saw one hundred people make twelve hundred pairs of $3.50 shoes every eight hours. The superintendent told me that three pairs out of each twelve would more than pay for the raw material, interest on the money, wear of machinery, boxing, draying, the foreman’s wages and all other expenses. Each workman would then have nine pairs, net, as his share for one day’s work. But, suppose we should take out still another $3.50 pair for maintaining schools, churches, paving, parks, hospitals and old-age pensions, then each workman would still have eight pairs left for himself as a result of eight hours’ work. In other words, he would have one pair of shoes for each hour’s work.

A large number of these workers were boys and girls who received as low as 75 cents per day, while the highest salary was $3.25 per day, not enough to buy back one-twelfth of what each person created daily. This lack of power to consume, generally mistaken for “over-production” is the cause of panics, calamities and bloody wars, such as are predicted by Secretary Shaw and hundreds of others who have studied the subject. To be just, each shoe worker should have been paid eight times $3.50, or a total of $28.00 per day.* He then could have purchased as much as he produced, when no over-production or panic could occur. The owner of the factory can not use the shoes, neither can the shoe workers purchase them, as they have not the money to buy. Hence, the owner must hunt foreign markets to dispose of them. England, Germany, France, Russia, Austria and Japan are all seeking the same markets, and this, then, becomes the cause of wars. Why did Russia and Japan fight? For markets. Why did England pounce upon the Boers? For markets. Why is every one looking for a great war between the United States and Japan? Why is the navy, by Roosevelt’s orders, on the way to the Pacific and the Philippines? When we do fight, it will be to supply the capitalist a market in which to sell even the very shoes that have been filched from the men, boys, and girls who made them in the factory. War is surely coming and your son will be expected to shoulder a rifle and kill a lot of people he never saw before; men who never harmed him: men, like himself, with families and loved ones at home.

*NOTE. — When Co-operation is fully established, the people will then decide what kind of money shall be used, whether of gold, silver, paper or labor time-checks.
It is about time the workers of the world awake to the fact that all wars are conducted at the workers' cost for profit to the idle rich who never go to war themselves, but still reap all the benefits.

THE CURE.

I have already hinted at the remedy for both wars and panics—their cause being one and the same. It is that the people, all the people, must own all the means of production and distribution, the factories of all kinds, railroads, telephones, telegraphs, mines, lands, etc., etc., and conduct them in the interest of themselves—all the people.

To make the illustration still plainer, suppose that when the shoes were finished they were taken to the warehouse and that the warehouse was the people's store, and that when the day's work was over, each worker was given a time-check showing that he had worked eight hours and had produced eight pairs of shoes. Now, if the shoe worker wanted a pair of shoes, that he had made, he would call at the warehouse and have one hour punched out of his time-check and the shoes are his. He could do whatever he pleased with the other seven hours left on his time-check.

You can see how the shoe workers will get shoes, but perhaps you don't understand how they will get hats. Suppose that another hundred people produce twelve hundred hats in eight hours. One person would then make twelve hats. Suppose further, that four hats were allowed for raw material and wear and tear of machinery, then one person would get eight hats for eight hours' work, or one hat per hour. It is clear that ONE HAT-HOUR would be equal to ONE SHOE-HOUR at the public warehouse—the People's store. This same plan of manufacturing and exchanging goods would be followed out in all lines of industry. If a person wished to work only four hours per day, he could do so, but would only get a four-hour labor time-check, and if another person wished to work fourteen or sixteen hours per day, he would be accommodated and get as much in time value as he created. Any one who refused to work would simply starve, as he should. This system would at once do away with all tramps, bums, and millionaire idlers.

All such are parasites, living without producing anything. Since it would be impossible for them to buy, save at a government store, there being no other stores under Co-operation, they would have to produce a labor time-check showing that they had worked, or get off the earth. Thus you will see that Co-operation does not divide up, but PREVENTS dividing up by permitting everyone to have an equal
opportunity to use the machinery and all other means of production and distribution. It does not attempt to make people equal, but to give everyone an EQUAL OPPORTUNITY to produce for himself, "each according to his deeds."

I have shown that the shoe workers are robbed of seven-eighths of all they create. Here is the average robbery in all industries, according to the United States Census Reports:

In the year 1890, 4,250,783 men, women and children, working in 355,441 factories, produced goods valued at $14,055,161,436 retail price. They received in wages $1,891,228,321. The producers, therefore, could buy back about one-eighth of the wealth they produced.

The reports for 1907 show a still greater robbery because of the more modern machinery.

(It is not claimed that the seven-eighths which the capitalist keeps as his share of what the worker produces is all clear profit. Some is used for raw material, etc., but by far the larger portion of it is worse than wasted because under the competitive system it must pass through so many needless hands in the form of rent, interest and profit. After this seven-eighths passes through the hands of the manufacturer, the jobber, the wholesaler, the retailer and the advertiser, to say nothing of the wastes described in this and other chapters, it is easy to see why the worker gets only a fraction of what his labor produces.)

Each man, woman and child produced, therefore, in round numbers, $3,500 with the sweat of his face, and should have received this amount as their just reward. According to Census Bulletin No. 150 they only received in wages an average of $437. The Capitalistic system compelled them to divide up the difference between the $3,500 which each worker created, and the $437 which each received, with non-producers and idlers—otherwise known as Capitalists.

It is self-evident that since all money in circulation must first be paid by the capitalist to the shop workers and that since their wages are one-eighth of what they produce, these workers can buy back only one-eighth of what they create, leaving the balance on the capitalist's shelves and this so-called "over-production" causes the glut in the market—the panic.

Now the question naturally arises, why can not the rest of the people buy the seven-eighths on the capitalist's shelves which the shop hands cannot buy and so prevent, or cure the panic?
Let us suppose that all goods as they are taken from the factories are placed in an immense wareroom, and that the capitalist owner stands at the door ready and anxious to sell these goods. The necessities and wants of the rest of the people are sufficient to absorb all the capitalist has and thus prevent the panic. Why don't they do it?

The shop hands desire things, other than what they have manufactured and therefore purchase with a portion of their wages commodities of the farmer, the grocer, the butcher, the baker and the candle-stick maker, who in turn also spend a portion of the money thus received with still other and other people for necessaries, pleasures, etc., until that portion of the money spent by the shop hands is in complete circulation among all the people.

All the people, which of course includes the shop workers, now appear before the capitalist ready and anxious to purchase the seven-eighths that the capitalist still has on his shelves. It is plain that the combined purchasing power of all the people is measured by the one-eighth paid to the shop workers. The fact that this one-eighth is now in the hands of millions, instead of thousands, does not affect its purchasing power. It is still the one-eighth received by the factory hands, though now in many hands.

The capitalist still has the goods on his shelves and the panic continues.

It matters not whether the workers permit the capitalist to retain one-eighth or seven-eighths of what they produce, it is nevertheless robbery. The remedy lies in abolishing the whole profit system, and permitting the workers to keep all they create. This is Co-operation.

After carefully studying the following page you can easily see WHY it is that all productive labor receives about one-eighth of what it creates. Statistics are really not needed to establish this fact.

MODERN MACHINERY.

Let me name a few of our great inventions and what they are accomplishing, and you explain why the laboring man does not benefit by them:

One man and two boys do the work of 1,100 spinners.
One cotton printing machine and one man do the work of 1,500 men.
One horseshoe machine does the work of 600 men.
A nail machine does the work of 1,200 men.
A modern sawmill takes the place of 800 men.
One man by machinery does the work of 1,100 in making pottery.
In loading and unloading ships by machinery, right here in Toledo, or any dock, 2,000 men are displaced.

Mr. Owens of Toledo invented a machine which it is claimed will do the work of 50 men in making bottles.

A needle machine turns out 260 needles per minute.

Sheets of tin are fed into one end of a machine and at the other end complete tin cans are dropped out at the rate of 38,000 per day. One child can operate the machine.

A bread making machine will mould 20,000 loaves per day.

These are but a few of the many inventions, and about the same increase exists in all branches of production.

These figures are taken from the census reports and can be verified.

The late Mr. Gladstone tells us that, by the aid of newly invented machinery, our capacity to manufacture is doubled every seven years. Do the wages of the workers double every seven years?

Now my dear reader, will you explain why it is that with all this marvelous machinery of production, our wonderful means of distribution, our increased knowledge in the arts and sciences, we still have in this free America, millions of people in abject poverty? It is because there are not only in America, but in all countries, two classes of people. One class that owns all the machinery, does no work, and yet receives all the good things. The other class makes all the machinery, does all the work, and has nothing but a living. The rich who own all the tools and other means of production, upon which the worker depends for a living, OWN THE MAN. The man is finding that out today.

DON'T WAKE 'EM UP.

What did you tell that man just now?
I told him to hurry.
What right have you to tell him to hurry?
I pay him to hurry.
What do you pay him?
Two dollars a day.
Where do you get the money with which to pay him?
I sell the bricks.
Who makes the bricks?
He does.
How many bricks does he make?
Twenty-four men can make 24,000 bricks a day.
How much do you get for the bricks?
I get seven dollars per thousand.
Then instead of your paying him, he pays you five
dollars a day for standing around and telling him to hurry.  
Well, but I own the machinery.  
How did you get the machinery?  
Sold bricks and bought it.  
Who made the bricks?  
Shut up, you'll make the fools wake up, and then they'll make the bricks for themselves.—Socialist News.

EVOlUTION OF MACHINERY.

Only one hundred years ago, labor was done by hand exactly as it was done five thousand years ago. More machinery has been invented in the last one hundred years than in all the preceding ages combined. As a result the handwork of a hundred years ago has passed away. Instead of the lone shoemaker or cobbler, who could only make one pair of shoes per day, we have the immense shoe factory employing thousands who by their combined efforts produce twelve times as much per man. The blacksmith shop, in which two men made complete buggies by hand, has now given away to the mighty machine shop and factory, in which twenty times as many buggies can be made.

Thus we see that a great change has been made in the manner of producing all commodities and a correspondingly great change must be made in the ownership and management of all industries. The change must be made from private or individual ownership to common or PUBLIC OWNERSHIP, which is SOCIALISM.

DR. LYMAN ABBOT.

The Rev. Dr. Lyman Abbot recently said:

“Socialism is inevitable. Our industries must be democratized; if a few men are to own and control all our domestic necessities, whence goes our republic? The labor problem can never be solved so long as one set of men own the tools, (machinery) and another set use them. When all those connected with industry become together owners and users, then will come the harmony and union which have been so long striven for.”

He is right.

The Capitalists continually parade the idea that because they were once poor boys and commenced at the very bottom of the ladder, as mill hands and messenger boys, that each and every one of their wage-slaves can also become a capitalist, and each own large factories, steamships and railways. This "ignis fatuus" is kept dangling before their eyes as an incentive to continue their daily grind of profits for their masters.
Still they boast that because a few men have become millionaires that all can do the same. How could each of the 5,000 men employed in a modern shoe factory own the entire plant? How could 175,000 weavers each own a plant costing a million or more? At the present time only one in 20,000 own one of these industries or ever can under the present system. How many of your working friends are now capitalists?

The only remedy is common ownership, which is SOCIALISM.

Under Socialism each person working in any factory will have a vote and a say as to who shall be his superintendent; how many hours per day he shall work; how many hours any worker shall be docked for idleness, or shirking; what kind of heat, light and ventilation shall be used in the shop or factory. Any one suspected of soldiering might be put at “piece work” but the rest of the workers in that factory would be the ones to decide upon his dues—not some capitalist. Because they are the OWNERS of the factory, the people, really employ themselves and can work as many hours as they desire or take a vacation when they choose and still always get all they have produced, and no one be wronged. If each one got as much as he produced, or its equivalent, there would be no need of charity.

But how is it in the present Capitalistic system? Can you do any of these things? Suppose you don’t like the long hours or the small pay you are getting; or suppose the factory closes, can you dictate to the owner? Not at all. If you did, would he not tell you to “go chase yourself” and hunt a new master?

THE WASTE OF COMPETITION.

The present system is wasteful in the extreme. The manufacturer sells to the jobber, the jobber sells to the wholesaler, and the wholesaler sells to the retailer, each having a large office force of stenographers, bookkeepers and traveling men. Each firm also does extensive advertising, collecting and livery hiring. All this unnecessary expense is paid finally, by the man who buys the goods, for the price he pays is from five to ten times as much as the producer receives for making the goods.

Every day you see a dozen or more wagons delivering groceries along the same street. One wagon will leave a pound of sugar at one house; and a block further along, a cake of soap; and a few houses further, a loaf of bread; still further along he leaves a box of “None Such Mince
Meat," a can of tomatoes, a pound of coffee and some Limburger cheese. The next wagon passes along the same street leaving a few packages here and there, until he also has traveled eight or ten miles to deliver a handful of groceries. The rest of the dozen wagons deliver in the same costly and wasteful way.

Then along come a dozen bakery wagons, a dozen meat wagons, a dozen furniture wagons, in fact, wagons too numerous to count. Think of the millions upon millions wasted in this way, and all this expense you, the consumer, must pay. There are hundreds of other wastes in the present competitive system, but space forbids their discussion.

You are certainly bright enough to know that one large van or one wagon could deliver the same goods at one trip just as one mail carrier now delivers all the mail. But the mail system is Socialism, and you already believe in the mail system. Why not in these matters?

Socialism will cut out at least seven-eighths of all this waste. It will give the worker his labor time-check, with which he can go to the store and get the worth of all he creates or its equivalent in other merchandise; that is, goods which took the same number of hours to produce.

You ask what will become of the vast army of jobbers, wholesalers, bankers, advertisers, collectors, attorneys, signwriters, delivery boys, and others engaged in useless occupations? If all this vast army will be useless under Socialism, (and they will be absolutely useless) you ask how will they get a living? Easy enough. They will be put to making things for themselves, have the same free access to the machinery as the rest of the workers will have, and they will also get all they produce, or its equivalent. This would shorten the hours of labor for all, as the people can produce in a few hours each day more than they can use. This will "divide up the day" and give the workers time to enjoy the good things of life instead of living the life of starved curs. Under the present system, those who produce nothing may live riotous lives, or live in wasteful luxury—our Harry Thaws, for instance.

As things now are, the men who build palaces live in rented shacks; those who make automobiles have the pleasure of going on foot; those who make the pianos get the jewsharps; the soldier who defends his country gets embalmed beef furnished by the Beef Trust; those who produce our fine meats get sowsbelly with a little stale liver on the side. Every day you have to beg to get even that much from your Masters. You workmen who produce the finest
firearms in the world, find yourself at the wrong end of the gun.

The System compels you to send your daughters to do the heavy, dirty work for the wives of these Capitalists holding special privileges. Do the daughters of the rich do housework for you? No! Your family could rot a thousand times before one of them would as much as turn a hand for you, and yet there are long faced hypocrites who tell us that there are no classes in America, that it is wrong to stir up strife, that we should be content with things as they now are.

**CONTENTMENT.**

The early colonists of America were not content to meekly bow down to the injustice of taxation without representation, and they swept the divine right of Kings off every foot of American soil. Indeed, every advancement of civilization, every forward movement in knowledge and culture and freedom, have been achieved by the organized discontent of men, breaking up the old and outgrown systems of the past, and accepting in their stead, advanced ideas.

“No more damnable error can be conceived than that of teaching the poor to be content with their lot; to be satisfied with the coarsest food, with cheap furniture and bare walls; to forego the pleasure of books and paintings and music in their homes; to be content with unhealthy tenements, with shabby clothes, with cowhide boots; to stifle the legitimate aspirations of talent, never to penetrate beyond the smoke of factories into God’s pure air, nor listen to the wondrous melodies of feathered songsters in the woods, nor watch the changing colors of His brush on the floral canvas of the fields, or azure evening skies; but always to go on, from morn till night, starving, with no prospect of comfort for the evening of life—‘to stand pat.’

“Surely it is the veriest mockery to preach contentment to the aged, poverty stricken worker who finds young men crowding him out as the years steal his strength away. A time comes to him when he is thrown away like an outworn tool or garment. The future looks dark and forbidding, and he grows tremulous with despair. His children are scattered far and wide, perhaps dead, and he is left sad and alone, and finally enters the poorhouse to end what should have been a useful life.”—From “Economic Discontent and the Remedy—Socialism,” by Father T. J. Hagerty.

This is the picture that stares millions of people in the face who have spent their lives in producing the wealth that others enjoy. Think of all these people who have worked
a lifetime only to suffer from the horrors of want for the common necessaries of sustenance, simply because they have been robbed of their earnings, through the profit system, to enrich their capitalistic masters.

The people still suffer, though surrounded by machinery capable of producing more than the entire human family can consume. Why? Because a few own these machines, and the many can only use them by giving the few idle owners all they create, except a bare living.

No, God never preached contentment with present conditions. Witness His prophet Isaiah: "And they shall build houses, and inhabit them; they shall plant vineyards and eat the fruit of them. They shall not build and another inhabit; they shall not plant and another eat." Why don't ministers preach Socialism, which is applied Christianity? The preachers wonder why they are preaching to empty seats, when it is plain they have ceased to preach the practical application and doctrines taught by Jesus, whom the common people flocked to hear, and the few rich did not.

Socialism proposes that the workers, those who made all the machinery and who operate it every day, shall also own it and have all they make and not divide up with a useless class. Give the workers justice, not Charity. That would be Christianity, and that would be Socialism.

HOW THE WORKERS ARE EXPLOITED.

To give you a plainer illustration of how the workers are being skinned every day, let us take a look at the Standard Oil Co. According to the Census Reports, they employ twelve thousand men and make a net profit of $84,000,000, and after allowing a surplus fund of $36,000,000, declared a dividend of $48,000,000. All this was done in one year, which means a net profit on each man employed by the company of $7,000 per year. This profit was clear after all expenses were paid and all competition accounted for, besides the vast sums to bribe the various legislatures. In addition they have attorneys in nearly every county in the various states, who get immense salaries. One lawyer in New York gets $200,000 as a retainer, and still the Standard Oil Co., made a clear profit of $7,000 on the labor of each man employed by it. John D. Rockefeller owns fifty-one per cent of the Standard Oil company and therefore received more than $42,000,000 as his part of the swag. Did he drill the wells, pump the oil, refine it, or deliver it at your door? No! He did none of the work. He recently testified, under oath, in court, that he had not been in his office for the past ten years.
Are you idiot enough to believe that he is justly entitled to the $42,000,000 that labor created? All the labor that John D. Rockefeller did in his career was to keep a set of books. To save himself from competition and ruination, he, later, formed a trust to squeeze profits out of the consumers and then, to cap the climax, the foolish people shout with glee when he gives a university or church a few millions of his wealth which the present system stole for him, from them. I do not blame Rockefeller, but I do blame the people who permit the system to continue, that enables him to do this robbing. If Rockefeller don’t freeze out his competitors they would freeze him out. It is not MEN the Socialists are fighting, but the SYSTEM. Under the present system there is nothing to do but grab all you can, look out for yourself, and let the devil look after the rest. He will take care of them so long as the present system continues, and it might as well be Rockefeller who gets the millions as myself.

In thirty years the system stole for Andrew Carnegie $400,000,000 from a few thousand steel workers, by permitting them to retain only one-eighth of all their labor created, and permitting him to keep the rest for himself.

The Steel trust employs 125,000 men, and declared a dividend of $125,000,000, a clear robbery of $1,000 per man. But why cite more instances? All business, under existing conditions and methods, is a system of graft and profit.

**PRESIDENT ROOSEVELT.**

How foolish for Teddy Roosevelt to make a pretense of “busting” trusts. Teddy, by this time has no idea of “busting” any trust. James R. Day, President of Syracuse University, in a recent interview plainly shows that Roosevelt is only playing to the galleries. Professor Day says: “One of the most serious things, so far as concerns the relation of the administration to the trusts, is the fact that President Roosevelt has actually accomplished no reform. He has not “busted” a single trust. He has sent no offender to prison. He has done nothing to improve any of the conditions, he has so severely criticised, but has only bluffe the country. The trusts are not alarmed and all of them are still doing business at the old stand.”

**OLD REMEDIES.**

During the past twenty years the Republican and Democratic parties have passed all kinds of Anti-Trust laws, and still the trusts are growing larger and more numerous all the time. Not a single trust has been put out of business by
either party. Why is this? Because both parties are owned, bag and baggage, soul and body, by the plutocrats who dictate the candidates and the platforms of both parties, and no matter which party wins, the people always lose.

What becomes of the immense profit made by the Standard Oil Co., the Steel Trust, and thousands of other trusts? It is mostly used to buy up other industries and form still other and larger trusts until shortly everything will be trustified. When these billions of profits made each year can no longer be re-invested, Capitalism will crumble of its own weight, and Socialism will become its successor.

The natural solution of the trust problem is for the people to own and not destroy them, and operate them for the benefit of the workers themselves—all having been made workers. To propose any other remedy is silly and childish.

TRUSTS.

The history of economic progress has been the history of the concentration of productive capital. That this concentration is necessary to the utilization of the best methods in modern industry is evident. To reverse this tendency and demoralize capital is to barbarize society. The Democratic party stands for this policy and is foredoomed to defeat.

The anti-trust movement is analogous to the anti-machinery movement of a century ago, when the handloom weavers marched through England and destroyed the power looms. The cry of "Down with Machinery," has been supplanted by "Down with Trusts." The movement toward greater organization of industry is natural and consequently inevitable. The result of this organization has been to drive the smaller and inferior competitors from the field. Because the middle class, with its old-fashioned machinery and methods, is unable to compete with the improved appliances of the larger corporations, they wish to destroy the trusts and force civilization back to a ruinous competitive stage and to hand production.

The middle class should see its doom in this concentration of capital. Of the 14,000 failures, annually, 87 per cent are those whose capital is $5,000 or less. It is small wonder, then, that this class should protest against this rapid concentration of capital and small business firms. At this rate a few years more of consolidation will wipe out the entire horde of small business men, and relegate them to the class of "has been." Forced out of the small owning class they are compelled to join the already overcrowded laboring class, which only adds confusion to the present serious problem of the starving and frantic hosts of the unemployed.
The hysterical cry, "Down with trusts," is only the wailing of the middle class, in behalf of its own interests. Their whine is not for the benefit of the laboring class. They do not wish to abolish the competitive profit-making system. They only object to being forced out of this robbing business and leaving the large combinations and trusts in the field to do the skinning.

This middle class does not object to the system which permits one class to ride on the backs of others, but complains because it can not do the riding. It only wails because it will henceforth be one of that large and ever increasing army who are forced like mules to carry idlers on their backs.

The machinery of production is so vast that the individual workers can never hope to own it individually and therefore if the trusts were to be destroyed this machinery would still be owned by other and smaller corporations. Suppose that all the machinery of production and distribution were in the hands of a dozen trust magnates and suddenly the trusts were all "busted" in compliance with the popular demand and their ownership handed over to, say, 100 or 1,000 or 50,000 small competing firms, would this new ownership benefit the millions who must still do all the hard work?

Wouldn't these 50,000 separate and competing firms all require separate sets of offices, stenographers, bookkeepers and agents? And would not they be compelled to pay separate rents, interest, advertising and other long lists of useless expenses?

To further illustrate how silly and senseless is this talk of "busting" or "regulating" the trusts, let us suppose that the ownership of the public schools and the postoffice should be handed over to a million small firms. Would such new ownership cheapen or add to the cost of our education, or a postage stamp?

The question is too simple to need an answer.

The postoffice and public schools are practical illustrations of trusts and if they were now owned by a few individuals, the hue and cry would be, "Down with Trusts," "Regulate the Trusts," "Fine every mother's son of them $29,240,000," and similar rantings of ignorant people. The sensible and only way out of this dilemma is to do with ALL trusts as we have done with the school and postal trusts—let the nation—the people own them, because to the owners always flow the benefits and profits.

No, trusts are not afraid of the competition of new capital. The individual members of the trusts own large
blocks of stock in many industries. Morgan, Gould, Vanderbilt, Harriman, Rockefeller and others own stock in the oil, steel, tobacco, railroad, lumber, salt, coal and similar trusts. They are thus interested in practically all lines of industry. Do you think that these magnates, who are about the only people who have large capital, would invest their surplus earnings in new enterprises that would compete with those they already own? Perish the thought.

The nation is already over-supplied with industries. The competition among the small firms was so fierce that trusts were formed to save themselves from utter destruction. After a trust was formed, the first act was to close the surplus factories—they were no longer needed. This also causes a large number of people to be jobless. These people, forced out of their former jobs, found partial relief by assisting to build new steam and electric roads, bridges, public buildings, canals and waterways. The United States is now so thoroughly supplied with these things, that the unemployed can no longer find relief in this direction. Thus from all quarters and from many sources come the hordes of masterless beings to swell the sea of unemployed. This army of unemployed constantly seeks the jobs of those now at work. Wages fall, strikes are ordered, the police and troops are dispatched to the scene and the killing begins. When the unemployed become too numerous and clamorous the plutocrats may prolong their system, yet a little, by an eight-hour law, old-age pension, free silver, income-tax, and a few other makeshifts.

Another method which may be employed to prolong the capitalist system is well stated by Gaylord Wilshire in his booklet, "Trusts and Imperialism," Wilshire's Magazine, New York: "The best thing of all, however, to bolster up the capitalist system is a rattling good war between the great powers, followed up by a prolonged civil war with great destruction of life and property."

"If the principal industrial plants, railways, shops, bridges, etc., of this country were destroyed, the upbuilding of them would give labor unlimited employment, and capital great scope for investment of savings. Witness the boom following our civil war, also the late Spanish war."

Think of the Capitalists and their Christian (?) government resorting to war and the wholesale destruction of property as their only means of relieving the unemployed problem.

In the very near future this nightmare of capitalism will be replaced by the entire program of co-operation,—SOCIALISM.
Political demagogues shout, "Control or regulate the trusts." These tricksters seek to limit the earning power of the trusts. Thus if a trust was earning 20 per cent profit per year it would double its capital every five years, or if it made 16 2/3 per cent profit it would take six years and so on. This means that the trusts would still be permitted to gobble up the earth, only it would take a little longer. The people would have the satisfaction of being destroyed by inches instead of by the yard.

If it is right to make a profit of 1 per cent off you, it is right to make 10 per cent; and if 10 per cent is right, so is 20 per cent; and if 20 per cent is right, so is 50 per cent, or 100 per cent. There is no line at which you can say on one side is right and on the other side is wrong. The same principle is involved all the way through. There is no use crying about the profits of the trusts, while admitting that the principle on which they operate is correct. Profit is right or it is not right. If it is right you open up an endless struggle about how much it shall be. But on the other hand, by denying the right of any man to make profit off another you have nothing else to dispute over. It is settled once and for all. Profit has led to all the economic ills that have ever affected the human race.

Thus we see that government regulation and control will not work.

If the capitalist has built, through his own individual initiative and enterprise, the great machines of wealth production and distribution, why should the government control them?

In whose interest do the President and the Republican and Democratic parties seek to control and regulate the trusts?

Do not the railroads, the oil refineries, and coal mines belong to Rockefeller, Gould, Morgan, et al? What business then has the government to step in and say that these industries shall not be controlled in a manner entirely satisfactory to these gentlemen?

The fact is that whenever your party admits—as both Republican and Democratic parties have admitted through their spokesmen—that the trust magnates are no longer competent to run their own business without interference on the part of the government, then have you acknowledged that private ownership of industries has reached a point where it has become a menace to the nation.

Forced to this conclusion, as you have been by the logic of past events, you are ready to take up the next phase of the problem, viz., ownership. If you don't own a thing you
don't have much to say about it, do you? You can't dodge this problem because ownership carries with it control, and the right to do therewith as you please.

If you have made up your mind that the nation should control the trusts, you will be forced by the same inexorable logic of necessity to make up your mind that the nation can only control them by owning them, and that is Socialism.

Socialists look upon the trusts as a stage in the progress toward Socialism. Who is there today who would return to the privations and wasteful methods of production of a century ago? Who would throw away the modern spinning machine, the great steamship, and mogul engine, to return to the spinning wheel, the sail boat, and the ox-cart? The world would starve in sixty days were it possible to destroy the machinery now used and return to the primitive tools of a century ago. Everywhere men are asking "How shall we be freed from the grip of this monster?" There is no satisfying answer save that given by the Socialist. The stupid cry of the demagogue and the charlatan, "Let us destroy the trusts" does not carry conviction with it. Even the average man knows that there is no use in turning backward to the past. He knows that the trusts are a natural development and that no political quack can stay the tide of progress.

Concentration in the business world has done what the great complex machinery has done for industry. It is a labor-saving device.

I have shown that the trust of itself is labor saving, wealth producing, and is not injurious except as the benefits go to the few. Then this going to the few individuals is where the meat of the whole matter lies. If the benefits went to all, all of us would be glad and "de-lighted" with the development of the trust system. That leads us to the remedy as above stated, viz., for all the people to own the trusts, that all the benefits may go to the owners,—the people.

We are bound to have monopolies and trusts. Industrial properties are too large for individual ownership. Shall they be publically owned and operated, or shall they be privately owned and operated to plunder all?

You have a choice between the two, and none other: LET THE NATION OWN THE TRUSTS.

WHO CREATES CAPITAL?

"But," you say, "do not capitalists furnish the capital and should not, therefore, all the profits go to them?" "In fact, if it were not for the capitalists, would not the people starve?"
Let us see. A hundred years ago a weaver used a hand loom with which he could weave only five or six yards a day. Now, one person handles thirty-two modern weaving machines, each of which can weave more than four hundred yards of cloth per day, or a total of twelve thousand eight hundred yards. Many other industries show a still greater productive power over hand work. A laborer goes into a modern factory of this kind and in the first half hour he produces more than three times the goods he could have produced in a day with the hand tools of one hundred years ago. In the first half hour he has produced more than his day's wages. But before he gets the opportunity to use these tools, to produce his own living, he is compelled to enter into a contract to work for six, eight or ten hours longer. During the second half hour he produced enough to pay for his share of the expense of the management, wear and tear of the factory, the new machinery required and all other necessary operating expenses. After working long enough to meet all the above items he continues to work on and on to make profits for the idle capitalist who perhaps lives in Europe hobnobbing with royalty, and buying a worthless duke for fifteen or twenty million and presenting him to his daughter who later divorces the worthless snob.

So we see that the laborer not only produces capital in the first place, but reproduces it every day that he works. All wear and tear of machinery and of the factory, as well as the great wastes of competition, and the profits of the capitalists, are all produced by labor. From these profits, taken from labor, the capitalist builds new factories, hires more men and robs them of all they produce except a bare existence. The Socialists believe that if the laborers are capable of making all this machinery, and operating it, they are also able to own it in common, as the public schools, fire departments, libraries, water works, streets, bridges and many other industries are now owned, but this would be Socialism.

CAN THE PEOPLE MANAGE INDUSTRIES?

Did you say that the nation can't run these industries for itself successfully? Well, if the nation can manage a state university, it can run a packing house. If it can feed a fighting army, it can run a hotel. If it can build bridges, it can build factories. If it can irrigate land, it can sell groceries. If it can sell postage stamps it can sell coal. If it can manage a navy, it can run telegraphs, telephones, express companies, and railroads. If it can make cannons, it can make stoves. If it can manage experimental farms
at the agricultural colleges, it can manage farming. If it can pave the streets, it can make the materials with which to pave the streets. If the people can run the public schools, they can run factories or any other public utility.

**THE NEGRO QUESTION.**

The Negro problem looms up dark and threatening and continues to get worse. Though you think the negro is not your equal mentally, he is physically. If you let him own and operate industries for himself and get the full benefit of all his labor, he will be free to work out his destiny as he sees it and can in no way be a competitor under Socialism.

All that has been said about Socialism for the whites applies with equal force to the blacks. Socialism will effectually settle the race, the Japanese, and all other oriental problems forever.

**A BIG JOB.**

You will say that it is a big job to do this. It was also a big job to form this nation, but it was formed just the same. See what a job it was to free the slaves, but when the people were aroused to the terrible wrong being done the negroes, they got together and shook off the southern slave owners forever. And so it will be when the people once understand how to protect themselves from being robbed. They will arise in their might and with the ballot establish the co-operative commonwealth—otherwise known as Socialism.

In order to obtain even a slight reform, in most countries it is necessary to have a bloody revolution, but in this country any desired change can be had by the ballot.

The Socialist party has been organized in every civilized nation for the purpose of establishing the co-operative commonwealth by agitation and education. For this purpose thousands of books, pamphlets, magazines and newspapers, both daily and weekly, some with special editions or more than four million copies, are being published. Among these the Appeal to Reason of Girard, Kan., Wilshire's Magazine of New York city, The Christian Socialist of Chicago, and the Chicago Daily Socialist, may be mentioned.

The Socialist movement, besides these widely distributed papers, has hundreds of weeklies and dailies which are well supported.

**KINDS OF SOCIALISM.**

We often hear it said by those who don't know any better that there are so many brands of Socialism that they
can never be harmonized. Socialism is the same everywhere, and its principles have been adopted by all Socialists in their National and Local platforms, the world over. They are these: "What the people use in common, they must own in common, and what they use privately they must own privately." Anyone who believes this, and joins the Socialist party, and votes the Socialist ticket, is a Socialist. All the rest may be Socialistically inclined but are not Socialists—only incubating.

You often hear people condemn Socialism, who have never read a work on Political Economy, much less a book or pamphlet on Socialism. Don't condemn a thing until you have studied it. Recently the writer in a debate compelled his opponent to admit that he had never read a book on Socialism, and yet he is a graduate of a university and President of a Railroad Company.

WILL SOCIALISM BREAK UP THE HOME?

Occasionally some hollow-chested individual claims that Socialism will break up the home. Well, do not millions of the filthy, miserable, germ-breeding hovels, called homes, need to be broken up?

According to Census Reports, ninety-six per cent of the people of New York do not own the houses they live in now. In Toledo seventy-two per cent do not own homes. The average of homeless people in the United States is sixty-two per cent. What of the boasted freedom of America? What does home mean to these people?

The Census also shows that there are over seven million unmarried men in the United States. They cannot afford to get married—cannot make a living for themselves as it is, much less provide for a wife and family. There are also about the same number of unmarried women in the United States. The poverty and uncertainty of a competency due to the present competitive system is why there are fifty thousand prostitutes in New York City alone, and in other cities in proportion.

Under Socialism every man would be assured the means of acquiring a good home. Then such immoral conditions could no longer exist.

The Census further shows that there are one million married women who are compelled to work in factories. This causes numberless police court troubles and divorces. There were over sixty-five thousand divorces in the United States during the last year. These cannot be charged to Socialism.

During one year, one hundred and twenty-five thousand
people with their few household goods were ruthlessly thrown into the gutters and streets of New York City by the greedy, soulless plutocratic landlords. Thousands of them were sick, others cripples and many about to become mothers. Mr. Astor who owns miles and miles of these hovels, by virtue of the present methods, inheriting them from his father, now lives in a magnificent palace in royal splendor in Europe, that he may be as far away as possible from the squalor he makes. If ever anyone deserved the lowest and hottest hell, is it not he? Don't you, who vote to continue the system which breeds these conditions, deserve the same treatment, and yet you have the nerve to say that Socialism would break up the home. If these victims haven't the money to pay rent, how could they move to the country, much less buy a farm? Were they to attempt it what could they do in their present helpless condition? Charity to these people is an insult and a mockery. Christianity, so contrary to these conditions, can never be comprehended by these people. Why preach contentment to these creatures? If preachers believe that such conditions develop high ideals, noble characters, and Christianity, why don't they swap places with these underlings? Why do some preachers ride to church in a coach, live in fine houses with servants, and accept salaries from the Rockefellers, Morgans and Astors, whose wealth is the product of the robberies perpetrated on those to whom they advise religion? Aren't you virtually "hand in glove" with these respectable (?) thieves?

If Christ were on earth, would he wear silk-lined, spike-tailed coats, tooth-pick shoes, silk hats, accept fat salaries, keep servants, permit high-toned exchange gamblers and other millionaire parasites to occupy front pews in church without uttering a word of protest, lest he lose his salary? He drove the money changers from the temple, but you cater to them and pose as a Christian for the sake of an easy living.

Socialism would give one and all equal opportunities to use the machinery of the world, to produce beautiful homes, all the comforts of life and give the leisure to enjoy them to the fullest extent.

I thoroughly believe in the teachings of Jesus Christ, and for that reason teach Socialism in order to prepare the way for practical Christianity. Many of our leading ministers are now spreading the doctrines of Socialism because it and Christianity go hand in hand. Every minister should read the Principles of Socialism, by Rev. Vail, and also subscribe for the "Christian Socialist," edited by the Rev. Edward Ellis Carr, 5406 Drexel avenue, Chicago.
Senator Beveridge, of Indiana, Roosevelt's friend, has shown us that there are two million small children working in the factories. Jacob Riis, the noted lecturer, stated at the Valentine theater that three hundred and twenty thousand people live in one square mile in New York city, often four families in a single room. Three-fourths of these rooms get no sunlight whatever, and air is admitted through a flue or chimney. Think of all these people, two whole cities the size of Toledo, crowded like sardines in one square mile. What does home mean to these people? They don't even know what home means. This is now the state of affairs as they exist today under the present Capitalistic system. Could Socialism make it worse? Socialism will give the worker the ownership of his job, all he creates, and confidence in his ability to provide a cheerful home for the woman he loves. In a few hours each day, he can earn all he and his family can use, without being compelled to send his wife and children to the dirty, noisy factory. Socialism will make and keep beautiful homes instead of destroying them. Think of people arguing that if you give a man one-eighth of all he creates he will build a home and make it beautiful, but if he gets eight-eighths, or all he creates, he will forthwith proceed to "bust" up his home. Yet President Roosevelt has the monumental gall to state in his last message (?) to congress that Socialism will destroy the home. I suggest that he read some Socialist Primer or confine himself to shooting fleeing Spaniards in the back, stabbing harmless bears, or denouncing scientists as "Nature Fakirs."

Read the Socialist Platform and see if you can find where it states that "Socialism will destroy the home."

CHRISTIANITY.

The same silly argument is used to show that Socialism is antagonistic to Christianity. If Christianity can be maintained only by robbing the worker, by compelling him and his family to work long hours and live the life the average worker does live, then Christianity ought to disappear. But Socialism does no such thing, instead it will enable men to live practical Christian lives and in every way promote Christianity. Religion deals with man's future life. Socialism deals with man's earthly life. Socialism does not, in any way, interfere with any religious belief or lack of belief, but permits the individual to have any opinion on the subject whatever. Any one who uses such an argument is only presuming on your ignorance and prejudice. The next fellow who talks this trash to you, notice the slant of his head and see if he is not a fit subject for some asylum for the
feeble-minded. Again I ask you to read the Socialist Platform and show where we intend to destroy Religion or Christianity.

Frances Willard is regarded as having been one of the foremost Christians of the past decade. She insisted that Socialism is applied Christianity. There are thousands of other people devoting their fortunes and entire time to teaching Socialism.

**FRANCES WILLARD.**

"Look about you, the products of labor are on every hand; you could not maintain for a moment a well ordered life without them; every object in your room has in it, for discerning eyes, the mark of ingenious tools and the pressure of labor's hands.

But is it not the cruelest injustice for the wealthy, whose lives are surrounded and embellished by labor's work, to have a super-abundance while the laborer himself is kept so steadily at work that he has no time to acquire the education and refinements of life that would make him and his family agreeable companions to the rich and cultured? The reason why I am a Socialist is just here.

I would take, not by force, but by the slow process of lawful acquisition, through better legislation as the outcome of a wiser ballot in the hands of men and women, the entire plant that we call civilization, all that has been achieved on this continent in the four hundred years since Columbus wended his way hither and make it the common property of all the people, requiring all to work enough with their hands to give them the finest physical development, but not to become burdensome in any case, and permitting all to share alike the advantages of education and refinement. I believe this to be perfectly practicable; indeed, that any other method is merely a relic of barbarism.

I believe that competition is doomed. The trusts, whose single object is to abolish competition, having proved that we are better without it than with it, the moment corporations control the supply of any product they combine. What the Socialists desire is that the corporation of humanity should control all production. Beloved comrades, this is the frictionless way; it is the higher way; it eliminates the motives for a selfish life; it enacts into our every-day life the ethics of Christ's gospel. Nothing else will do it; nothing else can bring the glad day of universal brotherhood.

Oh, that I were young again, Socialism would have my life!—It is God's way out of the wilderness and into the promised land. It is the very meat and marrow of Christ's Gospel. It is Christianity applied."
LABOR UNIONS AND THE CLASS STRUGGLE.

On one hand we have the manufacturers, organizing themselves into trusts to protect themselves from ruinous competition and also to get bigger profits—which means that they wish to get still more of what the laboring man creates. On the other hand, we have the workers organizing Unions for self-preservation, and to keep a larger share of what they have labored to create. Trusts and Labor Unions are the outgrowth of inventions, and the present Capitalistic system.

All senators! mayors of cities and towns, generals of the army, and officers of the state militia were put into their places by the rich parasites, with the aid of the laboring man's vote. And after electing your enemies to these places you come with bared heads and bended knee to beg for some insignificant labor legislation, which, if granted, is promptly knocked into a cocked hat by being declared "unconstitutional," by the very Plutocratic courts which your votes created.

Labor Unions deserve great credit for the service they have rendered the Working Class. The old form of Craft Unionism has fulfilled its mission and must give way to that form of unionism suited to the changed conditions of production. Craft Unionism must give way to Industrial Unionism to correspond with the change in production from individual production to trust production. Craft Unionism teaches the identity of interest of capital and labor. Industrial Unionism teaches that there can be no identity of interests between capital and labor—between master and slave—between exploiter and exploited. Craft Unionism also seeks to ameliorate the condition of the wage worker. Industrial Unionism will absolutely wipe out the whole wage system. Socialism and industrial Unionism are the two arms of the Labor Movement. Socialism is the political arm and Industrial Unionism the economic arm. They both teach that there are two classes, viz: the Capitalist Class and the Working Class. One buys labor power; the other sells labor power. If capital increases its profits it is at the expense of labor. If labor increases its wages it must be at the expense of capital. This, in a nutshell, is what we call the Class Struggle. Socialists did not create it; they seek to abolish it. Socialism teaches that if Individually you belong to the Working Class, and in Habits you belong to the Working Class, and Socially you belong to the Working Class, then you also belong Politically to the Working Class Party—the Socialist Party. Remember by simply voting the Socialist ticket you vote to change the whole system and
thus become one of the owners of the industries yourself, and get all you create? Neither of the old parties nor any reform party, even so much as pretends to change the present system. All of these parties are fighting Socialism with all their wealth endeavoring to maintain the present Capitalistic system. A vote for any other party than the Socialist means that you will continue to be slaves. The laborers have fifty votes to the Capitalists one and can establish Socialism whenever they care to do so.

Will you continue to play into the hands of your enemies? If so, you deserve slavery.

THE OLD PARTIES.

If you are still in doubt as to what the old parties intend to do, read from Roosevelt's letter of acceptance. "We intend to carry on the government in the same way we have carried it on in the past." This means that they will keep on skinning you. Or listen, "It is possible, with dollars to "steer" the selection of the candidates of both the great political parties for the highest office in our republic, that of President of the United States." T. W. Lawson, millionaire, in Everybody's Magazine.

"We have arranged the platform and candidates for both parties and are willing that the voters should take their choice." Jas Buel, Secy. Nat. Bankers Ass'n.

There you have it, in plain language—the open confession and boast of Capitalism, which ought to make every American blush with shame.

If, at the next election you continue to "whoop'er up" for these old parties, you are worse than a "mollycoddle."

"All trade unionists know the above is an illustration of the union label. All trade unionists ought to know that "A union working man on election day with union made shoes on his feet, a union made hat on his head, a union made coat on his back, a union made cigar in his mouth, and a scab ticket in his hand is a voting donkey."

SAVING.

Perhaps you believe the reason some people are poor is because they don't save. Millions of sober, industrious people do not get enough wages now to live decently. How could they save? I know of many men who only get from nine to twelve dollars per week. How can they keep a family, live half decently and save.
There are about thirty million people who work. Suppose that each one would save two dollars per week, or sixty million all told. That would, of course, take sixty million dollars from the retail stores per week, which would cause hundreds of retail stores to fail, and clerks by the score would walk the streets without a job and penniless. The wholesaler would also get sixty million less and many of them would be forced to the wall and they would also discharge their clerks, office force, draymen, salesmen, etc. The jobbing houses would also miss the sixty million dollars, discharge their clerks, traveling men, etc. The manufacturer, the coal dealer, the grocer, all industries, and transportation companies; in fact, all kinds of business would be paralyzed and we would at once have a frightful panic.

So you can see that while saving is a good thing for an individual, so long as other people do not save, it would create distress if all the people saved at the same time.

No, this sixty million, if saved, could not be re-invested in new stores and factories, or business, because the demand for goods had already been cut down sixty million dollars per week, and since stores and factories already in existence were fast going to the wall, certainly there would be no need for new stores and factories, so the saving could but make the matter worse. Perhaps you may never have thought of this before, but it is very plain that if everybody saved, a panic would surely follow. Saving is not a virtue. Some people think we live to work, I work to live. Some people live to eat, I eat to live. Working and eating are necessary, but not the aims of life. Neither is saving.

Under Socialism each worker would be required to contribute a small per cent of his services for the evolution and betterment of society in general, and to maintain schools, colleges, parks, hospitals, old-age allowances, etc. This small per cent, contributed by each worker, would be returned to him after his retirement—at least by the time he is fifty years of age. This is the only sensible form of life insurance.

The balance of each worker’s income would be completely used up by himself, since his future is provided for, and also because a thing must be used to be of any value.

Why delve into the bowels of the earth to obtain gold and then hoard it in musty, man-made vaults? It must circulate to be of any value. Moving water bubbles and sparkles with life, while quiet waters stagnate. The whole scheme of the universe is action. Any sane system would produce commodities for use and not for saving and hoarding.
Under Socialism, with modern machinery and everyone engaged in useful work, with idlers and wastes eliminated, workers will have short hours and still be able to retire at the age of fifty, if not before.

Under the present system what is your outlook for the afternoon of life? How secure are your small, tear-stained, sweat-smeared savings, while banks, business men, trust companies and corporations are failing on every hand?

With closed factories, sickness, strikes, riots and war staring them in the face, is it any wonder men are driven to drink, to murder and to suicide?

THE SALOON QUESTION.

Not a saloonkeeper in the land sells liquor because he likes the business, but because there is a seven-cent profit in a ten-cent drink. If the government owned the saloons there would be only about one-tenth as many saloons. Because no profit could be got from adulteration saloons would then furnish pure drinks at cost of production; the bartender would not seek to get you drunk, for the simple reason that there would be no profit in it for him. Our crazy competitive system drives thousands of people into the saloon business, and thousands of others into the drink habit, while Socialism would have the opposite effect.

"I have said over and over again that poverty was caused by intemperance; now I say, after twenty-one years of study and observation, that intemperance is caused by poverty."

FRANCES WILLARD.

"The overwork of mothers in factories and sweatshops is the very hot-bed of drunkenness for generations to come. Whatever bequeaths a defective or deficient nervous system will predispose the inheritor to inebriety."

PROF. COMMONS.

Robert Hunter has shown that at least 10,000,000 people in the United States are idle a part of each year. These idlers are constantly seeking the jobs of those that are now working. New suppose every unreliable worker, every drunk, bum, and tramp in the country should sober up and become a highly competent worker, would they not be in direct competition with the other sober workers and would not this reduce wages? I am not arguing in favor of drunkenness, but simply stating facts. I am thoroughly opposed to intemperance in any form.

It is directly to the interest of the capitalist class
to have a large number of unemployed men from which to draw, in case a raise in wages is demanded. This large body of unemployed is needed for two reasons: When times are booming they can be used to make more profits for the masters, and when business is dull they are ready to take the strikers' jobs. No other method is so effective in keeping a workman at his task as the knowledge that just outside the factory door stand great hordes of idle and hungry men, ready to take his job at any price. This also keeps wages down to mere subsistence. Idleness and poverty drive the workers to all forms of intemperance and crime.

Suppose you are out of work, out of money, out of food, clothing and fuel,—rent due, little one at home crying for bread, your wife sick-abed, your credit gone. Suppose while you are roaming about with dejected spirit and aching heart, a friend should offer you $100 per month to tend bar; or a brewer offers to start you out in the saloon business for yourself on favorable conditions, with the prospect that later on you will own the business yourself and thus eliminate the terrible suffering of your family. For you or any intelligent man to continue to live this terrible life without becoming a drunkard or committing theft, murder, or suicide requires a heroism compared to which the martyrdom of a John Brown is a pleasant pastime. Here is a chance to better your condition—a way to relieve your suffering. What should you do? What would I do? I can not say, as I have never been placed in such a position. What either of us would do is not the point. The law of self-preservation is the first law of nature, and since men must live, ninety-nine men out of each hundred would accept—there being no other means of escape under the present system of doing business.

Under Socialism no man will be placed in such a predicament. He will never be tempted either to sell or taste liquor, and with the temptation to make profit eliminated who would wish to enter the saloon business?

Under Socialism as explained in another chapter, each would be developed along his mental, moral, physical and mechanical capacities. The teacher would implant in the mind of every pupil justice, liberty, peace, love, good-will and equality before God and man. It is the teacher's business to discover the natural aptitude of each child and develop him to the utmost in that direction. Every vocation in life will be at his command. By a competitive examination he will finally decide the one to which he is best adapted. His selection will afford him the greatest pleasure and profit because it is a natural selection. The heaviest
and most disagreeable work will be given the shortest hours of labor while the highest and most pleasant work will receive longer hours.

All labor will be regulated by those entering the various pursuits of life. The pay probably will be the same in all. The only difference will be the number of hours. Now, suppose a young man, educated under Socialism, is ready to select his life work. He is ambitious to win the love and admiration of his fellow men; he desires to make his mark in the world; he is young and full of hope and life, and fully equipped for the struggle of his career. Let us further suppose that under Socialism there were a few scattering saloons left that must have some one to conduct them. As he scans the long list of useful, honorable and necessary occupations he chances to see, the once numerous but now fast disappearing occupation of "Saloon-Keeper" near the bottom of the list. After being tendered the position in the saloon, suppose he should ask his teachers the following questions:

"If I refuse this job can I still have other work, with pay equally great?" "Yes."
"Is there bigger pay in the saloon business than other jobs?" "No!"
"Can I hold the respect of my friends?" "No!"
"Is it a necessary occupation?" "No!"
"Will it bless mankind?" "No!"
"Can I achieve distinction in it?" "No!"
"Will it cause distress, poverty, insanity, and murder and cause innocent women and children to suffer untold agony, and bring upon me the curses of my fellow men?" "Yes!"

You know full well that not one would select the liquor business as a matter of choice. Under Socialism there would be no incentive for any one to run the saloon business while the whole nature of man, the best influence of society, his future prospects, and every grand and noble impulse would impel him away from it. Under our present system men are driven into the saloon business for a living.

My good temperance friends, you are in a noble work but you are attacking the fruit and not the ROOT of the tree of intemperance. You have given battle to this enemy where he is strongest and where you are weakest. You are trying to suppress the evil while the cause remains. The cause is profit.

The millionaire brewers and whiskey men have unlimited capital at their disposal. Their living depends upon a continuance of the saloon business, the more liquor sold
the more dividends. Will they seek to destroy their own welfare? They have their hands on the throat of each of the old parties. For profit they try to debauch the legislatures of every state and nation. In the end they defeat every temporary gain for temperance and decency.

The saloon business has been legalized by the various states and the nation, and is therefore a legitimate business in the eye of the law. Now suppose you were to succeed in wiping out the entire liquor business from every foot of American soil? Have you made any provision for compensating the saloon men, the brewers, the distillers and jobbers for their property? Have you provided other work for them that they may earn an honest living? If these millions of men engaged in the liquor traffic were to be turned loose to compete with the already overcrowded labor market wouldn't wages drop to a frightful degree, and wouldn't that create the greatest panic in the world's history? Perhaps you never thought of this before, if not it is time you did.

Under Socialism it will be an easy matter to regulate or discontinue the saloons, and the people, at that time will determine just what they want, by a referendum vote. And since, under Socialism, the people will own and operate all the means of production, distribution and exchange, all these ex-saloon people will be given an equal opportunity to use this vast machinery to create things for their own use and enjoyment, "each according to his deeds," in the same manner as all other citizens of the nation of which they are a part.

Show the saloon keepers and brewers where they can make an honest living and it will not be necessary to legislate or drive them out of the liquor business. They will be thankful to embrace the first opportunity to quit the accursed traffic. Socialism will provide them with this opportunity.

If you really wish to eliminate the drink evil, can you do otherwise than join the Socialist movement?

To endorse our LOGIC and still continue the old methods is cowardly. The most glorious thing is not to be victorious, but to be right. The most glorious martyrdom is to sink beneath the supreme effort of lifting the burdens of mastership from the struggling and toiling millions.

INITIATIVE AND REFERENDUM.

Under Socialism public business and all industries will be conducted by a direct vote of men and women twenty-one years of age or over—each having equal voice. Further,
the Initiative, Referendum and Recall will be in use. The Initiative means, that some, (say, five per cent of the voters) can initiate or start any law they may desire, by petition, and it must then be submitted to a vote of the people.

The Referendum means, that if a legislature or council or any legislative body passes a law the people do not want, it can be referred back to a vote of the people.

The Recall means that any officer or legislator may be recalled to private life and another selected to fill his place, providing the legislator has not done his duty. Thus, you see, under Socialism, the people will be in full control of all industries and legislation, and consequently there will be no political parties or cliques; no special interests seeking special privileges, with which to fill their own purses.

"But," you ask, "Won't the Socialist party also become corrupt in time?" Yes, if the Socialist party was striving to continue the present system, it would also become rotten. But the Socialist party is organized to establish the co-operative commonwealth. When that has been accomplished, the party, as such, will cease to exist, because all legislation and management of industries will be by a direct vote of the people through the Initiative, Referendum and Recall, as above described.

DIVIDING UP:

Did you say that in a few years after Socialism was inaugurated that everything would be back again in the hands of the rich? Indeed it would if the Socialists intended to "divide up" and give everyone an equal share with which to do as he desired. They do not propose to do anything of the kind. The people now own the public schools, fire departments, waterworks, warships, postoffices, etc., and these are never divided up. The fire department can not bribe the waterworks department, but any manufacturer who has fire engines or supplies to sell, can bribe the fire department, the waterworks, etc., so also can the book trust bribe the school boards, and all firms supplying material to the postoffice, the navy, the army, etc., can, and do bribe these departments. But suppose the people manufactured their own supplies, could they bribe themselves? In fact, these, one and all are now being bribed and will continue to be bribed until the people manufacture all the supplies used by the schools, parks, navies, army, postoffice, waterworks, etc., etc.

All of the above institutions are now owned by the people equally, and you do not, nor do you propose to divide them up and then permit the rich to gobble them up in a few years, only to be redivided and gobbled up again.
NO COMPLICATIONS UNDER SOCIALISM.

Under Socialism, business will be a simple proposition, mere child’s play, as there will be no need of money that tempts, or banks, or insurance agents, or collectors, or traveling men, or lawyers, or advertising, or trading, or buying, or selling; no retail stores, as we know them, only an occasional sample store owned by the people, in which will be kept samples of everything needed, from which to order whatever you want and pay for it out of your labor time-checks earned by honest effort yourself. Nothing could be more simple, reasonable, and therefore more certain of adoption when once the people understand the advantages to be gained from Socialism.

I think it was Josh Billings who said that if “he wanted to make an accomplished liar of his son, he would have him learn the dry goods business.” If he had made the remark today he could easily have included all “business.”

The most successful merchant today is the one who can hire the biggest liars to help dispose of his wares; clerks who can mix the most sand in sugar without detection; sell the most cotton shoddy for all wool; sell pot-metal razors for the real article; put the large potatoes on the top and the small ones at the bottom; sell split-leather for calfskin; hire his clerks the cheapest, and work them the hardest and longest; hire ad-writers who can devise the greatest number of fake bargain sales, at which sales goods are usually sold at a higher price than ordinary. Yes, he does all these and many other contemptible things for PROFIT—to keep the “dear common people” from trading elsewhere and thus destroy his competition, while all those who escape his store are “forhanschwaggled” to the queen’s taste by his competitor who is a close second in the deception, adulteration, misrepresentation of this modern (?) business man.

Under the present system all the high-priced managers, superintendents, foremen, floor-walkers, head-clerks, etc., are only trying to “get” trade while the owners and stockholders of these stores are enjoying their winters in Florida and their summers in Newport, with dog parties, monkey dinners and baboon entertainments to drive dull monotony away.

During 364 days of each year you detest and condemn such conditions, and on the 365th day you, YES YOU, vote to continue the system that breeds these very conditions. Barnum and Bailey could do a rushing business, in the main tent at that, with you as the sole attraction, under the truthful caption “The Great Human Monstrosity.” Come now, aren’t these facts?
MONKEYS COMPARED.

Suppose you were traveling in Africa and should see a colony of monkeys in a cocoanut grove, and a few large monkeys compelled all the rest to bring cocoanuts to them, while they, the few, enjoyed themselves in the shade, giving back only enough cocoanuts to keep those that serve, alive, while quantities of cocoanuts were going to waste, and whenever a monkey "got gay" and demanded more cocoanuts to keep him from starving, the large monkeys denouncing him as "undesirable," and if this demand was repeated too often, kill him.

What would you think of them? Now suppose these same monkeys should chance to travel in the United States and see millions of human beings digging coal, catching fish, smelting iron, sawing lumber, making shoes, dishes, pianos, books, or raising all farm products, and then handing all these things over to a few other human (?) beings—beings who do nothing, and then form themselves into vast armies and navies and defend these idlers with their lives, and then teach their offspring that such killing is patriotism, erect hovels for themselves and palaces for the idlers, and with face and hands turned toward heaven, beg the idlers for a chance to continue to eke out an existence. If they saw all this, what do you think the monkeys would think of the people? They couldn't help but think the American species of monkeys are fit candidates for monkey asylums for the feeble-minded. If not, why not?

The human is the only species of animal on the face of the earth that permits millions of its own kind to starve while surrounded by plenty and to spare. What a travesty on civilization, and then to think that we, the Socialists, who know how to better the condition of humanity, must suffer with the rest, because we are powerless to change it without your votes.

HASN'T SOCIALISM FAILED WHEREVER TRIED.

Socialism has never been tried in the history of the world. A few Communist enterprises have at different times been tried, but Communism is not Socialism. These Communist enterprises were compelled to buy all of their raw material from the trusts, pay exorbitant freight rates, and compete with all the rest of the world in exactly the same way that a private concern now does. Practically all the wastes of competition were still present, and that is why all co-operative stores, conducted on a small scale in the midst of competition, usually fail. Competition and Socialism can-
not exist together. Competition is war, and war means that one party to any contest must perish.

Under Communism, everyone shares equally whether he works as much as others or not. As explained in a previous chapter, Socialism only gives equal opportunities to use the machinery and means of production, and each worker gets what he creates, or its equivalent, and spends it as he pleases. He could in no possible way live off the labor of others.

**HUMAN NATURE NOT CHANGED.**

No, it will not be necessary to change human nature before we can get Socialism. Human beings are by nature selfish and Socialists bank on every person being selfish enough to want all he creates, which is all right and is absolute justice. When he gets justice there will be nothing to fight about, and further, he will be permitted to enjoy the fruits of his labor in his own peculiar way. Bossism, graft and scheming for profits will have disappeared, since their cause has disappeared.

**SOFT SNAPS.**

"Under Socialism wouldn't everyone want the soft snaps?" Some occupations are naturally more laborious and dangerous than others, and in order to get the people to work in the streets or dig sewers it may, and probably will be necessary to give extra pay or larger time-checks to secure this labor. The average number of hours per day of labor would be greatly shortened by Socialism. Economists say less than four hours per day for each worker. But we might require the teacher to work five hours while the street paver works three hours; or six hours might be required for the teacher, or bookkeeper and two hours for the street paver. This seeming difficulty can be easily adjusted on this plan.

Personally I always enjoy better health when doing heavy out door labor and would now be a mechanic or farmer if I could get decent hours and gather as much money as I can now at my profession. I therefore would select the so-called "dirty work" as the hours would be shorter and the pay better. I know of many others who would join me since it would give us more leisure, better health, the wherewith and the time to gratify some of our ambitions that now remain ungratified. What satisfaction can there be in acquiring a liberal education in the arts and sciences, in music, literature and painting, and then never have the time or means to enjoy them?
The average university man never finds time to enjoy or further develop the grand and noble ideas that were taught him while at college, or get in touch with nature, even for a short outing. At least this has been my experience, and that of most of my acquaintances. Under Socialism all useful labor would be honorable. The nurse who ministers to the wants of the sick; the man who keeps the sewers clean and prevents epidemics; the women who cook our meals, do the washing, and rear our children; the men who dig coal, that society shall not freeze, or who furnish food, shelter and clothing for the people, are rendering a thousand times greater good to society than are the banker, the bond clipper, the rent taker and the interest and profit gatherers of today, and should have better pay.

Under Capitalism the useless parasites are your society people; yet, they do not even speak to the workers. Under Socialism an individual would be rated by his intellect, his culture, his accomplishments, and his ability and willingness to render valuable services to society. Now, people are judged by the number of almighty dollars they have squeezed out of their victims. This is all wrong and will be corrected when the working class wakes up.

And finally, if the present talented managers of industries refuse to act as managers under Socialism because they imagine there is no incentive, but prefer to work in the sewers, they can be easily accommodated.

**INVENTORS.**

What about inventors under Socialism? The majority of the inventors have never been benefited by their inventions because the capitalist generally gets the profits. The Census reports show that sixty-five per cent of our inventors die paupers.

Under Socialism the inventor would be given every encouragement and assistance by the government and he would be properly rewarded with a pension. This Capitalistic government now has chemists and inventors at work trying to invent some high explosive or some new fangled gun with which to kill the people more rapidly. Socialism would have inventors at work to benefit the people, not kill them.

Every invention under Socialism would shorten hours of work for the whole people, and would be hailed with joy and grateful appreciation. Now, inventions throw thousands out of work and force them to be tramps, paupers and criminals.

Edison, our greatest inventor, does not work for profit,
but because his great intellect finds its natural expression in electricity and mechanics. He has been known to work weeks at a time without ever leaving his laboratory and workshop.

He is several times a millionaire and with his immense popularity could cut a wider "swath" than any member of the "400." He seldom takes a day off, because he finds real pleasure in his chosen work. Profit is never an incentive to a man of intellect, education, or true Christianity.

**WHO WILL SELECT THE BOSSES?**

When Socialism comes who will tell me what kind of work I must do and who shall be boss?

Under Socialism each child will be developed along his mental, moral and physical capacities. A part of each day will be devoted to intellectual studies, and the balance of the day to useful and healthful manual training. Each child will not only receive a thorough knowledge of the common branches, but a full collegiate course, if his capacity permits and he so desires. He will also be given enough of music and art, painting, drawing and designing to develop any natural abilities he may possess. In the manual training each one will learn a trade, if he has the ability, and when these pupils are finally ready to enter their life work, each will have several occupations that he can choose from, and be able to select the one for which he is best fitted, as from that he will get greater returns and more pleasure than from some other occupation for which he has no aptitude.

If too many pupils should apply for certain occupations, and pass the examination for them, then only the very highest would be selected, and the rest would fall back, temporarily, on their second or third choice, as the case might be, but all would get work, and each receive as much as he created. There would be plenty of incentive for each to strive for the occupation he preferred, and to excel in his work. Under the present system you have very little or no choice.

Thousands are now working at something that is absolutely unsuited to them, while many lawyers, ministers and doctors should be digging post holes. Education under Socialism will continue throughout life, as people will have the time and opportunity for greater development. Now the majority of us are busy keeping the wolf from the door, and the rest of us are chasing the Almighty Dollar, so that throughout life, education is neglected to the extent that less than one-sixth of all pupils entering the first grade ever enter the eighth; less than one-fifteenth of those who
enter the first grade ever enter high school; less than one-third of those who enter high school ever finish the four years, and only three-tenths of one per cent ever enter a college or university and less than one-half finish.

The Burlingham (official) report from New York city shows that 465,800 out of 600,000 school children are physically defective. Of these 148,000 go to school underfed, and suffering the pangs of hunger. There are 63,000 children who can not attend school because no school buildings are provided. Still we boast of our educated Americans. What a boast to be sure. Why do such conditions exist?

New York City contains 2,437 millionaires, one billionaire, and is the wealthiest city on earth. The wealth of these millionaire idlers was filched from the parents of these children. Each millionaire means one thousand families pauperized. Last year in New York city $120,000,000 was given by charitable institutions alone, to relieve this suffering, and still conditions are growing more alarming. Could Socialism make it worse?

These conditions exist because millions of children are driven into factories to create profits for the idle rich, rather than into the schools to secure an education. You know this to be a fact, and you should at once assist in spreading Socialism, which would put all the children in the schools, where they belong, and ought to be.

"THE COMING SLAVERY."

"It is perfectly proper to enact laws which will give the teacher the authority to sort out the boys and girls, assign to each the trade to which he or she seems best adapted, and the law should then COMPEL these children to be trained for these trades."—President Eliot of Harvard, at the banquet of the National Society for the Promotion of Industrial Education.

President Eliot is the chief mouthpiece of Capitalism and the hearty applause accorded his utterances indicates that they are soon to be put into practice. This would give us double distilled slavery with a vengeance from which there will be no appeal. He proposes that the children of the working class shall be taken by the teachers, hired and controlled by the possessing, employing class and assigned to the trades in which there is the greatest need of wage slaves. Neither the parents, nor the children themselves, are to have any voice in determining the choice of occupations. Compare this with the Socialist program outlined above.
AN INCONSISTENCY.

Nearly everyone will admit that he is in favor of "Public Ownership of Public Utilities," but Socialism NEVER! All such people are therefore in favor of public ownership of the street cars, which would save a passenger, say, two cents on each ride four times a day, or a grand total of eight cents per day. This same person by owning his own shoe shop, at present prices, would save $28.00 per day, and by owning all the factories, mines, etc., each would save in proportion on everything consumed. Canst thou tell me then, my "Brilliant Sir" upon what kind of logic thou dost feed, that thou canst arrive at such magnificent conclusions, or perchance thou dost not employ logic at all? Perhaps thou believest in the adage—"Penny wise and pound foolish?"

SOCIALISM AND THE FARMER.

The average farmer now works from early dawn until bedtime, or about double the hours of the mechanic. Yet all he gets is a coarse living, a chance once a year to see the "pumpkins" at the County Fair, assist at a barn raising, and attend the funeral of some of his friends who could not stand the pressure of this terrible life. The farmer's wife, sons and daughters work as long and as hard as he does. They live in houses miles apart, away from civilization and all conveniences such as electric lights, parks, theaters, lecture courses, etc.

You would naturally suppose that after all this hard work and sacrifice, the farmer would be rich. Let us see. The Census reports inform us that 1,094,646 farm families live on mortgaged farms, also, 2,014,316 farms are rented. Anyone can see that the number of farms that are being worked by renters is increasing every year. This loss of ownership is why so many boys and girls leave the farm, as soon as, or before they get an education. They know from experience that farming under the present system means slavery. When the farmer sells his products, it is to the trust at a low figure, and when he buys he pays trust prices for oil, binder twine, nails, plows, harrows, drills, wagons, pianos, self-binders, in fact all his earnings go into the hands of the trusts except enough to keep him alive and provide more profits for the trusts. The Census also shows that the Capitalists pay $19 for making a self-binder; $7.60 for making a two-horse wagon; 72c. per dozen for twelve-inch three-tine pitch forks; 94c. for one dozen 12-tooth garden rakes. How do these prices compare with what you are now paying the trusts for the same articles? Un-
der Socialism you would get these and everything else at cost. Besides, most farming would be arranged and operated on the trust plan, which means,—large tracts of land and immense machinery such as we see on great farms of the west. One steam engine will plow, harrow and seed a strip of land twenty-four furrows wide and miles long by simply passing over the ground once, and when the grain is ready to harvest, a modern machine which threshes, weighs and sacks the grain all in one trip, will dispose of 120 acres in one day. Wheat can be raised by this modern method for a few cents a bushel. On this plan farmers could live in groups or hamlets on electric lines, go to their work each morning and return at night, and still have all the comforts of city life without the city's dust, noise, smoke and filth. They would no longer be called "clodhopper" by impolite people. Under Socialism if any farmer wished to farm in the "good-old-fashioned-way" he could do so, and still buy his goods and machinery at cost, as we have shown, but those farmers who worked with modern machinery would produce five or six times as much with the same work as these "good-old-fashioned-way" fellows. In a short time every farmer would want to be and would be modern. Under Socialism farming would be specialized. Chemists will determine to what crop each section of land is best suited and then that particular crop will be raised on it. We will then have large groups of men who raise nothing but wheat, others oats, others hay, others fruits, others vegetables, others sugar-beets, others cattle, others greenhouse products, etc., each group to be operated on an immense scale by experts and not, as now, expect a farmer to be jack of all trades. Farming will then be a pleasure, and will attract plenty of workers. The trouble will then be to keep the people in the cities. Isn't it strange that about the only farmer who lays up something for a rainy day is the man who is mean enough to half starve his family and himself and live on what he can not sell that he may add to his bank account.

Socialism does not necessarily require the national ownership of farm land that is used by its owner. Farmers who have by their own efforts acquired land need have no fear that Socialism will do them an injustice or take away their farm without adequate compensation.

Socialism stands for exact justice. Justice to the landless farmer demands that the nation acquire all land now held for rent, and lease or sell it to those who will actually use the land, except such portion as may be needed for general use. Farmers will be paid in full for all land that is
taken over by the government, providing such land was earned by the sweat of their own faces. For the same reason the nation will pay any one from whom it gets not only land but property of any kind, thus guaranteeing to all "a square deal."

**DOES FARMING PAY?**

"It pays the road that hauls the grain,
It pays the store that keeps from rain,
It pays the agents when they sell,
It pays the insurance very well,
It pays the banks that make the loans,
It pays the man the mortgage owns,
It pays the shops that makes machines,
It pays the merchant on his liens,
It pays the tax, fed'ral and state,
It pays the trust to keep up rates,
It pays everybody so grand,
Except the man who works the land."

**A MODERN PARABLE.**

"Hello, Mr. Farmer! What are you doing?"
"Digging potatoes."
"Have you any to sell?"
"No."
"What are you going to do with them?"
"I sort them in four piles."
"What do you do with them then?"
"The big pile of fine potatoes you see over there, I give to the landlord as LAND RENT for the privilege of living on the earth; next to the biggest pile I give to the MONEY LORD as interest, the third pile I give to the politicians as TAX, and the little ones I give to the hogs, and what the hogs don’t eat I eat myself. So, you see, between the Landlord, the Money Lord, the politicians and the other hogs, I get my living."

"But what do you do with the hogs?"
"I give them to the railroad company for hauling the big potatoes to the Land and Money Lords."

**WOMEN.**

Under Capitalism, woman, during all history, under all forms of government, has been the slave of man.

In Free America we find women on a level with convicts, and far below a common ward heeler, inasmuch as we permit the heeler to vote and deny the right to our
daughters, our wives, and our mothers. Politically they class with the man wearing prison stripes.

Under Socialism women will have all the privileges and opportunities that men enjoy, and that means an equal vote on all questions whatsoever. Voting is a peaceful means of majority rule. Are women not a part of the human family? Does not the law punish them as it does the men? Then why deny women the same privileges we accord the negro?

Socialism will guarantee to women, as well as men, an opportunity for employment, and at the same reward for an hour's labor. Women will thus be enabled to earn their own living, if they choose, and not be dependent on some grouchly, close-fisted, autocratic lord of creation, called MAN. Women being free, can follow out their individuality, and being the equal of man, will be companions instead of mere housekeepers, playthings or sex slaves.

Invalid men and women will then not be required to work, as they will be supported by the nation, as a matter of justice, not one of charity. Today, the laboring men are so poorly paid that the children and mothers are driven from their homes to factories, in order to make both ends meet.

Thus home life and influences are destroyed. Whenever women and children are forced to compete in the labor market with men, wages are so lowered that the earnings of the whole family are less than the wages formerly received by the father alone.

Socialists believe that it is the father's business to provide for the family, and since Socialism will enable every man to easily do this, marriage and home life will be encouraged.

Socialism, while giving every woman equal opportunities to earn her own living, does not compel, or even encourage, her to leave the home, but recognizes that she should be free to do as she pleases in the matter. Girls would no longer be compelled to marry the first simpleton who comes along, or some wealthy degenerate, for the sake of a home. Virtue would no longer be exchanged for a crust of bread. Capitalism has polluted the stream of love till the most sacred human relation is often made a matter of commerce.

Socialism would relieve women of many household drudgeries by doing the washing, ironing and baking at large laundries and bakeries, for a mere fraction of the present cost. Heating and lighting would be done by hot water and electricity from central plants, doing away with smoke, dirt and ashes. Dusting and sweeping would be
done by suction devices attached to a hose, also operated from a central plant. Even a dish-washing machine has been invented that will do the work of a score of women and would be in general use.

Hundreds of other labor saving devices would so lessen labor that each woman could do her work easily and in short order and have leisure to enjoy life. The "servant girl" problem will be solved. There will be no "hired girl" servants or other menials, forced by poverty, to do the drudgery for others than themselves. Why should one human being be the servant of another? In case of sickness the patient will be cared for by the department of health, by the best trained nurses and most learned doctors to be had. These doctors and nurses will be the exact equal in rights and opportunities of all the rest of humanity. If found mentally unfit they will be relegated to some position for which they are fitted. No odium or degradation will attach to such.

Socialism will bring even greater benefits to woman than to man, because it will raise her to the level of man, and out of the bondage to which she has been chained for centuries.

**HOW TO GET SOCIALISM.**

How will you bring Socialism about? Well, how did we acquire the public schools, the parks, the water works, the navy, the fire departments, the libraries, the court houses, the asylums, the poor houses, the hospitals, the universities, the public high schools, the bridges, etc.? These and many others are being operated successfully by the people. These have been acquired peaceably and all other industries can be acquired in the same peaceful way.

We expend annually over $200,000,000 on our army and navy. This sum would purchase, in one year nearly, if not all, the telephone and telegraph systems of the whole nation.

Since the people already own and manage the things mentioned above, it is improper to ask, "When will Socialism arrive?" A goodly portion of Socialism has already arrived. The desire of the Socialist is to extend this common ownership of the means of production and distribution to all those things that the people use jointly. Thus we see that Socialism is not "a new and untried thing," but merely an extension of the co-operation idea to other things that are vital to the very existence of the people.

**THE GROWTH OF SOCIALISM.**

Socialism is not far away, as the following figures dem-
onstrate. Eighty thousand votes were cast by the Socialists in the United States in 1900. Nearly five hundred thousand were cast in 1904.

In Germany 24,000 votes were cast twenty years ago. Now they have about 3,326,000. France casts nearly 2,000,000 Socialist votes; Australia 1,000,000. All other nations of Europe have a Socialist vote of about the same proportion. Thirty-one Socialists and Laborites were recently elected to the English Parliament. Ninety-four members were in the German Reichstag (Congress). Austria recently elected one hundred and sixty-one Socialists to their Congress. There are about 10,000,000 Socialist voters in the world, and all this voting strength has been developed within a comparatively few years.

SOCIALIST LITERATURE AND PUBLICATIONS.

I have given you only a brief outline of Socialism and you should investigate further by reading some standard works on Socialism. The Socialist movement has thousands of splendid books and pamphlets among which are "Capital," by Carl Marks; "The Struggle for Existence," by Walter T. Mills; "Socialism Made Plain," by Allen L. Benson; "Merrie England," by Blatchford; Edward Bellamy's "Looking Backward," and its companion book, "Equality." The above named books can be obtained at any Socialist Local, which you should join, or you can send direct to the Appeal to Reason, Girard, Kansas; Wilshire's Magazine, New York City; The Chicago Daily Socialist, Chicago; Charles H. Kerr Co., Chicago, Ill., and others.

PANICS.

Remember that when the next panic comes—and we have had panics at regular intervals during the last one hundred years, or ever since the introduction of modern machinery—you will see hungry people by the thousands roaming the streets for work; factories closed; mortgages foreclosed; whole families with their belongings thrown into the streets by the police and sheriffs, whom you voted into power; innocent children freezing and crying for bread—and your child may easily become one of these victims. Remember, I repeat, when you are actually in the midst of this hell on earth, you will be told by our Captains of Industry, our Bankers, our Business Men, our Capitalistic Newspapers, that the panic was caused by "over-production." Ye Gods! Must we believe that millions of people should go hungry, ragged, shivering and dejected because they have produced too much food; too much clothing and
shelter, the lack of which causes their suffering? No matter how ignorant you are, you know that such assertions are falsehoods, plain lies. Give every man and woman all they create, or its equivalent, an equal chance to produce, and you will never have such a thing as a tramp, a pauper, a tenement district, and certainly you could have no over-production, or under-consumption, or a panic.

THE UNEMPLOYED.

"What is a man to do, who is out of work, in a financial crisis and starving?" was asked of the Secretary of War and a probable Republican candidate for president.

"God knows. They have my deepest sympathy if they can not get work. It is awful when a man is willing to work and is put in this position," was his feeble, faltering and only reply.

THAT QUESTION AND ANSWER WILL BECOME HISTORIC.

That question is the one great question which the workers of the world are putting to the rulers everywhere. "We starve in the midst of plenty, what shall we do?" demands the desperate army of unemployed. "We are sorry but we can do nothing," reply the rulers of the world.

The problem of the unemployed is the riddle of Capitalism. It must answer it or Capitalism must die.

The workers are weary of watching children die for lack of what their fathers are denied the chance to produce.

If the plutocratic rulers will not solve this problem, the workers will. Secretary Taft has already told us how the worker will answer it. In his speech before the Boston Merchants' Association he said:

"If the abuses of monopoly and discrimination cannot be restrained; if the concentration of power made possible by such abuses continues and increases, and it is made manifest that under the system of individualism and private property the tyranny and oppression of an oligarchy of wealth cannot be avoided, then Socialism will triumph and the institution of private property will perish." Remember that Secretary Taft said this.

Secretary Taft has admitted that he knows no way to avoid or remedy this "abuse."

Then by his own confession, and in his own words "SOCIALISM WILL TRIUMPH."

The WORKERS will answer the question by tearing down the wall that stands between the gifts of nature and the tools their strength and skill have created. They will use their votes to make the things that are necessary to the
life of all, the property of all, and will then use those things
to satisfy the wants of all who care to work and produce
what they want. That would be Socialism.

An unemployed animal able to capture game, and
starving for the lack of game, is unthinkable.

During the early ages when mankind lived in tribes
along the banks of streams, gaining subsistence from forest
and stream the word “unemployed” would have had no
meaning. During all the time of chattel slavery and serf-
dom, when men worked with tools so crude that days were
required to produce what is now done in as many minutes,
there could have been no thought of “unemployed.” In all
past ages man was never denied the use of even crude tools
and thus starve.

Today the worker produces many times as much
as he needs to feed, clothe and house himself and family.
No one will claim these men have lost their skill, and that
the machines have lost their power to produce when prop-
erly handled. Everyone sees that these men are suffering
for the things their own hands are capable of creating.

The plutocratic capitalists who live off the labor of
others causing all this suffering and death had better ponder
over Secretary Shaw’s prediction quoted at the beginning of
this booklet. Is it any wonder that he asserts that “they
will be hard to deal with?” How long would you, dear
reader, freeze, starve and suffer; how many of your chil-
dren would you permit to die because your capitalist boss
would not let you use the machinery you created with which
you could prevent this calamity? I don’t think you would
wait long before you would be “doin’ things” at a lively
rate.

“It is an ill wind that blows no good.” The most
fortunate thing about the present panic is that it came
during a Republican administration, under a Gold Stand-
ard, and a High Protective Tariff. This is all the stock in
trade the Republican party has, and all it has had for the
past thirty years. The Democratic party has been dead
long ago in point of principle and is not worth discussing.
But the Republican party has blazoned upon all its ban-
ners, and shouted from all the rooftops, that “Gold
Standard insures perpetual prosperity; and the High Pro-
tective Tariff, a good wage and a full ‘dinner pail.’” Even
at that, why should you sneak off in some dark corner and
eat a cold meal out of your tin pail?

“Were the Democratic party now in power every Re-
publican, and Republican paper, in the United States would
charge that the panic came as the result of turning the Republican party out.

"But fortunately—if there can be anything fortunate about a calamity—the panic has come with full force and with deadly effect in the very midst of a Republican gold standard administration.

"The last panic was charged up to the Democratic party. So you see that parties are not responsible for panics. The system of robbery called Capitalism is responsible, and until this system is abolished, panics will continue at shorter intervals and with more severity.

"Wake up, you dull and sleeping toilers, to the fact that the man that owns the machine which you use to gain a living, owns the job—owns you. Vote to own your own jobs and you will never suffer if you are willing to work."

—Adapted from the Chicago Daily Socialist.

ANARCHY.

The plutocrats with the aid of their servile press are continually shouting "Anarchy" at any and all who dare to interfere with their high-handed robberies. It is well, therefore, to determine who the real Anarchists are.

Anarchy does not lose its identity be it ever so high in society or state, and it is the spirit and method of Anarchy—of lawlessness—in the high places, that is most threatening at the present day. Mrs. Browning once said: "The devil is the most devilish when respectable." So I say, that it is respectable Anarchy that is the most devilish and dangerous.

"Talk about Anarchy!" exclaimed ex-Mayor Swift in an address before the Commercial Club of Chicago. "Talk about breeding the spirit of lawlessness. Who does it more than your representative men? Your high-toned 'business men,' your prominent citizens?

"Who bribe the common council? It is not the men in the common walks of life, it is the men in your own walks of life, sitting by your firesides at your clubs."

Talk about Anarchy! Where, we ask, on all this broad earth does it flaunt itself so brazenly as in the lobbies and the halls of our Legislatures and Congress?

Where else are there plots so deep and diabolical, laid to subvert justice, to assault the very citadel of government, to strike at the fundamentals of law and order, to trample the rights and liberties of the people under foot? "I can not shut my eyes," says Father O'Brien, of Toledo, "to the dangers that threaten the republic. The greatest danger that I see now is the anarchy of wealth."
There are ten men in the city of New York,” said Senator Depew, “who can in twenty-four hours stop every wheel on all the railways, close every factory, lock every switch on every telegraph line, shut down every coal mine and iron mine in the United States.” What a travesty on the declaration that this is a government “of the people, for the people, and by the people,” when ten men can make starving beggars of 80,000,000 people in twenty-four hours.

Such men, or rather I should have said thieves, as have just been described, are Anarchists boiled down to a thick green scum, compared to which the Socialists, who wish to give equal opportunities to all, and the full product of labor to him who produces it, are angels. Socialists do not believe in Anarchy, neither of the high or the low, and realize that Socialism will remove the cause of all Anarchy and usher in an era of “Peace on earth and good will to men.”

The Capitalists, one and all, have joined the Manufacturers Association, which hires spies to join every labor union in the country for the double purpose of keeping the plutes informed of all intended strikes, and spot all agitators, who are then promptly discharged. When a strike is declared these spies, these modern Benedict Arnolds, follow their masters’ instructions and begin to fight, burn and shoot, well knowing that such tactics offer an easy excuse for the entrance of County, State and National Soldiery upon the scene to shoot men down like so many dogs.

If each and every member of the Manufacturers Association is not an Anarchist then, indeed, there never was an Anarchist.

LINCOLN.

In the early days of our race the Almighty said to the first of our ancestors: “In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread.” And since then, with the exception of light and air of heaven no good thing has been or can be enjoyed by us, without first having cost labor. And inasmuch as all good things have been produced by labor, it follows that such things of right belong to those whose labor has produced them. But it has so happened in all ages of the world that some have labored and others, without labor have enjoyed a large portion of the fruits. This is wrong and should not continue. To secure to each laborer the whole product of his labor, or as nearly as possible, is a worthy object of any government.—Abraham Lincoln.

Lincoln’s words quoted above are the “meat and marrow” of Socialism, and after this, remember that when you call Socialists agitators, demagogues, horse thieves; and
Anarchists, you include Lincoln with the rest of us, because Socialism aims to secure for the worker all he creates, and this is exactly what Lincoln demanded.

**DO SOCIALISTS BELIEVE IN KILLING.**

No, Socialists do not believe in killing the rich. The rich are the natural product of the competitive system for which they are not to blame. Rockefeller, Morgan and Harriman are gobbling up all the industries and as rapidly as possible forming them into trusts. They realize that competition is ruination, and to save their own bacon unite with their competitor for mutual protection and greater profits. This, I repeat, is a NECESSITY arising out of the competitive system and, at the rate the trusts are forming and growing, it will be only a few years until these Captains of Industry will have gathered up the remaining industries and have dumped them into the hopper of consolidation.

When this short task has been completed, the last, but necessary step will have been taken and all industries made ready to be taken over by the government—the people—and conducted for the benefit of all.

Why, then, should any sane person, and especially the Socialists who have studied the subject, wish to kill all these men who are so rapidly paving the way for Socialism? These magnates are the right men in the right place, and all Socialists hope Divine Providence may spare them, at least long enough to complete this all important work.

The servile, deceptive, cringing and trust-owned newspapers shout at every opportunity that Socialism means murder and Anarchy; that it would break up the home, destroy religion, incentive and ambition and stifle the noble and higher aspirations of life. They publish all this trash, which they well know is false, because they are paid to do it. Editors are compelled by the profit system to cringingly stultify themselves in order to live. Not an editor in all Christendom would continue to do this slimy work if they owned their own papers, or did not depend on capitalistic advertising for support.

To corroborate this statement I quote the words of a well known journalist, at a New York Press Club banquet, in response to a toast—"The Independent Press:" "There is no such thing in America as an independent press. You know it and I know it. There is not one of you who dare to write your honest opinions, and if you did you know beforehand that it would never appear in print.

"I am paid $150 a week for keeping my honest opinion
out of the paper I am connected with—owners, you are paid similar salaries for similar things—and any of you who would be so foolish as to write honest opinions would be out on the streets looking for another job.

"If I allowed my honest opinions to appear in one issue of my paper, before twenty-four hours my occupation would be gone.

"The business of the journalist is to destroy the truth, to lie outright, to pervert, to vilify, to fawn at the feet of Mammon, and to sell his country and his race for his daily bread.

"You know this and I know it, and what folly is this to be toasting an 'Independent Press.'

"We are the tools and vassals of rich men behind the scenes. We are the jumping jacks, they pull the strings and we dance. Our talents, our possibilities and our lives are all the property of other men. WE ARE INTELLECTUAL PROSTITUTES."—John Swinton.

This from one of the topnotchers himself ought to cause every thinking person to hang his head in shame when the words freedom and liberty are spoken.

Freedom of the press, indeed!

DO WE NEED CAPITALISTS?

Under Socialism there will be collective ownership of capital, but private ownership of wealth. Capital is surplus value extracted from labor and used to create more capital. Wealth is surplus value used for private enjoyment. Thus a shoe factory is capital, and should be owned by all in common, so with all factories, mines, railroads, etc. The shoes are wealth and should belong to those who made them, so with all commodities such as furniture, clothing, pianos, etc., and that because they rightfully belong to the makers, and to no others.

The distinction between private and public property is: That what the people use in common they must own in common, and what they use privately they must own privately. It is therefore plain that there can be no “dividing up” business under Socialism, but instead, each will receive according to the number of hours he has worked, or if at “piece work,” by the number of articles produced. If he who makes a thing does not get it, or its labor value who should?

Yes, Capital needs labor, and labor needs Capital, but we do not need Capitalists. The Postal system is an immense thing, but has no Capitalists at the head of it, neither have the fire departments. The public schools have no
capitalists at their head but are run successfully. Suppose all these departments of Public Utilities were owned by capitalists. Wouldn’t they demand profits and interest, and wouldn’t they compete and fight each other, bribe legislatures and councils to get advantages over competitors, and wouldn’t all this extra cost and expense be paid from the sweat of labor and add to the laborer’s burdens? Yes, we need capital, but not Capitalists any more than we need blood suckers on our body. Don’t blame the Capitalist blood suckers, but blame yourselves for allowing them to absorb all you produce beyond a scanty existence.

Arouse, shake off the leeches, by the only means left you—the BALLOT. Already in many states, a property qualification is imposed upon the voter. This means that you cannot vote unless you own property. Think of the capitalistic devils through the present competitive system, robbing you of the wealth you create, and then denying you the right to vote because you have no wealth. On the same plea, in nearly all countries, the workers are denied the right to vote. Denied this right, they resort to the only means left them—anarchy and bloodshed—the method employed by the Russian serfs, who were reduced to their present deplorable condition by this same capitalistic system.

If you ever change the present system it must be by the ballot or the other of these two methods. The Socialists are organized throughout the entire world for the purpose of bringing about this great change peaceably, with the ballot. Will you assist to make this change peaceably, with the ballot, or will you continue to sleep on until you wake up to find yourself in the midst of the throes of the bloody revolution which Secretary Shaw predicts?

THROWING AWAY YOUR VOTE.

Did you say you wished to vote for immediate results—for something you can get now, some measly “reform,” and not lose your vote?

The ultimate aim of Socialism is the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth, but during the transition period the Socialist party at its last national convention pledged itself to watch and work in both the economic and the political struggle for each successive immediate interest of the working class:

1.—For shortened days of labor and increase of wages.
2.—For the insurance of workers against accident, sickness and lack of employment.
3.—For pensions for aged and exhausted workers.
4.—For the public ownership of the means of transportation, communication and exchange.
5.—For the graduated taxation of incomes, inheritances, franchises and land values, the proceeds to be applied to the public employment and improvement of the conditions of the workers.
6.—For the complete education of children and their freedom from the workshop.
7.—For the equal suffrage of men and women.
8.—For the free administration of justice.
9.—For the prevention of the use of the military against labor in the settlement of strikes.
10.—For popular government, including initiative, referendum, proportional representation, equal suffrage, and municipal home rule, and the recall of officers by their constituents.

The rest of these immediate demands will be found in the National Platform of the Socialist Party.

While Socialists believe in establishing ultimately all there is of Socialism, they also believe in the above "immediate steps." The Socialists would be more likely to be successful under Capitalism, while it lasts, than would the Capitalists. It would only be natural for the plutocrats to misdirect these "immediate steps" in order to prolong their system of plundering the people.

Common sense shows this. The result in Colorado demonstrates its truth. The workers in that state elected a Republican (Capitalistic) Governor and Legislature by 47,000 majority, who were pledged to enact an eight-hour day, but afterward shamefully disregarded their sworn duty. The workers struck to enforce their rights and were bull-penned, deported, imprisoned and shot down like dogs, not only by the sheriffs, whom they had elected, but by their state militia, and by the national soldiers as well. The same thing occurs in Democratic states.

Had these workers elected Socialist Governors, Legislatures, Sheriffs, and Judges of the Courts, all this thwarting the will of the people, and bloodshed would have been avoided.

Better trust your friends, the Socialists, rather than your enemies, with your votes, if you really want "immediate results" and not bullets.

DIFFERENT SYSTEMS.

Ask the average man how he intends to remedy these conditions and he will tell you, with a shrug of his shoulders, that "these conditions cannot be improved." **always
was and always will be so.” This is not true. On the contrary, society is a growth and development and has passed through many complete and radical changes and is now ready to make the grandest change in all history. I will briefly describe only the last three great changes.

**SLAVERY.**

In the early days it was the man with the largest club, who made a slave of his less muscular neighbor. This developed the slave owning class. Whole tribes and nations found that it was to their financial advantage to enslave their captives, rather than to kill them, and thus slavery flourished for centuries.

**FEUDALISM.**

Later, it was the feudal lord, who, by reason of his ownership of the land, absorbed the results of labor. Thus was feudalism or the landlord introduced as a class. Under the feudal system the serf was attached to the soil. He must stay on it and work it. Part of the products of his labor went to his lord and part he kept. When the feudal system gave way, the absolute ownership of the land was vested in the lord. The peasants were dispossessed and driven off the land. They drifted to towns and engaged in handicraft. The work was all done by hand. Each worker owned his little kit of tools. If he lost his job he took his tools with him.

**CAPITALISM.**

This last change is called “Capitalism” and has the previous systems beat a mile when it comes to skinning the workers. Even under Chattel Slavery the colored man was always sure of enough to eat and a place to sleep because his owner had from one thousand to two thousand dollars invested in him. You are not sure of even that now. When the slave owner lost a horse, or a negro, or a mule it meant so much of a money loss to him. When a modern wage-slave—black or white, dies, his master, the Capitalist, sustains no loss. A thousand other wage-slaves scramble to fill his place. Your sickness, your poverty, and your suffering are no concern of his. Is it any wonder that the Capitalists are moving heaven and earth to prevent the next change, which will be the freedom of men through the ownership of jobs, or Socialism.

When Socialism comes, the former Capitalist will be given the same opportunity to use the machinery as others, but he will no longer be permitted to rob. This is right, this is simple justice, this is Socialism and must prevail.
ROBERT HUNTER.

Robert Hunter, one of the world’s greatest humanitarians, after spending a vast fortune in charities, after finding that charity is no cure for poverty, is now devoting his fortune and best efforts to destroying private ownership and its effects.

I quote the following from his book, “Poverty”:

"On cold, rainy mornings, at the dusk of dawn, I have been awakened, two hours before my rising time, by the monotonous clatter of hobnailed boots on plank sidewalks, as the procession to the factory passed under my window. Heavy, brooding men, tired, anxious women, thinly dressed, unkempt little girls, and frail, joyless little lads passed along, half awake, not one uttering a word as they hurried to the great factory. From all directions thousands were entering the various gates to the factory. Hundreds of others—obviously a hungrier, poorer lot than those entering the gates; some were most ragged and almost shoeless, but all with eager faces—waited in front of a closed gate until finally a great red-bearded man came out and selected twenty-three of the strongest, best-looking of the men. For these the gates were opened, and the others, with downcast eyes, marched off to seek employment elsewhere or to sit at home, or in a saloon, or in a lodging-house, until the following morning, when they came wistfully again to the same factory gate. In this community, the saddest in which I have ever lived, (N. Y.) fully fifty thousand men, women, and children were all the time either in poverty or on the verge of poverty. It would not be possible to describe how they worked and starved and ached to rise out of it. They broke their health down; the men acquired in this particular trade a painful and disabling rheumatism, and consumption was very common. The boys and girls followed in the paths of their parents. The wages were so low that mothers with babies at their side toiled in order to add to the income. Theirs was a sort of treadmill existence with no prospect of anything else in life but more treadmill. When they were not given work in the mill, they starved; and when they grew desperate, they came to my office and asked for charity. Here was a mass of men whose ways of living were violently opposed to those of the vagrant or the pauper. They were distorting themselves in the struggle to be independent of charity and to overcome poverty. That they hated charity must be taken without question."

"Difficulties and struggles, simple fare and simple liv-
ing, are good for men; but poverty—the poverty of which we have been speaking—is without its jewel and is both unlovely and venomous. And this is more true of the child of poverty than it is of man. However sad and miserable that poverty is, which undermines the power and usefulness of men, it is a slight thing compared to that poverty which blights and ruins childhood. It will be recalled that in those streets and courts and alleys in which the inebriate, the blind, the crippled, the consumptive, and the aged—the ragged ends of life—live, there also live the half-starved, underclad beginnings in life—the children. The poverty which kills, which makes terrible the end of life, is not so terrible as the poverty which blackens and stifles childhood and casts a shadow over all the after life. Poverty degrades all men who struggle under its yoke, but the poverty which oppresses childhood is a monstrous and unnatural thing, for it denies the child growth, development, strength; it robs the child of the present and curses the man of the future.

And yet wherever there is a man in poverty, there are several children. There are more children than adults in the world, and the same holds true of those in poverty. If there are, indeed, ten million persons in this country underfed, underclothed, and badly housed, the great majority are children who have neither violated social laws nor committed sin.”

“To live miserable we know not why, to have the dread of hunger, to work sore and yet gain nothing,—this is the essence of poverty.

There are many people in the world who believe that the provisions of charity are in the present day so generous and varied that no one need suffer; but, even if this were true, it would not materially lessen the sorrow of the poor. To thousands and thousands of working-men the dread of public pauperism is the dread and agony of their lives. The mass of working-men on the brink of poverty hate charity. Not only their words convey a knowledge of this fact, but their actions, when in distress, make it absolutely undeniable. When the poor face the necessity of becoming paupers, when they must apply for charity if they are to live at all, many desert their families and enter the ranks of vagrancy; others drink themselves insensible; some go insane; and still others commit suicide. Recently a man, who had been unable to find work and in despair committed suicide left a note to his wife saying: ‘I have gone forever; there is one less in the world to feed. Good-bye. God help you to care for Tony; don’t put her away.’
Is the fear and dread of pauperism: ‘don’t put Tony away;’ is the last thought of the man whose misery caused him to take his own life.

These are the terrible alternatives which the working people in poverty accept in preference to pauperism."

That the horrible conditions described above can exist and continue to grow rapidly worse in the midst of this “land of the free and home of the brave” with machinery capable of supplying every man, woman, and child, not only with the necessaries, but with the comforts and luxuries of life and ample leisure to enjoy them,—is the shame of the twentieth century civilization. That these conditions exist all about us everywhere is continually impressed on our minds by the daily papers and our own eyes.

In spite of all laws ever enacted, in spite of all reformers and their various schemes to remedy and relieve, in spite of all charitable people with millions of donations, in spite of all the newspaper and magazine efforts, in spite of all the unnumbered struggles, sermons, and prayers of this great Christian nation—I repeat, in spite of all this—crime, pauperism, poverty, insanity, and murder are flourishing as never before.

That these awful conditions need to exist no one believes. That civilization will crumble and decay if the present capitalistic system of private ownership continues, is self-evident.

Isn’t it time to apply the ax to the root, destroy the tree of private ownership and plant in its stead the tree of “common ownership.”—Socialism?

Have you ever read the poem of the “Ninety and Nine” —not Sankey’s hymn of that name, but an ode to the hosts of labor. Commit this to memory:

Their labor has made the wilderness bloom,
The forest before them falls,
Their skill has fashioned stately homes
And cities with marble halls.
But the one owns cities, and homes and lands,
While the ninety and nine have empty hands.

You know this to be only too true, dear reader. Then join with the hosts of Truth and Justice in their effort to right the wrongs of the centuries, and re-establish the people in their God-given rights as children of men.
MEN AND MULES.

All those who believe:

That the earth belongs equally to all men;
That no one can show a warranty deed for a foot of land signed by God;
That opportunities should be equal to all;
That rent, interest and profit should be abolished;
That whoever makes a thing should have it or its equivalent;
That Socialism deals with earthly things—man's present life;
That Christianity deals with heavenly things—man's future life;
That Socialism does not interfere with any man's religion;
That Socialism will advance true Christianity;
That there are two distinct classes in the world—the working class, and the capitalist class;
That all should be useful workers and not idlers;
That the Initiative, Referendum and Recall—direct legislation—is right;
That this would restore the power of governing to the people;
That the means of production, distribution and exchange should be owned by all the people for the benefit of all who labor and not for the idle few;
That people formerly lived comfortably on the products made by hand tools;
That modern machinery can produce a hundred times as much as hand labor, and since we can produce more than we can use, it is all unnecessary and wrong for people to starve;
That this contention is worse than slavery, because even colored slaves never starved;
That the man who owns the machinery owns the jobs;
That the man who owns the jobs owns the man;
That the man is finding that out, and when he "gets next," then look out;
That it should be impossible to starve, if willing to work;
All those who believe:
That it is wrong to produce eight-eighths, keep one-eighth and give seven-eighths to the idle owners for the privilege of using this machinery.
That if one gets only one-eighth he can buy back only one-eighth of all he produces;
That this seven-eighths remains on the capitalist’s shelves and gluts the markets;
That this seven-eighths remaining on his shelves is what the capitalist calls “over-production;”
That this surplus in reality is due to under-consumption;
That this glut closes factories, causes panics, poverty, crime, tramps and paupers;
That the man who says that all this is caused by “over-production” when he knows it is “under-consumption” is a deceiver;
That the capitalist system is a “skin game” and the capitalist favors it because it benefits him;
That the workers should oppose this system because it harms them;
That the workers will abolish this system when they get “horse sense;”
That competition is war, that war is hell;
That co-operation is better than competition;
That to work with your fellow man is better than working against your fellow man;
That the capitalists have abolished competition for themselves by organizing industries into trusts;
That all workers should join their Union and the Socialist party;
That this is exactly what the capitalist is afraid the workers will do, and unless the workers do this they are doomed;
That Secretary Taft, by admitting that he has no remedy to offer the unemployed, acknowledges that he is unfit even to be a candidate for President of the United States;
That Taft’s answer, “God knows,” is a cheap, ignorant and weak answer—a subterfuge;
That Taft’s answer, “God knows,” won’t pay the grocery bill;
All those who believe:
That a starving workman can't "cash in" on Taft's answer, "God knows;"
That the Republicans and the Democrats are using the same answer, "God knows;"
That Taft's government spends $200,000,000 annually on the army and navy, but refuses to spend a cent to keep the millions of men, women and children from starving;
That this vast sum would build 200,000 homes at $1,000 each, and should be used to house, feed and clothe the needy;
That this would not be "Paternalism"—would not be "anarchy"—but would be common sense—would be Socialism;
That if Teddy can't bust a trust after trying for seven years he never can;
That if Teddy really put a trust magnate behind prison bars, and then charged an admission fee, the people would flock to see the magnate;
That Teddy should hand over his admission fee to Taft to solve the unemployed problem, since "God knows" has failed to solve it;
That some day the unemployed and downtrodden will call Teddy, Taft & Co.'s bluff, and solve the trust problem by letting the nation own the trusts, and thus the people will own their own jobs;
That the working men will never get what they want by voting for what they do not want;
That when a man steals a loaf of bread he is sent to the penitentiary;
That when he steals a railroad he is sent to Congress;
That what the people use in common, they should own in common;
That what the people use privately they should own privately;
That this is associated labor—is co-operation, is Christianity, is brotherhood, is Socialism;
That so long as the capitalist system remains compelling the many to do the work and permitting the few to rake in the profits, there will be idlers, panics and distress;
That the capitalist system, not the men are to blame;
That so long as it is a case of "ride or be ridden," that he is a fool who is ridden;
I repeat, that all those who believe in the foregoing facts and principles are Socialists—are MEN.
All those who do not believe in the afore-mentioned facts and principles, but do believe the following absurdities:
That competition is the life of trade;
That an idle class should live off the labor of the working class;
That a worker should only retain one-eighth of all he makes;
That injunctions are just the thing for strikers;
That armies, navies and war are "messengers of peace;"
That panics are "necessary evils;"
That strikes should be settled by bullets;
That millions should be idle, hungry and freezing in the midst of plenty;
That adulterated food is O. K.;
That lying and misrepresentation is "business;"
That others should ride on his back;
That the ridden should tamely submit;
That those who build palaces should live in shacks;
That those who make clothing should freeze;
That those who make shoes should go barefoot;
That those who do nothing should have millions;
That those who do everything should have nothing;
That "Divine Right" Baer should own all the coal mines, and compel the rest of humanity to "cough up" exorbitant coal prices or freeze;
That the idle few should be strictly "IT" while the worker is strictly "NIT;"
That it is patriotic to go to war and be shot full of holes in defense of his (?) country while the real owners, Rockefeller, Morgan & Co., remain at home to reap the benefits;
That Socialism is anarchy, "dividing up;"
That Socialism will destroy religion and home;
That because he produces many times as much as his grandfather did, he should still suffer and starve;
That his wife and daughter should do all their own work, and then wash, bake, iron and scrub for the millionaire's family;
That if Christ were on earth today He would do the thousand-and-one things that the modern business man is compelled to do in order to get "business;"
That Christ would not hesitate to imitate the modern business man by putting glucose in the honey, sand in the sugar, formaldehyde in the milk, and alum in the flour, for profit;
That think anarchy the same as Socialism;
That condemn Socialism, yet do not even know what it is;
That he should slave for others and make no kick;
That he should work a great deal, sleep less, and think not at all;

I repeat that all those who believe in these absurdities and cling to such antiquated ideas are not men, neither are they respectable shadows of real men, but are MULES.

We know:

That mules, the four legged kind, in return for what they do for their capitalistic owners and bosses are well fed, watered and groomed, properly shod and bedded, supplied with warm and roomy stables, and are seldom overworked or abused; in sickness they are promptly looked after by a veterinary. Yes, these mules get this treatment and submit because they don't know any better—because they are MULES.

We know:

That mules, the two-legged kind, in return for a life of long hours of labor, self-denial and hard, slavish work for their capitalist owners and bosses, are herded in rented shanties, fed on the cheapest of adulterated foods, embalmed beef, stale liver, and after spending their youthful and best years to enrich their employers, after becoming emaciated, after being displaced by fresh recruits from the army of the unemployed, these fellows are by these same masters turned over to charitable institutions, or to the tender mercies of the elements, to become wanderers, tramps, thieves, criminals, or food for the penitentiaries or asylums. Yes, these men (?) get this treatment, and submit, because in the language of Uncle Josh Wethersby, "They are Gosh Darned Fools"—MULES.

This comparison of men and mules is made with sincere and respectful apologies to the mules, because the mules when underfed, overworked and abused know enough to "kick." This can not be said of those who vote to continue the present crazy competitive system.

If, heretofore, you have acted the part of a mule by voting old party tickets and reform fakes, make a change, vote the Socialist ticket and become a MAN.
S-Y.

The century now opening is luminous with great achievements. In every department of human endeavor marvelous progress has been made. By the magic of the machine which sprang from the inventive genius of man, wealth has been created in fabulous abundance. But, alas, this wealth instead of blessing the race, has been the means of enslaving it. The few have gained possession of all, and the many have been reduced to the extremity of living by permission.

This is called Christianized Civilization. This civilization is chaos, surcharged with the spirit of hell. Beneath the surface we see a world wide fight, an universal struggle, unnatural conflict, never ceasing, merciless and pitiless; a seething multitude desperately fighting each other, with hearts black with deadly cunning, ferocity, distrust, envy, jealousy and hatred; while despair and poverty are the dread of all.

On every hand we behold the massive doors of factories, where millions of my brothers and sisters are toiling with bent backs, bathing in their own sweat, and by their actions showing that,

"They are neither man nor woman—They are neither brute nor human—"

They are ghouls—

Nerveless, brainless, spiritless, with neither body nor soul—bending, twisting, first here, then there, using up what little vital force they possess in toiling for the little bread they must eat.

We see millions of small, innocent children, weak, pale, physically, mentally and morally undeveloped, creeping along early in the morning to their daily toil.

Those among them who will survive the struggle will become the progenitors of future generations of weaklings. They will give birth to degenerates and criminals. This is the work of our boasted Christianized Civilization.

Socialism will forever blot out this nightmare of so-called civilization and usher in a nation of happy people, freed from the haunting fearsome thought of the morrow, with its frightful struggle for mere animal existence; a nation whose mothers and daughters know not the toil of the sweat-shops and the factories; a nation whose childhood and youth is spent in wholesome, body-strengthening, soul-expanding frolic; whose young manhood and womanhood is spent in the great universities of learning; whose
men labor in the nation's workshop for very joy; a nation whose grandfathers and grandmothers, after a career of usefulness will approach the evening of life without fear of poverty and want—knowing from the abundant surplus which they themselves have helped to create, their simple wants will be supplied.

When you fully realize how easily this new state of society can be attained you will instantly wish to join this greatest crusade of all the ages now organizing for its world mission. Its name is Socialism; a beautiful word, a noble expression, a divine ideal.

For the first time in human history, a great fraternal movement is sweeping across the face of the earth and its millions of loyal adherents, social crusaders in the true sense of that term, are clasping hands across the border line of all nations, and in joyous acclamation, voicing the inspiring sentiments: "We are brothers all," and "War shall curse and stain fair earth no more."

100,000 "Men and Mules" on this wagon. Largest load of "brain food" in the world. 1,000,000 sold in five months.
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DEFINITIONS OF SOCIALISM

Some people have queer ideas about Socialism. They think it is Anarchy, disorder, dividing up property, etc., etc. A few definitions from dictionaries and world-famous men are here given:

The ethics of Socialism are identical with the ethics of Christianity.—Encyclopedia Britannica.

Socialism is simply applied Christianity; the Golden Rule applied to everyday life.—Prof. Ely.

Socialism being the product of Social evolution, the only danger lies in obstructing it.—Rev. F. M. Sprague, the Great Divine.

Socialism is a theory of society that advocates a more precise, orderly and harmonious arrangement of the Social relations of mankind than that which has hitherto prevailed.—Webster's Dictionary.

A theory or policy that aims to secure the reconstruction of society, increase of wealth, and a more equal distribution of the products of labor through the public (collective) ownership of labor and capital (as distinguished from property), and the public (collective) management of all industries. Its motto is: "Everyone according to his deeds."—Standard Dictionary.
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