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The debate recorded in the following pages, will doubtless be repeated many times as long as society is organized on a class basis.

Capitalist reform, versus proletarian revolution will always be a crucial question as long as capitalist and proletaire confront each other in the political arena.

In this instance it is the National Progressive Party under Roosevelt, which champions reform. It is the Socialist Party which champions the cause of revolution.

Capitalist reform parties will come and go, as they have in the past. They will always be composed of the same incongruous elements, which characterizes the Progressives today.

They will present until the last, the same appeals for opportunism.

Their leading figures will always be found as today either members of the capitalist class or closely affiliated with that class.

What is today urged against the Progressive Party can be urged, with equal force against the reform parties of the future.

Consequently the various positions put forth will be always timely. They will lose none of their effectiveness through the fact, that on this particular event they were used as a campaign vehicle.
DEBATE between Frederick C. Ruppel, Socialist Candidate for Congressman from 21st District and Augustus R. Hatton, Professor of Political Science, Western Reserve University, Progressive Candidate for Congressman from 21st District, at Vorwaert's Turn Hall, 1610 E. 55th Street, October 25th, 1912 8 p. m.

Question Resolved: That the Socialist Party and not the Progressive Party is entitled to the support of the workers in this election.

The meeting was called to order by Mr. Wm. Bessemer, who made certain announcements and then introduced the Chairman of the evening, Matthew B. Excell, Esq.

MR. EXCELL. Ladies and gentlemen, a few years ago I was a candidate on the Democratic ticket for congressman in this district, and the Socialists challenged me to debate, and I debated. They also challenged the Republican candidate, and he had the same Republican habit, now adopted by the Democrats in that respect, and he didn’t debate either. And in the tent, the following night, Tom L. Johnson, in speaking for my candidacy, said that any man who was a candidate for Congress, and who was unwilling to meet any of his opponents in debate, ought to be defeated. (Applause.) I don’t mean that as anything unkind towards Mr. Bulkley, who belongs to my political party, nor yet towards Judge Taft, who has been my very intimate friend for more than twenty years, but I am ashamed of both of them that they are not here this evening. (Applause.) You didn’t come here to hear a Democrat; you came here to hear a debate between the two candidates for Congress in this district who are not afraid to debate. Without detaining you longer, I will introduce to you Mr. Frederick C. Ruppel, the candidate of the Socialist Party, who has fifteen minutes to make the opening address. (Applause).

MR. RUPPEL. Mr. Chairman, and comrades and friends: I hope that throughout this debate you will give not only myself but my opponent the closest attention and please do not interrupt too much with applause.

I want to say that what the Chairman said about the Democratic and Republican candidates is undoubtedly true, and I do want at this time to pay tribute to Professor Hatton for the courage of his convictions. (Applause.) Evidently Robert Bulkley and Judge Taft either have not the courage of their convictions or else have no convictions, or they would have accepted our challenge for debate.

We find ourselves on this platform, myself and my opponent, as the representatives of two leading political parties, the Socialist and the Progressive Parties. Now, my friends, what are political parties? In any society where there exists suffrage, where a portion of the people can exercise political power, there political parties spring up as the expression of economic interests, as the expression of dollars and cents or bread and butter interests. These exist for the purpose of changing society, of remodeling it more or less. You find political parties necessary for certain classes in society to gain political power, to gain control of the state, in order to strengthen their positions in society. You do not find a political party necessary for the introduction of the peek-a-boo
waist or ragtime music. These are questions of fashion and taste, not questions of economics, and today as in the past, these two political parties, as well as the Republican and Democratic Parties, stand for certain economic groups in society.

And political parties are not to be understood unless the economic structure of society of which they exist is investigated. For instance, in the past we have had the Republican and Democratic parties. At the hey dey of the career of the Republican Party, in its palmy days, when it was a party to be respected, when it was a party that was worthy, at that time—I am referring to ante-bellum days—at that time the Republican Party stood for the interests of the manufacturers and the bankers and the traders of the North, while the Democratic Party stood for the Bourbons, the slave owners of the South, and between those two there was fought out a mighty political conflict as to whether the wage system of developed capital should still further develop itself, or whether it should be restricted and the slaveholders permitted to retain their hold on the American government to the betterment of their economic condition. But since that, both parties have degenerated into senility. Today we find that the land, tools and machinery of this nation are the property, the private possessions of a small group in society, and we find that food, clothing and shelter, which make life possible, are produced by the application of labor power to the land, tools and machinery, and we find that there is a great class in society, the majority, your class, the working class, that owns this labor power and that sells this labor power in the open market to the highest bidder. Your labor power, we find, is sold just as much as potatoes are sold, just as much as coal is sold, just as much as cast-off clothing is sold; and what is more significant is that when the wage worker of today sells his labor power by the hour, day, week or piece, he sells himself along with that labor power and makes of himself a slave.

My friends, no man ever gave a better definition of the elements of slavery than Horace Greeley, one of the sublime figures in American history. Let me give you Horace Greeley’s famous postulates on slavery, given to an abolition convention held in Cincinnati in 1845. This is what Horace Greeley has to say about slavery. What constituted its elements:

“Whenever one human being deems it honorable and right to have other human beings mainly devoted to his or her convenience or comfort and thus to live, diverting the labor of these persons from all productive or general usefulness to his or her own special uses, while he or she is rendering or has rendered no corresponding service to the cause of human wellbeing, there exists the spirit which originated and still sustains human slavery. “Wherever opportunity to labor is obtained with difficulty and is so deficient that the employing class may virtually prescribe their own terms and pay the laborer only such as they choose of the product, there is a very strong tendency for slavery. “Wherever certain human beings devote their time and thoughts mainly to obeying and serving other human beings, and this not because they choose to do so, but because they must, there (I think) is slavery.” (Applause.)

I affirm that the Progressive party will not touch this condition in society. I affirm that the Socialist Party, by making the
land, tools and machinery the collective property of all the people will make a real and a necessary change in society. The Socialist Party means to change the internal elements of society as well as its externals, while the Progressive Party deals only with externals, with superficialities. I maintain that the Progressive Party stands merely for reform, merely for a little tinkering here and there of this worn-out capitalist system, to keep you in servitude a few generations longer. (Applause.) I affirm that by placing the land, tools and machinery in the hands of all the people, where they properly belong, and giving every man, woman or child in society an equal strong economic positions, Socialism spells for real democracy; and I maintain that by placing a class government in the control of trustified industry, the Progressive Party spells not real democracy but benevolent feudalism. (Applause.) I maintain that the Socialist Party by doing this would liberate humanity; and I further maintain that by the adoption of their complete platform the Progressives would enslave humanity. (Applause).

But, my friends, parties are not only to be judged by their principles. It is true that men make parties, but it is also true that parties make men. Let us take a glimpse of the two conventions of the Socialist and Progressive Parties. At the Socialist convention in Indianapolis in May, we find gathered there working-men of every imaginable shade and degree, and not one capitalist. At the Progressive Party convention in Chicago we find gathered capitalists of all shade and degree and hardly a workingman; and the proceedings of the convention, instead of being marked by that calm, deliberative air which should pervade a gathering of men appearing there for advancing society's interests, was pervaded by the atmosphere of a Georgia campmeeting. And we likewise find that the candidates of these parties, throughout the United States the candidates on the Socialist ticket are men like Mayor George R. Lunn, of Schenectady, who waged war for that most elemental right, the right of free speech, even going to jail, together with his devoted wife, in defense of that right. On the other hand, we have a leader in the Progressive organization, from that very state, who spoke here last night, Oscar Strauss, of the Progressive Party, who has at various times proven himself to be an enemy of the working class. Again, we have in our comradeship in the Socialist Party men like Eugene V. Debs. (applause), who has stood behind prison bars in his advocacy of the rights of the working class. And we find on the other hand men like Garford, who have antagonized that very working class; and we find men like Debs and Haywood, waging the fight for the working class.

At the head of the Progressive ticket we find one who has proven himself on numerous occasions to have no real respect or any love for the working class, that arch enemy of the workers, Theodore Roosevelt. (Applause).

In conclusion, I wish to ask my opponent, Professor Hatton, these three questions:

Is it not a fact that the finances of the Progressive Party have been supplied by men who have grown rich at the expense of the working class? Whence their sudden altruism?

Is it not a fact, as I have stated that Roosevelt, Strauss and
Garford have in the past been enemies of the working class? Why their sudden conversion?

Is it not a fact that the adoption of the whole Progressive platform would not change the economic dependence of the workers on the master class, the capitalist class?

With these statements I close my interval, and I hope that my learned opponent Professor Hatton will not neglect to answer these questions. (Prolonged Applause).

THE CHAIRMAN. While the Professor is looking over these questions, I want to say that I didn't deem it necessary, in introducing the first speaker, to tell you anything about the Socialist Party, because we have had the Socialist Party with us for a long while. And I suppose it is not necessary to say anything about the progressive Party. But I am reminded of a cold winter's morning when I stopped a boy that was hollering "Hot Waffles," to buy some waffles and warm myself up, and the first waffle that I bit was frozen, and I said, "Look here," these waffles are not hot." He said, "Who said they were hot?" "Why," I said, "you did." "Oh, no," he said, "I didn't say they were hot, but that's the name of them." (Laughter and applause.) There are those who are unkind enough to say that the Progressive Party got its name in much the same way. I don't say that, but I will introduce to you the most versatile man in the 21st District, the man who received the endorsement of the reactionary Board of Trustees of Western Reserve University for the M. A. Hanna Chair of Political Economy, and the man who received the endorsement of the Democratic machine for a seat in the Ohio Constitutional Convention, and now has received the endorsement of Teddy for a seat in the national Congress. (Applause.) Professor Hatton will have forty minutes.

PROFESSOR HATTON. Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen, I have always found great pleasure in addressing audiences made up pretty largely of men and women of the Socialist faith, as I judge, from the applause that has been accorded here this evening, this audience is. I am not a stranger to a great many of the Socialists of Cleveland, because on a number of occasions I have been asked to speak before them at the Central Branch, and I think I have never been asked to speak to them that I haven't responded. We haven't agreed, altogether; we have agreed up to a certain point. We haven't agreed, but our disagreement has been perfectly amicable. I have always left those meetings absolutely convinced of the complete patriotism and sincerity of my Socialist friends, and I hope that they gave me credit for the same sincerity. (Applause.) I don't expect ever that I shall be able to convert very many of my Socialist friends here tonight. (Laughter and applause.) But in the small part that I have taken in public life, I do not believe that any man can say that he ever found me running away from an issue. And so, when Mr. Ruppel asked me if I was willing to discuss with him the question of whether the working people this year should support the Progressive or the Socialist Party, I said, "Certainly, I shall be very glad to discuss that question."

Now, I wish to call your attention to some things in the speech of Mr. Ruppel which are characteristic of Socialist orators everywhere; things of which I think the Socialists need to be told.
not because I believe them insincere, but because I believe they are trying to be open-minded and are willing to hear the truth. Mr. Ruppel has made a characteristic speech, full of denunciation, and, above all, full of the most glittering generalities. All Socialists assume, as a basis of discussion, that Socialism is an absolutely scientific, unified doctrine, without any change since the days of Karl Marx. In reality the ultimate aim of the Socialist Party is not an issue in this debate. I might agree with you perfectly as to the ultimate aim of the Socialist Party, and still I might disagree with you as to whether or not it is the thing this year to support the Socialist rather than the Progressive ticket. But while the question of the ultimate aim of Socialism is not an issue in this debate still in order in some respects to answer my friend, Mr. Ruppel, I wish to call your attention to a few things in the evolution of the Socialist doctrine.

You Socialists seem to want us to believe that it is to the scientific socialism of which Karl Marx was the father that you adhere, and that you have remained true to Marx down to the present time. Now, Karl Marx founded the so-called scientific Socialism upon certain propositions which he advanced—the materialistic conception of history; labor value—that all value is contributed to products by labor; increasing misery, and a great final economic crisis. Now, I am not going to stop to discuss those things as to their theoretical value, because if Mr. Ruppel and I began to discuss them tonight, we would be debating it for the next six months. The truth is that you Socialists are today divided into many different camps as to what Socialism actually means. You are only held together because you are out of power, and attach yourselves to a vague, hazy ideal, with no clear conception as to how that ideal can be realized. I am not accusing you of insincerity, but I am talking plainly and kindly. If you examine the Socialist writers of today, you will find that they have largely abandoned Karl Marx’s doctrines. They have found that they could not base social development upon a purely materialistic basis. As to the doctrine of the surplus value of labor, the later writers, such as Bernstein, no longer stand by that. You have abandoned the doctrine of increasing misery, because you have had to face the fact that (while there is poverty, while there is misery,) contrary to the original Marxian doctrine and contrary to the doctrine preached to you constantly today, statistics show that there is an increasing betterment in the condition of the laboring classes. Now, these are facts, and Mr. Ruppel in his charges against capitalistic society ought to meet those facts. The consequence is that when you filter this thing down to the bottom, so far as the Socialist movement of today is concerned the only thing upon which have got to take the position that you are willing that these evils shall continue—because you admit that there are immediate evils that should be remedied, and that you can’t remedy them until some party that proposes to remedy them gets into control of the government—or you have got to say, “We are afraid that if those remedies were applied and these evils were swept out of existence, we might find that, after all, there was no need for Socialism in the ultimate or Utopian sense.” I believe firmly in your sincerity and that you believe that ultimately Socialism must come. If the doctrine of Socialism is sound, it will prevail, even if you bring about
all Socialists are agreed is a certain program for immediate action. You do not say in general terms that you believe in the social ownership of the means of production, and perhaps of exchange. But there again when you find your Socialist writers begin to tell us of how they are going to bring this about, and organize society under it, you find them as wide apart as the poles. Because, when they attempt to do that, they are brought face to face with a dilemma: either they have got to establish in place of the so-called capitalistic control merely a modified competitive system, or they are forced to admit that it would be necessary to provide some central power strong enough to step in and allot the labor, fix the amount of production and practically eliminate all individual initiative. Kautsky in one part of his book accepts the latter alternative. In another part of the same book, when face to face with this great dilemma he says, “No, we will not do that, but we will in large measure leave certain groups free, and have competition between groups and co-operation within groups.” Socialists can take whichever horn of this dilemma they choose: that they are going to establish an iron-clad individual initiative, or that they admit they were wrong in their fundamental premise and must leave a considerable portion of the competitive system in existence in order to save their theory from overwhelming objections.

And so, when you come down to an examination of the actual issue before us, the Socialist Party is first a party of protest, a party of magnificent protest, a party to which I have on more than one platform and on a dozen occasions, given my hearty approval for the attack it has made upon the present abuses of the industrial system. And in addition to that (when we get down to the things in regard to which Socialists agree, we find that those are things in regard to which they agree with me in common with other social workers and men interested in the social welfare. The fundamental issue before us now is, what are we going to do in order to meet the recognized evils that exist? Are we going to be able to unite now in doing those things which all agree should be done, or shall we continue apart because we disagree concerning the final solution, and thus permit the evils which exist to continue simply in order to appease your god of Socialism?

Now, my friends, that is the problem which confronts us. What are you going to do? I think Mr. Ruppel should answer here tonight whether he believes, in view of the facts which not a Socialist here would deny, that Mr. Debs, with all of his magnificent qualities has absolutely no chance of winning, that the Socialist Party has no possible chance of coming into control of the government either this year or for years to come, I say that Mr. Ruppel should tell us whether in view of these facts, he is willing, for instance, to continue to feed our children into the maw of the industrial Moloch, simply in order when child labor is abolished he can do it through a party called Socialistic? If I believed with him in the ultimate aim of the Socialist Party, I wouldn’t agree with him in that.

Now, my friends, there is another aspect of this. If you Socialists refuse to unite with us in accomplishing these reforms you
these immediate reforms. Then why should you not unite this year with other men and women agree with you in regard to an immediate program and thus sweep out of existence now these evils that confront us?

My friends, that is the issue, as I see it. I am talking plainly and kindly. I am not a Socialist. I don't care for political parties. A political party, as Mr. Ruppel says, and in that I agree with him perfectly is simply a means to an end, an organization of men and women united to get control of the Government for the purpose of putting certain policies into operation. At the present time I believe that the Progressive Party offers the only hope for something like an immediate solution of our pressing problems. If at some future time I come to feel that the Progressive Party no longer offers the best means, yes, if at any time in my career I come honestly to feel that the Socialist Party offers the best means of accomplishing social reform. I shall turn Socialist without the slightest hesitation. (Applause).

Now, my friends, that is the issue as I see it. Mr. Ruppel has made some suggestions in regard to certain things in the Progressive Party, among others that certain men prominent in it are connected with capitalistic organizations. Certainly they are. Let me tell you something about the Socialistic movement at the present time. You have been fret from self-seeking men because you haven't been in power. The minute you get into power, as you did in Milwaukee, you begin to squabble among yourselves. Every movement, so long as out of power and fighting with no hope of immediate success, gets along beautifully. The minute it gets control of the machinery of government, self-seeking creeps in and there is more or less internal conflict. That has been perfectly true of the Socialist Party just as well as of the other parties. And then, let me say one plain, straightforward thing: I think you Socialists are unfair to many of the men you call capitalists. Many of the men even of great wealth, in impugning their sincerity in whatever move they make. You can't do that without tearing out of history many men who, regardless of the effect upon their class, have stood for the rights of the people. You would have to cast out George Washington who was one of the wealthiest men of the Revolutionary period, you would have to cast out John Hancock, who was perhaps the wealthiest man of his time in the United States, and you would have to cast out some men from your own ranks. With what degree of fairness can you say that the men Mr. Ruppel mentioned are insincere, and simply in the Progressive Party for what they can get out of it? I am not going to do that. Except in the face of strong evidence to the contrary, I prefer to attribute sincerity to Socialist and Progressive alike. I thank you for the hearing that you have given me. (Applause).

Here Prof. Hatton concluded, having used but seventeen of his allotted forty minutes.

THE CHAIRMAN. Mr. Ruppel will now have thirty minutes. (Applause).

Professor Hatton charges me with casting some aspersions upon leaders in the Progressive Party. In that connection I want to call your attention to the fact that I asked the Professor three specific questions. He did not answer them; I hope that he will not fail to do so in his next interval.

— S —
As to individual motives in political parties, why, no Socialist with any degree of common sense has ever claimed that when the average workingman joins the Socialist Party he sprouts wings and gets a golden harp placed in his hand. (Laughter). We of course have all those little brickerings and squabblings that always occur in any gathering of human beings. But, my friends, the very thing that I wanted to point out was not touched upon by Professor Hatton, and that was this: I not only said that political parties are means to certain ends. So is a pushcart a means to a certain end, but it is not a political party. A political party is a means to a certain specific end, and that is the acquirement of the powers of the state by a certain economic group in society, and that group in society will strive for those things, and we don't accuse them of individual selfishness in striving for them. The working class, in organizing our Socialist Party, are striving for the land, tools and machinery which are material things in order to bring about the possibility of a larger human existence, to abolish wage slavery and allow the human race an opportunity to develop. On the other hand, we find against us the capitalist class, and we find that it has three political parties. And this is due to the fact that the capitalist class is broken up into three warring factions, and each faction has its political party. On the one hand we have the Democratic Party, the friend of labor, which controls the solid South, that, as Professor Hatton eloquently said, is busily engaged in throwing our children into the maw of the Moloch of capitalism. On the other hand we have the Republican Party, owned by Standard Oil, by any amount of trusts and great capitalists in society, by the banking syndicate, and so forth. And again, we have the Progressive Party, financed, furnished the sinews of war by George Perkins, of the Steel Trust, by J. Medill McCormick, of the Harvester Trust, by Dan Hanna, of the Lakes Trust and others. (Applause.) All of these gentlemen are agreed in one thing, and that is that the poor working class is hopelessly downtrodden and must be elevated. (Laughter.) And I would just mention here as a suggestion, that those gentlemen never needed a political party for that purpose. If they felt such qualms of conscience for the workers, George Perkins could have established better conditions in the Steel Trust long ago. (Great applause.) J. Medill McCormick could have established better conditions in the vilest industrial establishment in America, the Harvester Trust's works outside of Chicago, long ago, and Dan Hanna, instead of establishing a thing on the Great Lakes called by the wage workers in front of the fiery furnace, in front of the stoke-holes tonight not the welfare plan but the hell-fare plan, might have established something of real benefit. (Applause).

But, my friends, Professor Hatton says that ultimate Socialism is not an issue in this debate. I affirm that it is. I affirm that if you never start for some place you will never get there. (Great applause.) He asks why can't we forge ultimate Socialism and unite on immediate reforms to cure the ills of present society? My friends, I want to say that reforms have only value when the working class achieves those reforms, and the working class must guard itself against being led up an interminable road of reform and never reaching revolution.
Let me give you an instance. We, the intelligent, class-conscious portion of the working class, refuse to unite ourselves with any class financed and led by the master class, (applause) no matter how glittering its platform may be. Would you follow a political organization which depicted in the most exquisite language, with the finest word pictures, an ideal society to which it could lead you, officered by Porfirio Diaz and Captain Kidd? I should think not. The working class must not look to some force above it to lead it somewhere, to unite with it, for when the working class unites with the capitalist class, it is the same kind of unity which takes place between mutton and the wolf. (Laughter and applause).

And isn't my opponent cognizant of all the examples that history's pages have to offer of working classes that depended on well intentioned men on the outside to lead them somewhere? History's pages record the name of Numa Pompilius, the greatest, noblest and wisest ruler of the Romans, who established all kinds of reforms for the workers, and who gave them even the right to organize, who assisted them by every means in his power; and yet this assistance to the working class always came from above and never developed that independence, that power of organization which would have made it possible for them to maintain those things once Numa Pompilius had given them to them, so they lost them to the patrician class of Rome in later years, and went down in ever increasing degradation until the invasion of the northern barbarians overswept Roman civilization.

Is my learned opponent unaware of Solon, one of the wisest and best spirited legislators, who in ancient Attica abolished mortgage, parcelled out the land, declared all debts null and void, and did all in his power to raise the working class? But that help came from above, and again the Attic working class lost that independence.

Is he unaware of the code of Lycurgus in Sparta, which had the same outcome?

My friends, it is true of a race or a class, as it is of an individual. Observe a young man about to take his place in society. How often do we see that a parent, with too much affection for a son coddles that son and carefully pads him all through life from the fierce winds and distresses of society, and does that type of son ever amount to anything? He is always a nonentity. But the son that stands firmly upon his own basis and attempts self development, that son makes a mark in society. That is true of a class as well as of an individual.

I want to say this: I haven't the least doubt of the sincerity of Professor Hatton, but I do believe that Professor Hatton is unable to see the stern economic motives back of the men who floated the Progressive Party. I believe that Professor Hatton is unaware of the company that he is keeping. (Applause.) I even deny that the Progressive Party is sincere in its program of reform. Every reform that has been introduced upon the statute books of this nation that meant something to the working class, has been declared in late years unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. Now, we have heard much of Roosevelt's recall of judicial decisions, and I will read to you the plank from the Progressive platform dealing with that specific subject, the Courts:
"The Progressive Party demands such restriction of the power of the courts as shall leave to the people the ultimate authority to determine fundamental questions of social welfare and public policy. To secure this end it pledges itself to provide:

1. "That when an act, passed under the police power of the state, is held unconstitutional under the state constitution, by the courts, the people, after an ample interval for deliberation, shall have an opportunity to vote on the question whether they desire the act to become a law, notwithstanding such decision.

2. "That every decision of the highest appellate court of a state declaring an act of the legislature unconstitutional on the ground of its violation of the federal constitutions, shall be subject to the same review by the Supreme Court of the United States as is now accorded to decisions sustaining such legislation."

That means, my friends, that if in the state of Ohio the Progressives would pass a reform measure and the Supreme Court of the state of Ohio should reject it as being unconstitutional, you could recall such a decision. But at the same time that decision could be carried up to the United States Supreme Court, and where is the pledge in that platform that the same power is going to be taken away from the United States Supreme Court? (Applause.) In our platform we demand that this power of declaring laws unconstitutional shall be taken from the United States Supreme Court—that is the language, without jugglery. (Great applause).

I claim that the Progressive Party, or the men who formulated that platform, were very shrewd in fencing about with a fence of verbiage an important issue like that.

Now, Professor Hatton tells us that the only thing we Socialists agree on is immediate demands, that we have deserted Marx and abandoned the materialistic conception of history and the theory of increasing misery. While I have been a follower of the Socialist movement and a member of the party for years I have read also somewhat of Karl Marr, and I want to say that when Karl Marx pointed out increasing misery, he didn't mean absolute misery, but relative misery. He said that the working man would see that while ere long his own condition would advance from the hovel to the hut, the capitalist condition would advance from the cottage to the palace. Things like this help to make workingmen revolutionary, when they come home from their daily labors in the mills, and they stand on Euclid Avenue, and they find the chauffeur of some rich man, himself a workingman, driving at immense speed through the thoroughfare. They see absolute disregard of the workers, and see today even the very streets of our city littered with the products of the surplus value of the working class, while his own existence merely remains on an animal plane. We do not deny that on the whole the working class has improved absolutely its condition, but we do affirm most emphatically that in the remarkable advance which has taken place in wealth production in the last twenty-five years, the working class has shared very little.

Professor Hatton also cites Kautsky to the effect that we are rather undecided as to the exact means of social transformation. If Professor Hatton will read the masters of Socialist literature carefully, he will find them declaring at all times that they are not prophets, that the means of transforming society will only be.
determined at the time that transformation takes place; that the lines on which a battle shall be fought or a military campaign conducted, cannot be decided fifty years in advance, and neither can social transformation be decided in that manner.

We are also told that we have deserted the materialistic interpretation of history. So far from Socialists deserting the materialistic interpretation of history, capitalistic professors have embraced it most readily, including Professor Seligman, of Columbia, who has written a work on the subject.

Now, my friends, I have been accused of casting aspersions upon members of the Progressive Party. I know that Professor Hatton has not made that statement here, and I do not wish to take advantage of a statement not made here, but I know that many of the platform leaders are accusing us Socialists for some responsibility in connection with the attempt on Mr. Roosevelt's life. I want to say that it was especially the progressive press of the United States that spread that filthy, dirty lie that a Socialist shot Roosevelt. It was the Cleveland News of this city, Dan Hanna's little, private two by four specimen of journalism, (applause), which claimed that a negro was later shot by a man who shouted "Hurrah for Debs," and the Cleveland Socialist last week has an affidavit by the man that was shot, denying that assertion which proves the editor of the News a liar because he has not had the courage to retract that statement.

And I want to say further, no matter what attacks we have made upon Theodore Roosevelt, we have never dragged in Mrs. Roosevelt or his daughter. But when Theodore Roosevelt accused the Socialist movement—and I affirm that no movement on the face of the globe has more virtuous women—accused the women of that movement as well as the men, the movement in its entirety, of circulating obscenity, pornographic literature, so-called, he issued a diatribe that has never been equaled for filthiness and cowardice by any American public man in the history of this country. I do not for a minute wish to fasten any responsibility on Professor Hatton for such a statement; I know that he would never condone such a statement.

Now, my friends, one of the great reforms that the Progressive Party talks largely about is a minimum wage. Let us see how sincere this aggregation of capitalists, Garford, Roosevelt, Strauss—Garford, who in 1907 fought the machinists and kept a spy outside of the machinists' meeting hall in Lorain, to watch the men of his plant who went in; Oscar Strauss, of New York, who, in 1905 or 1906, when appealed to by the Lithographic Association of the United States, when the men were all on strike for an eight-hour day, when appealed to to take advantage of the clause in the contract labor law allowing the importation of labor when there was a scarcity of labor, allowed the importation of scabs to break that strike—that is Oscar Strauss, the friend of Labor; and Theodore Roosevelt, who denied the employees of the government, on January 25th, 1906, even the right of free speech, the right of petition—these men are going into office, and they are going to formulate a minimum wage law for you! (Applause).
Now, my friends, the average wage in this country for adult males over 16 years of age, Census Bulletin 93, Page 12; United States Census on Occupations, Page 7, is close on to six hundred dollars. There are 20,000,000 of these wage workers. Six of the best social workers of the Sage Foundation in New York were asked to give an estimate of what a minimum wage should be, and their estimates averaged up $931.00 a year. Now, that is a difference of $331.00 a year between what they consider to be a living minimum wage and what the worker actually gets. But suppose for a moment that the Progressives go into Congress and pass a minimum wage bill, and suppose that the United States Courts don't declare it unconstitutional, and suppose further that through their generous efforts, Garford, Strauss, Roosevelt, and all these friends of Labor, on every worker's income would tack $250.00, which would still leave it about $80.00 below the minimum wage allowed by these social investigators of New York, we would find then that these capitalists back of the Progressive Party would be passing a law to deprive themselves of five billions of dollars annually, which in silver dollars, loaded one ton on a truck, would make a stream of wagons 1,300 miles long—and they tell you that the Progressive Party will quite likely do this when they get in, (laughter and applause); and if they don't do that, it won't be a minimum wage worth considering.

Now, my friends, I further want to state this, that we workers do not consider the minimum wage to be a social goal. I will tell you how we want a minimum wage. We want the working class to organize themselves in the factory, so that the working class will say to the masters what the minimum wage will be, and not that a commission named by the capitalist office holders, shall come to the workingman, Jim Jones, and say, "Jim Jones, how many potatoes do you eat a day, how many pounds of potatoes do you need a week, how much beef do you need, how much calico does your wife need?" We don't want that kind of investigation from a class above to tell us what a minimum wage should be. We class-conscious workers know that it is true of a class as of an individual, that if you want anything done you must do it yourself, (applause) and we propose to go into Congress and use what political power we have toward passing such laws at the behest of the working class as will increase the working classes power of resistance against capitalism, and further, on every imaginable opportunity, aid the working class—we are all members of the working class movement, in building up powerful organizations in the factory that shall day after day demand more wages and less hours, and finally take over the machinery of capitalism, and the land, tools and machinery. And when that hour strikes, then the methods of which Professor Hatton claims we are poverty stricken, then the methods and the tactics will be decided by the majority, and not before. But so long as the working class allows itself to be led first by the charms of one orator of a political party, and next by a glittering platform of another political party, and allows itself to be divided into fractions so that it no longer presents a solid front to the capitalist class, lets itself be divided on religious grounds, on differences of organization, on differences of race—so long as the working class is so divided, it is easy for the master class, although a minority, to deal with any of these groups
You know that the fasces, which the lictors carried in the Forum before the ancient Roman senators, that bundle of rods with an ax in the center, it signified the power there was in union. And when the working class realizes that under capitalism all that the workingman can hope to be at the best is a well fed slave, and that the soul of every man with red blood in his veins revolts at the idea of being a slave, then the working class will say to all political parties outside of their ranks, "You who have organized these political parties, you vote for them. We will organize our own and vote for it." (Prolonged applause).

THE CHAIRMAN. Professor Hatton now has forty-three minutes.

PROFESSOR HATTON. I find myself in the unpleasant position, in the beginning, of having to correct a few statements which Mr. Ruppel has made, which no doubt he would wish me to correct, and which perhaps he made inadvertently in the heat of his oratory. In the first place, I wish to call his attention to the fact that Mr. Medill McCormick is not connected with the Harvester Trust. I wish to call his attention to the reason why, in the platform of the National Progressive Party, no statement was made in regard to the recall of decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States. Quite in contradiction to what he has said, the decisions of the Supreme Court of the United States upon labor matters and social welfare questions have been extremely liberal, while the decisions of the state courts, as for instance New York and Ohio, have been extremely illiberal. The reason why provision was made for the recall of judicial decisions in the states was this, that at the present time, as the political power is divided between the federal government and the states, the federal government has little power to pass welfare legislation, and the only power that can pass it is the State, and consequently the only court decisions we have any need to recall are the decisions of the state courts.

I also wish to call Mr. Ruppel's attention, in passing, to the fact that when a state court declares an act of the state legislature unconstitutional because it violates the state constitution, it cannot be appealed to the Supreme Court of the United States. The platform provision is a perfectly straightforward and fair declaration as to what is necessary now in order to overturn adverse court decisions in so far as any legislature in this country can deal with social matters. And moreover, let me say this, that the Progressive Party believes, and has so stated in its platform, that as the powers are now divided between the nation and the states, this nation cannot deal adequately with the great problems that confront us, and that the power of the federal government should be expanded so that we can act throughout the length and breadth of the United States by a law that affects social conditions all over the country. That part of the Progressive platform is a perfectly straightforward statement and there is absolutely no evasion in it.

Now, in addition to that, the Progressive Party has declared, as no other party in the country except the Socialist Party has declared, for absolute control of the government by the people—read the provisions of its platform upon that—the Initiative, Ref-
erendum and Recall, the direct election of United States senators, presidential primary laws, the short ballot, popular review of judicial decisions in social matters, and for an easier method of changing the constitution of the United States in order to meet the real problems which confront us. It is the only great party, aside from the Socialist Party, which has had the bravery to make such a declaration. So I don't think you can cast any aspersions upon us in that matter.

Mr. Ruppel was mistaken when he said there were no laboring men in the Progressive Convention at Chicago. It is true the convention was called together hastily, and that for that reason there were not so many as in the Socialist convention. And moreover, your party adheres to the doctrine of class struggle and class consciousness, and absolutely refuses to deal with any one except upon a class basis. Nobody has ever accused me of being an enemy of the laboring class. I know what it is to labor with my hands; I have done as continuous and as hard labor as any man in this room. There is one thing I especially dislike in the principles of the Socialist Party, much as I admire the men and women in it and believe in their sincerity. I don't believe in preaching the doctrine of class struggle and class antagonism. I don't believe it is necessary or that we shall ever meet our social problems adequately on that basis.

What I find myself puzzled about here this evening is this: why the Socialist Party makes any pronouncement upon these immediate issues at all. If you believe what Mr. Ruppel says you do, that, after all, these immediate demands are only paltering with the main question, that we never shall get any relief until we adopt what you call co-operative commonwealth, and that you shall cooperate with no one in ameliorating present distress, then you should drop all else and work only for the economic revolution. Your entire position is in conflict with the very doctrine of social and economic evolution in which you say you believe. You assume an ability to forecast the future that history shows has never been given to any man or group of men. Absolutely every advance that has been made in the whole history of the world, economic, political, social, has been made by proceeding step by step, as the way could be seen clearly, and no faster. If I were a Socialist today, and if I knew that the party could tomorrow get control of things and undertake to do at once what you now propose, I should oppose it, for such action would set the progress of Socialism back a hundred years.

The standpatters believe that society is hard, set and solid, the extreme radicals believe that it is completely fluid and will at once take the shape of any mold into which it may be poured. It is neither. Society moves like a viscous mass; it moves like the great glaciers that go down the mountain side, which if forced too rapidly will either break the mold or rupture the body of the glacier itself. And that is precisely true of social and economic advance. I challenge you Socialists to meet the doctrine of social evolution fairly. By the methods you propose, you are flying in the face of the very principle in which you claim to believe.

Some of your Socialist writers have said, when they have confronted the hard facts of social reconstruction, "We will concede that we cannot see the perfect picture. We hope that the picture will be as it is in our mind, but we cannot see to the end."
I agree with them that we cannot. And consequently, when any man proclaims the doctrine Mr. Ruppel has urged here tonight that we should not do these things except in one way and will find no relief until we can carry through this whole ambitious program, I say to him, as I say to Mr. Ruppel, that he is flying in the face of our knowledge of evolution, and stating something that leads me to wonder why it is that he makes any immediate demands at all.

Now, let me say one or two other plain things. The Socialist Party started out without any other demand than that of economic revolution. This was originally opposed to labor unions, as merely paltering with the situation. It was only gradually that Socialists say that they would have to recognize immediate issues. Why should you deny that fact now, and say you will not take anything “until we can get it in the form we propose, and that unless action can be secured through a purely working class organization we will continue to permit those unholy and evil things to exist.” I do not think that is a fair, just, or reasonable position to take.

There is one other thing that I ought to say in regard to your position. Mr. Ruppel has seemed to imply, as Socialists usually imply, that it is impossible for the working class to get anything unless they work with that body alone which you are pleased to call the working class, (and, by the way, you make that body a much narrower body than I do.) Now, my friends, the Progressive Party does not preach the doctrine that the laboring people should take what somebody hands down to them, and you have no right to impute that to the Progressive Party. What does the Progressive Party say about the laboring man? It is the first great party, aside from the Socialist Party, that has ever said the working people should have the right to organize in their own interest. That is said as frankly in the Progressive platform as it could be said, and yet you say that the Progressive Party is the party of the trusts and the interests. I go as far as Mr. Ruppel in my condemnation of what has occurred in the Steel Trust; I believe that it is absolutely disgusting and disgraceful. I don’t think we can do justice to the people so long as those things exist. We have got to be able to control these great powers of special privilege that have been able to stamp out organized labor. Now, we say to the Steel Trust, in spite of all that, Mr. Ruppel says with regard to the interest of the Steel Trust in our party, we say to the Steel Trust, “You must permit labor to organize in your shops.” (Laughter).

Now, my friends, I am just as willing to work with a laboring man, of whom I count myself one, as you Socialists are to work together as laboring people. I count you just as much citizens of this country, included in the bonds of human brotherhood, as you count yourselves included in the bonds of Socialism. I see no reason why, when the opportunity is offered to secure these reforms, you should not join with us. The ultimate aim of Socialism is not involved. I ask Mr. Ruppel to answer whether, because he is unwilling to follow a party with certain gentlemen in it, he is willing to push off these reforms to the distant future?

Now, what does the Progressive Party propose in the campaign? We propose the prohibition of child labor. We have said that if we cannot secure that through present national power and state laws, we will change the constitution of the United States so
as to make it possible to have a thorough going national law. We have declared for a minimum wage for women, and have said that if we cannot secure that adequately through the state, as we don't think we can, we will expand the national power so as to do it. We believe in the prohibition of night work for women, in the eight-hour day for women and young persons; in one day's rest in seven for all wage workers; in other words that conditions where men work not six but seven days a week should not exist, and we propose to put the power of a great political party behind a movement of that kind, both in the nation and in the state. We declare for the eight-hour day in 24-hour industries. In the past in some industries men have worked twelve hours a day and sometimes seven days a week, and when a shift occurred they must sometimes work eighteen hours continuously. We have said that this must stop, and that there must be an eight-hour day in all these 24-hour industries. We declare for publicity as to wages, hours and conditions of labor. You as laboring men know what that means. You know that one of the great difficulties in meeting adverse wage conditions in this country has been that it has been possible to cover up the truth as to wages, hours and conditions of labor, and that if we had known the facts adequately we could have met the evil conditions, their very publicity would in many cases have ended them.

We believe that when an accident occurs that accident should be reported, in order that proper action can be taken. We believe in minimum standards of health and safety in industry. We believe in protection against industrial accidents, occupational diseases, overwork and unemployment. We believe in social insurance against sickness, unemployment and old age; in the abolition of prison contract labor. We declare for the establishment of a National Department of Labor that shall deal entirely with labor questions, with a labor man at the head of it, having a seat in the president's cabinet, so that there shall constantly come into the very heart of the government of the United States the aspirations and the woes of the great laboring class of this nation.

And finally, we have said that we believe in the right of the working men to organize in their own behalf. Furthermore I have not said, nor has the Progressive Party, that the working people should keep out of politics. I have preached, in season and out of season, not only since I have become a candidate, but in the five years I have been in Cleveland, that the laboring man must go into politics. In my opinion the only hope we have for the proper solution of these problems is not by the abstention of the laborer from politics, but by his active participation at the polls, through his unions and elsewhere in the discussion of political questions, in the election of men to office and in the actual enactment of the laws under which he must work. I do not believe, and this Progressive Party does not believe, that we shall ever be able to have satisfactory conditions or be able to abolish the system of private warfare between employer and employee, until our system of laws is made so just that strikes and lockouts shall be both unnecessary and undesirable. Does that sound as if the Progressive Party wanted to make laws and hand them down to the laboring people? I am convinced, from the response which they make as we go
about the factories and mills that the great bulk of the laboring men in Cleveland don't feel in that way toward the Progressive Party. As we put the question to them as to the platform in which they believe and as to what party they expect to support the hands go up by scores for the Progressive platform and the Progressive Party where there are two's and three's for any other platform or party.

The laboring people of this country are not deceived as to the meaning of the Progressive movement. They know that this platform was not written by any group of men that grinds down labor. I happen to know how this platform was made, because I participated in it somewhat myself. It was made by men and women who up to this time have given their lives, outside of political activity in a large measure, to the improvement of social conditions; such men as Ben Lindsey of Denver, such women as Jane Addams, the very angel of the poor and unfortunate of the city of Chicago; Raymond Robbins, one of the ablest champions of labor and preachers of social justice in this country; by Dean Kirchway, of Columbia University Law School—those were the people that made this platform, and in addition to them, that brilliant, hard-fighting group of men from the Pacific Coast who absolutely kicked the Southern Pacific Railroad out of the politics of California. (Applause.) And yet you say to us that the Progressive Party is a party that proposes to hand something down to labor. We are saying with all the strength that we can put into that utterance in this campaign, that it is time for the laboring men, the common men and women of this country, to unite as one and strike for themselves, in order to secure that measure of industrial justice to which we believe they are entitled.

I was in California when this platform was being made. When the draft of it that was being considered by this western group was in process of formation, I was called into consultation. I know the sincerity, the almost religious feeling, which pervaded that group. And I cannot agree with my friend Mr. Ruppel when he indicates that the spirit which actuated the Chicago Convention was something like the spirit of a Methodist campmeeting. The spirit that dominated that Chicago convention was a religious spirit, in the very best sense of the word. It was nothing tricked up for the occasion, but a spirit which came from the hearts of men and women who sincerely believed in the doctrine that was being written in that platform.

Now, Mr. Ruppel asked me certain questions. He says, "Is it not a fact that the finances of the Progressive Party have been supplied by men grown rich at the expense of the working classes? Whence their sudden altruism?" There is no question that some of the finances of the Progressive Party have been supplied by men who have grown rich under the present industrial system, but, as I said in my first speech, I am not willing to hold that any man cannot change his course, or may not be willing to strike out for a new system of reform or a new doctrine of freedom, simply because he happens to have grown rich under a different system. To say that would be simply to say that no man can rise out of the class in which he finds himself and that is absolutely contrary to the Socialist attitude. If you held to such a view you could not have this enthusiasm, this comradeship, these aspirations for some-
thing higher. You least of all can say that men can never rise higher than their own class or look beyond their immediate bounds.

"Is it not a fact," Mr. Ruppel says, "that Roosevelt, Strauss and Garford have in the past been enemies of the working class? Why their sudden conversion?" I reply that Roosevelt, Strauss and Garford have not been enemies of the working class. (Derisive laughter.) Now, my friends, in making that statement I am not saying that I have always agreed with what Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Strauss or Mr. Garford has done, any more than that I have always agreed with my wife or that you always agree among yourselves. I have criticised them all. Much as I believe in the labor movement, I have occasionally criticised labor leaders, because I think they make mistakes—because we are all human. But for any man to say that Mr. Roosevelt, Mr. Garford and Mr. Strauss are inherently enemies of the laboring class, is to say something with which I do not agree and which I do not believe any fair-minded man would accept. (Applause).

"Is it not a fact," asked Mr. Ruppel again, "that the adoption of the whole Progressive platform would not change the economic dependence of the workers upon the master class, the capitalist class?" That is not a fact; if the workers have the right by law to organize, so that they can wring from the capitalist class, if you wish to call them such, their demands, do you think the economic status would be unaltered? The standard of wages in this country has been dependent in no small measure upon the union labor movement, which exists outside of the Socialist Party, and I would like to ask Mr. Ruppel if he does not believe that union labor has had some influence upon labor conditions in this country, and whether it would not have more if we had an absolute legal guarantee that working people should have the right to organize? Wouldn't it change the economic condition if a minimum wage were established? To say of a party that stands for the absolute popular control of the government—and you Socialists have not gone any farther than the Progressive Party has in the desire to make a government that the people can control—to say that through these measures you cannot secure improvement of present conditions seems to me to denote an absolutely unwillingness to face the facts. I have always said that I would go as far as any Socialist in making a government that the people can control, and if the time ever comes when the majority of the people wish to adopt the Socialists' system, I shall say amen, because I am a good Democrat and I hope, a good loser.

Now, I wish to close this debate, as I began it, by calling Mr. Ruppel's attention to the fact, and calling the attention of you Socialists to the fact that you are simply making broad, glaring, glittering generalizations as to what you propose, that you are not consistent in your economic theory, that you will not find any two of your prominent writers agreeing as to the actual basis of your economic program, or agreeing upon how you are going to bring it about or how far you should go if you could. As I said before, I believe that step by step, as rapidly as we can see our way, we should adjust conditions in this country so that every man, woman and child, shall have the opportunity to develop to the full those capacities which God may have given him or her. Just as fast as I can see my way I am willing to use political parties, whatever those parties may be, to accomplish those ends, but I am not
willing, and I don't believe the great majority of the people of this country are willing, to take this long leap in the dark which you are proposing. As I have said, you are flying in the face of your doctrine of economic evolution when you ask it. I do not believe that the average man and the average woman want to have all opportunity of individual initiative, all opportunity to own and control productive property taken from them. I believe that the average man would prefer to have a system wrought out under which he shall have, within a certain sphere, as large a degree of individual initiative and of absolute liberty in the use of his property and his powers as the welfare of the whole people will permit. And consequently I have always said that in my opinion the successive adoption of limitations on the powers of the individual, for the benefit of the many, is very likely to stop at that point where the average man and woman, feels that there is nothing to be gained by further destructions. Men naturally revolt at the idea of turning over the entire control of their activities and interests to some great organization even tho controlled by the people. Now, my friends, you Socialists cannot deny the fact, that your doctrine must lead you to that if you are logical in your analysis. If you are not willing to accept that conclusion, you must face the other dilemma which Kautsky has accepted that in order to preserve some measure of individual initiative and avoid stagnation you must preserve some of the features of the competitive system.

And now, my friends, what shall we say about the immediate issue this year? Are you willing, as I said before, in order that you may do a thing in your way, in order that the Socialist Party may get credit for it, to defer enactment of these reforms for perhaps another quarter of a century? Are you afraid that if these reforms were adopted the demand for ultimate Socialism would disappear? That is the issue, and I ask you to answer it when you go to the polls. Do you believe that you would lose all your intelligence if you should join with another movement, no matter by whom led, to secure those immediate reforms? Do you believe that by so doing you would become so debased that you could never again take up the standard of ultimate Socialism if it should seem desirable? Do you believe that if you acted with workers for an immediate good that you would even need to lay the standard of Socialism down? To say that you would is to say that you are not now men and women with the intelligence for which I give you credit.

The countries in which the most progress is being made in social reform are those where action is being taken step by step in the direction of economic freedom. A few years ago I talked with Philip Snowden of England, and he said to me, "Much as I regret it, the Socialist Party as a party, will never get control of the English government." I said, "Why?" He said, "Because the English people are of such a common sense turn of mind that they are going to proceed step by step for reform. They may ultimately establish a Socialist state, but it will never be secured through the Socialist Party, but I would rather have it that way, step by step, rather than simply to mark time until we can secure it all in a lump." That was the statement of one of the leading English Socialists to me within two years.
Now, just a word in closing, in regard to the leader of the Progressive Party. When have you ever had another man, who, as president of the United States, or as candidate for president of the United States, born to ease as Theodore Roosevelt was, a man who might have devoted his life to the making of money, yet absolutely refusing to do anything in the way of making himself a great force in industrial society, absolutely refusing to try to pile up any more fortune, because Theodore Roosevelt is a poorer man today than when he entered politics. (Laughter.) You may laugh, but that is the truth—where will you find any man in his position as president of the United States, who was willing and anxious to go into the homes of the miners, as he did in Pennsylvania, in order to discover for himself what ought to be done in order to remedy those conditions? Where have you ever had another president of the United States going into the sweatshop homes in New York in order to make investigations, with the idea of remedying those conditions? Where have you had another man, as president of the United States, stepping into a great industrial struggle, as Mr. Roosevelt did in the anthracite strike, and saying to the mine owners, "You must settle this problem with justice to the miner, or I will use the power of the government to settle it for you." Somebody says he sent the militia. He sent no militia. He threatened to send the regular troops to take the mines from the mine owners, if he could not settle it any other way. That is the man who is asking you to follow him this year. You may not agree with him in everything, as I do not. I don't pick my friends or leaders from those people with whom I entirely agree. Perhaps that is why I have so many good friends among the Socialists. But that is the type of man, strong, hard-hitting, forceful, who is committed to the accomplishment of these immediate reforms. And I say to you that I do not believe that as Socialists, saying that you approve of these immediate reforms, you can conscientiously refuse to join with the great masses of workingmen throughout the country who are getting behind the Progressive movement. I cannot see how you can refuse to give your support to that movement, no matter what your position as to the ultimate aim of the Socialist Party may be. (Applause.)

THE CHAIRMAN. After the debate closes there will be an opportunity for questions, so that I hope there won't any of you go out unless you go very quietly. Mr. Ruppel now has 23 minutes.

MR. RUPPEL. I want to point out that Professor Hatton's last speech contained a very glaring contradiction. He first asserted that all these measures were not reforms coming down from somebody up above to the working class, and he closed by asking if it wasn't a fact that Theodore Roosevelt went into the homes of the miners and on the East Side to see what conditions were preparatory to handling them a legislative lemon. (Laughter.) My friends, when I put that question, "Is it not a fact that the adoption of the whole Progressive platform would leave the workers just as much dependent on the masters of life?", when I said that I also implied that the adoption of the Socialist platform, the adoption of the working class platform, would free the working class, whereas the adoption of every plank that the Progressive demand would leave you free to fight a little longer with the capitalist class, that is all. Every reform demanded by the National
Progressive Party is to be found in force in New Zealand, or Australia or Switzerland or Germany. Germany is miles ahead of us, ages ahead of us, I should say, in the progress of social reform. Has this pacified the workers? No, because social reform in Germany was achieved by the workers themselves, and as the result of these efforts they have built up the most important labor movement on the face of this globe, that today is the pattern for labor movements the world over, and today causes fears to the whole international capitalist class. And they know very well that this movement is not so divided as Professor Hatton would have us believe. (Applause.)

The Progressive Party is going to give the workers the right to organize. How benevolent! The Progressive Party also endorses and is going to pass a law making the sun the center of the solar system. After a thing has once arrived and is inevitable and has become a fixity, then, in the history of the human race, the ruling class that confronted it, always bowed to the inevitable and endorsed it. (Laughter and applause.)

We owe not fighting labor organizations in this country to the George Washingtons, not to the men of the type of Theodore Roosevelt or William Taft. We owe them first to the fine spirit in this country of the early American workers, and that today they are beginning to rise and achieve some degree of power is due to the fact that the clear heads among the workers have continually urged the workers to organize, and nobody has been more active in this work than the Socialists. (Applause.) And when Professor Hatton says that the Socialists in the beginning opposed labor organizations, he is misinformed. The early Socialists, the Marxians, Marx, Lasalle, Bebel, Liebknecht and Engels, what did they tell the workers: “Workers of the world, unite. You have nothing to lose but your chains, and the world to gain.”

Why do we make immediate demands? Why do we ask for these things if we don’t believe in them? My friends, I need bread, but I refuse to beg for that bread; I want to earn it, I want to achieve it. (Applause.) I refuse to have somebody from the “upper classes” come down and give us something. I say that until we can organize and get these things, we are not worthy of their possession and we will not be able to hold them. (Applause).

And Professor Hatton did not deal with my historic analogies where reforms were granted to a passive working class, and where later that working class lost those reforms. History is replete with such instances, and only now, with modern learning, with modern science in the van, can we Socialists, can the working class organize themselves to carry out these things.

Professor Hatton asks in effect, “Do you pursue the dog-in-the-manger-policy; are you unwilling to have these things unless you can get them in your own way?” and I say most emphatically, yes, because you will find that unless we achieve these things ourselves, the capitalist class will not give us those things, but imitations of them that will pain and gall us forever. (Applause.)

And that is not mere assertion. The history of the human race has many, many examples to offer. Is Professor Hatton unaware of the history of Louis Blanc, the French revolutionist, or rather great French reformer, of 1848, who wanted to establish in France national workshops, who with a most eloquent tongue
rallied sections of the working class around him, and also well wishers of that class, and who forced the capitalist government of France to establish national workshop. And is he not aware that those workshops were established, not by the working class, but by the capitalist class, and that now nearly all authorities reviewing them agree that they were instituted and conducted for the direct purpose of disgracing them and making anything of a Socialistic nature a bad taste in the mouth of the French workers forever?

As to my charge against Theodore Roosevelt, Oscar Straus and Mr. Garford, Professor Hatton makes a flat denial. He is like the country boy that went to a circus and saw a kangaroo, and said, "There hain't no sich animal". (Prolonged Laughter.)

A fact is not to be met by denying it, and I affirm that the Socialist Party and not the Progressive Party is entitled to the support of the workers at the coming election for these reasons:

First, the Progressive Party is financed by the capitalist class, and if you want to know what any organizations stand for and whose interests it stands for, ask, in the vernacular, "Who pays the freight?" The Socialist Party is financed and controlled by the working class, and consequently must remain true to its proprietors. (Applause.) And second,

I want to say that there would never have been a National Progressive Party in this country, with its platform of reform, unless Socialists on street corners, up and down the land had been preaching these things for years in season and out. (Tremendous applause.)

And when I say furthermore that they are not entitled to the support of the workers, I will not quote Professor Hatton, but I will quote the literary agent of Dan Hanna, the editor of the Leader, who said, "The adoption of these reforms is burning the grass in front of socialism." They think you are like the plebians and proletarians of ancient Rome, whom Julius Caesar confronted when he said, "Give them oil, corn and the circus, and they will be satisfied."

How have the working classes in England and this country listened to one reformer after another! Sixteen years ago William Jennings Bryan was telling you that the coinage of silver in the ratio of 16 to 1 would make you all happy and free, and you applauded him more wildly than you do me tonight. And if you look over the history of this country, you will find any number of reform movements, always wanting to patch up a system that was beginning to show signs of senility and decay. The capitalist class today is composed of 10 per cent. of the people of the United States who own 90 per cent. of its land, tools and machinery. Society is cracking apart, the working class numerous, and the capitalist class small in numbers but powerful in property. And this makes for a condition which we socialists point to and ask you to abolish. To say that we preach class hatred is to merely mouth an old accusation, it is merely to bring up again the allegations that we believe in free love, anarchy and destroying God, and a lot of other things. I am surprised that my opponent should have made such a statement.
In conclusion let me state this, my friends, that the ills of society today cannot be cured by passing more good laws. We in 1904 put 32,000 laws on the statute books of this nation, and we have been putting them on at that rate ever since. Now, these men who are putting them on are lawyers, and presumably know what good and bad laws are, and we will presume they have been putting on good laws. So, if this process of making laws to govern society is to keep on, it will require the activities of half the nation to cut down trees, make paper, and print the statute books to govern the other half by. Society is not made by passing laws. When Robert Watt invented the steam engine, he anticipated what proved to be a revolution in law. Many laws were abolished by reason of it.

Today we find the trusts bring workers together by the thousand to co-operate, and we find these socially conducted industries individually owned, and in order to overcome this antagonism, our well wishers, like Professor Hatton, would pass more laws. Not by printing laws on statute books can that condition be remedied, but by abolishing the economic condition at the base of it, the private ownership of the means of life. And my friends, I want to say in conclusion, that I hope that Professor Hatton will see fit, as many other professors of political science have done, to unite with the socialist movement, but only on the basis that he will first recognize the class struggle and himself as a part of the working class. I urge upon him to ponder more upon his situation in that respect, to work with us for the abolition of that giant wrong in society, the private ownership at the means of life; beautifully epitomized by the English poet Mackaye, when he said:

"Lo, a cloud's about to vanish from the day
And a brazen wrong to crumble into clay;
Lo, the right's about to conquer
Clear the way!"

"And with the right shall many more
Enter smiling at the door;
With the giant Wrong shall fall
Many others, great and small
That for ages long have held us for their prey;
Men of thought and men of action,
Clear the way!"

(Great applause.)
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