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PREFACE

THE writer is descendant from Scottish ancestors who, becoming "Friends," or Quakers, moved to Holland for religious freedom. When William Penn received his grant to Pennsylvania, they came to America and settled with the Holland "Dutch" there. Later his grandfather moved to Southeastern Ohio. Being of "Friend" stock, who were all abolitionists, the writer as a youth had his ideas of America strongly accented toward fair play and helpfulness of men toward man.

In the public school he read about William Tell, who tossed not his ready cap in air at sight of that great ruffian, of Arnold Winkelried who, by the uplifting of his brow told where the bolt would strike and how, and who cried "Make way for Liberty." But soon after coming to Cleveland in 1889 he had his ideas of America jolted into a solid conviction that something was wrong. But as few men seemed to care, the writer determined to pinch and save and if possible get a competence that would free him to work for the ideas herein expressed. In 1910, after a successful business career of 11 years, he tried a co-operative building concern, but found antagonism from those who controlled the Bricklayer's Union* although the by-laws of the Corporation compelled every man hired to be paid a union wage and at no time to oppose a raise of wages. This difficulty made the co-operative enterprise a failure. Since 1914 the writer has used most of his time developing and working for the ideas here expressed.

*At a meeting of forty members out of a membership of over 600, a fine was placed upon the co-operators for being contractors. This is given as an answer to the question, why don't you try it out individually.
WHY BE AN EMPLOYEE?

READER, in this busy world, what are you? One of the employers or just one of the employees?

(A) One of the employees.

(B) Why did you start in life as an employee? Why did you not start as the owner of that fine building there, that factory yonder, of a street car line, or a steel plant, something worth while?

(A) Because I was not born rich. I had no choice as to who my parents were to be. To start that way requires that one be born the heir to such property. I, not being heir to sufficient property to employ myself, was compelled to seek employment of those who owned such properties as you mention.

(B) You began life as an employee, then, because you were born poor, because you must or starve?

(A) Yes.

(B) Then you did not have an equal chance in life's race with those who inherit these things?

(A) Indeed not, nobody but a fool (or a liar trying to bolster up some argument) would say I had. The question is almost an insult to my intelligence.

(B) As you seem to take some pride in your intelligence, will you tell me why employers hire men—the compelling motive?

(A) Employers aim to hire those, who, in their opinion, can fill the positions to the best interest of their employers; that is, men who can show the greatest margin between the salary or wage paid and the product which is the result of their labor.

(B) Suppose two men seeking a position, the records of whose past efforts are submitted for inspection. Now let us suppose one asks $A$ dollars,
per month, salary and the other asks $A + b$ dollars per month, will they employ the first man because he accepts the least salary?

(A) Certainly not on that account, such a question neglects the reason why employers hire men. Employers are looking for the margin I spoke of in my previous answer. The margin is what they get. If it is large, then their pride in the employee is large; if it is nothing, their pride in the employee turns to disgust or hatred. Now, if the margin on the applicant's efforts who will accept $A$ dollars is, say 50% of $A$ or $\frac{1}{2} A$ and of the one who wishes $A + b$ dollars is 60%, then the one asking the higher salary will be chosen, because the difference in margin will appear like this $(60\% A + 60\% b) - (50\% A) = 10\% A + 60\% b$. The higher priced employee being the better yielder of income, the more profitable, will be chosen and the employer will be proud to have acquired him over the other man.

(B) Employers do not hire men then to get work done merely, but to acquire this margin to rattle into their silk-lined purses, to pay for their comforts and enjoyments?

(A) Now you have the reason why men are hired; no man is hired except that the employer hopes to make himself a profit by the transaction or prevent a greater loss, which is the same idea.

(B) Why do you say hopes?

(B) Because profits are not always realized. Just as we arrest a man and jail him for breaking into a house, even if he found nothing there to steal, because it was plain he hoped to be able to steal or he would not have broken into the house.

(B) But suppose after hiring you they discover

*Suppose the man who wishes the least pay, say $200, will produce $300 worth of product, while the other man asks $225 but produces $360 products, then the employer makes $35 more on his effort than on the cheaper man.
that no margin of profit can be made out of your efforts what will happen to you?

(A) I have said before their pride would turn to disgust, and I would be asked to leave their premises.

(B) Am I justified in saying then, all that the employer cares for the employee is for the profit he hopes to make out of him?

(A) Yes. Otherwise, he would not discharge me, when his hope of my making him a profit ceased.

(B) Let us now compare this system under which we work with the one that died with the Civil War. Before that time, a man in the southern part of the United States bought another man, called a chattel-slave. Why did the master buy the chattel-slave?

(A) To have him do work that he otherwise would have to do for himself, but mainly to have him produce crops for him that he could sell for more money than it cost him to feed, clothe, and shelter the slave, and to care for him when he was sick.

(B) Suppose it had become impossible for any man to make a margin over the first cost of the slave plus the expense of his keep as above mentioned, would slavery have continued?

(A) No, it would have died out in the South as it had died out in the North.

(B) Slavery then was carried on for the sake of the profit to the master?

(A) Profit was the motive, the kernel in the slavery nut.

(B) Throwing away the husk and clinging to the kernel, let me define a slave in terms of profit also adding the idea of its legality. Would this not be a good definition? That man was a slave who was **legally compelled to earn a profit** for another man (known as the profit taker or master).
(A) Yes, the one receiving the profit being the master, and the one earning it being the slave.

(B) Now if we change the verb from was to is the truth of this definition is not impaired as both are parts of the verb to be.

(A) That is correct.

(B) It now reads, That man is a slave who is legally compelled to earn a profit for another man (known as the profit taker). Now, if we can find a man anywhere who is legally compelled to earn a profit for another, we have found some kind of a slave?*

(A) Yes, if he be legally compelled.

(B) Let's return to your case, you told me you were compelled to seek employment of another and in order to keep your position you were compelled to earn your employer a profit?

(A) Yes, that is very true.

(B) Any court in the land will tell you that the employer has the legal right to discharge you, will it not?

(A) Certainly.

(B) Then in your relation to your employer have we not the legal right of compulsory profit earning?

(A) It is hard to see myself a slave when I have always been told I am a free American.

(B) Yes, I have passed through your state of feeling. But let me make it plainer. Suppose that across the street from you, standing in row after row, were all the employers in the world, now if they

*Slavery ain't of nary color,
Tain't the hide that makes it wus,
All it keers fer in a feller,
'S jest to make him fill its pus.
—Lowell's Biglow Papers—1846.
were all there, then would you go with them legal
title to the entire means of employment and the earth
itself, would it not?

(A) Yes, title to everything intended to em-
ploy anyone.

(B) Are they not in a legal position to say to
you, "Come out on our earth and earn some one of us
a profit or stay where you are and starve to death?"
And you cannot dodge it, except by theft or beggary.

(A) No. I cannot avoid it. To be a law abid-
ing citizen I must earn some employer a profit.

(B) Now as you are not bought and sold, you
are not a "chattel"-slave. You see, I am seeking to
find a front name for your kind of a slave (as we say
James Smith to designate that it is not John Smith but
that he has still many of the family traits of the
Smiths but not the particular ear marks of John).

You told me in the beginning, did you not, that
you were compelled to seek employment to serve be-
cause of your lack of financial or economic means
to employ yourself?

(A) Yes.

(B) Then, if I call you an economic-slave, I
will be using a front name for the kind of slave you
are, that you gave me yourself. And you would
know exactly what I meant by it?

(A) Yes, I would understand by it (economic-
slave) that you were speaking of a man who had not
the means to shelter and employ himself and who
was compelled to seek employment of another, and
to earn the employer a profit as the price of his
chance to create his own means of life.*

*"To ask a fellow worm to give him leave to toil," Burns.
Man is the only animal that permits another of his kind to
stand between himself and his den or feeding ground. Hence
men's lack of backbone suggested the worm idea to the poet.

I will give any man $1,000 who will show me that this slav-
ery does not exist. I believe I am able to see a truth that is for
my own financial good.
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(B) In your illustration of the two men who sought a salaried position, which was the greater slave?

(A) The one chosen because he yielded the greater profit.

(B) Would you not think he would be the first to complain of his slavery?

(A) No, the fact that he is doing better than most slaves, and the fact that he comes in contact with the masters, their makers of public opinion, and that he is so busy trying to overtake other slaves just ahead of him; these, so blind him to his real condition that he says, when one attempts to show him he is a slave, "I'm satisfied," and "I do not call myself a slave." But suppose you call yourself a millionaire, will that cause your pockets to bulge out with money and bonds? No. But if you begin seriously to tell your neighbors that it did, you would soon land in an asylum. May one not be as nutty on not being a slave?

(B) Do you think he is like a chattel-slave that my father used to tell about with whom he personally came in contact? In order to appreciate my father's chagrin at the expression of the slave, you will need the setting of the story. My paternal grandfather died when my father, the oldest child, was eleven years of age. My grandmother lived in Southeastern Ohio between the Ohio River and the Old National Pike. In those days before the railroads, the Kentucky drovers used to cross the Ohio River and make for the Old National Pike and thence to Baltimore and Washington.

My grandfather's new brick house was quite a landmark in that neighborhood in those days. So my grandmother used to keep the drovers over night and my father had a job the following day showing the shortest and best way North to the National Pike. At this time, my father had become quite an ardent abolitionist, and although only sixteen years of age,
a conductor on the underground railroad. The underground railroad was a secret organization that was helping runaway slaves into Canada. After working one whole night hauling these slaves from one depot to another, he had occasion, a day or two later, to guide a Kentucky drover and his cattle which were accompanied by some of his pet slaves to the Old National Pike. As they were passing a settler's house built of logs, chunked, and daubed with mud; the wife and children dressed in calico, the children barefoot, filed out of the house to see the cattle go by. Seeing this and no doubt comparing them with his master's wife and children, forgetting the condition of himself and his fellow slaves (as all good slaves are trained to do), one big fellow reared back in his saddle and let out a hearty "Yaw, yaw. Massy's dog lives better than the people in Ohio."

My father said he felt like braining him right then and there, but my father was to be excused for his feeling of anger, as he was not in the habit (as his son is) of coming in contact with satisfied slaves.

(A) No, I do not think my man is as justifiable in his self satisfaction as your father's "Yaw, yaw" man, because my man is really producing more than he gets and as your story says—the chattel was a pet living with his master and no doubt having a "snap" as we say, really getting more than he produced. As long as Massy lived, he probably would continue to have such a "snap." No, he resembles a well paid preacher, who teaches Contentment in the walk of life, in which God, his "Money God,"* has seen fit to place the employee who must earn the money given this Mammonite; or a well paid lawyer who sees that the laws are properly interpreted and

*How foolish of the Galilean to mistake that fellow who took him up on the mountain. See how much wiser Saint Rockefeller was to say, "Yes Lord, I bow!"

Also see Matt. XXIII;15 for true description of such capitalistic propagandists.
who, when votes of employees are needed to be given to the employer's candidates, pours forth his eloquence to keep the employees throwing away their law-controlling power to their direst enemies, their masters' subservient politicians.

(B) Does the law anywhere recognize that the employee is not the free man the politicians, preachers, teachers, and capitalistic newspapers are wont to make him believe he is?

(A) It may, but I do not know where.

(B) Is it not a fact that the election laws, in most of the states, call for the secret Australian ballot? Was not the argument made when these laws were passed that the employees were being dismissed because they did not vote as their employers wished? Why should a free man need to hide his ballot?

(A) That is so, the election laws of Ohio, at least recognize the deterring power of the employer's knowledge as to how the employee votes.

(B) Why were you, Mr. Employee, born into economic slavery?

(A) That I would like to know.

(B) Let me show you by an illustration.

Suppose your mother left you $5,000 to buy a home as soon as you married. Suppose that you and your wife chose a place that you could purchase for that sum. As you are on your way from the bank where you drew out your inheritance to pay for this home, I slip up behind you, tap you behind the ear with my blackjack and appropriate your inheritance.

While you are writhing on the street I hasten to the man who lives next door and who also wishes to purchase this house to rent. I loan him the $5,000, take a six per cent mortgage on both properties with compound interest payable quarterly, due in twelve years. Fearing discovery, I depart. When you come to and go home, inform the wife that you have been robbed, she will cry awhile with you, but soon she
will say, but, John, we must still have a home. Renting is now your only means of getting a home. You decide to rent the one you intended to buy because you like it and it can be obtained for $50 per month. When my note matures, I seek to collect it. But in the meantime, you have discovered who stole your money and that it is loaned to your landlord.

You request him to let you know when I appear. He does. You have me arrested, and prove your case. Now the judge has the note, the maker is ready to pay principal and interest. How much shall the judge say is yours, just the original $5,000 or the entire amount, principal and interest, which is now more than double the original?

(A) Surely the entire amount for that will not repay me for the original robbery plus the rent I have been compelled to pay.

(B) This was a supposed robbery. See the real robbery that has been committed upon all poor men in America. You are a child of old Mother Nature, are you not?

(A) Yes, I claim to be.

(B) Yet you can show no legal title to a spot upon earth, can you?

(A) No.

(B) Yet you would quote with patriotic gusto, "Breathes there a man with soul so dead, Who never to himself has said, This is my own, MY Native Land!"

(A) I have been taught so to do.

(B) Would not this be more appropriate to your actual condition in life?

Breathes there a man with brain so dead, Who ever to himself has said, This is my own, my own dear land, Who does not own a foot of sand,
A place whereon his feet to stand,*
Who owns no home, no shop or mill,
But for each need of life to fill,
Bows to some greedy owner's will.
Breathes there a man with brain SO DEAD?

(A) Yes, just now, I'm sorry to say,
    That I was one much stung that way!

(B) Would not this be a better patriotism?
    "Where'er one man may help another,
    That spot of earth is thine and mine.
    There is the true man's birthplace grand,
    Mine is a world-wide fatherland."

(Lowell.)

This thought has been expressed by such great thinkers of the past as Socrates, Diogenese, Tom Paine, and Wm. Lloyd Garrison.

(A) But what about that comparison you started to give me?

(B) This old Mother of yours has left to her children what is known as natural wealth. When we look about over these United States of America, we perceive that her gift is more than half of the entire wealth therein. Did you get your share?

(A) No, I did not.

(B) Your guardians, the Reps. and Dems. must have seen the other fellows first. At all events, your inheritance has been stolen for more than twelve years and so if you wish to reclaim your inheritance with such part of the rent and interest that you and

*"The birds of the air have nests,
    And the beasts of the fields have dens.
    But the son of man hath not where to lay his head."*

And the U. S. statistics say to you that 57% of the sons of America own not the place to lay their heads, and 14% more have their homes mortgaged.

*Thoughts expressed by a man afterwards executed for his teachings. Is it any wonder that such a poor man, condemning the rich, should have received death and not justice from the highest religio-political court of his land?
your forebears have been compelled to pay, as is possible to get (you cannot get it all because your masters have lived up a vast part of it) you must sue in the court of public opinion and keep up your suit until these fellow exploited citizens of yours see the light of hope that a just judgment shall be rendered that will make all of Mother Nature's children the co-heirs of civilization and not see the many born Economic-Slaves of a very few Economic-masters.

“If I'm yon rich man's* slave,  
     By Nature's law designed,  
Why was an independent wish,  
     E'er planted in my mind?”  

Burns.

(A) Now I see how it happens that so many are born economic slaves; how

“Man's inhumanity to man  
     Makes countless thousands mourn.”  
But how shall we act to free ourselves?

(B) That is what I wish to show you, but first let us make a comparison between chattel-slavery and economic-slavery. Suppose an employer today has 100 employees working for him, can he make more profit than a master could, before the Civil War, who, owned 100 chattel-slaves?

(A) I do not know.

(B) Which would you guess?

(A) The man employing the 100 today.

(B) Would you like a proof of your guess? The Ford Automobile Company reported in 1916 a dividend of nearly $60,000,000. At the same time, there was employed in factory and distributing places between 56,000 and 58,000 employees. Call it 60,000 so as to be safe. $60,000,000 divided by 60,000 employees equals $1,000 per head. What

*All italicized words in quotation are changes to present day meaning. Emphasis is in black type.
were chattel-slaves worth on an average? As I see you have not the information, I shall quote from "The Suppression of the African Slave Trade" by W. E. B. DuBois, page 162:

"The average price of slaves rose from about $325 in 1840 to $360 in 1850 and to $500 in 1860."

Do you suppose if I had a bunch of slaves that made me a profit of $1,000 each per year, I should sell them for $500 apiece?

(A) No, I should think not.

(B) What is the privilege of working these economic-slaves worth to the Ford company taking into account that they cost nothing to replace as the chattel-slaves did?

(A) An annuity of $1,000 per year when money is worth 6%, would sell for $1,000 divided by 6%, or $16,666.67. Setting aside $1,666.67 for each of the 60,000 employees or $100,000,000 for the actual value of the entire equipment,* then the $15,000 remaining per man would only be thirty times the value of the chattel-slaves of 1860. Now all businesses are not as profitable as the Ford Company, but there is quite a margin between one and thirty times; therefore, I am going to congratulate you, for belonging to the most profitable kind of slaves that the world has ever seen. Aren't you proud?

(B) No, but why rub it in, and why are you so interested being a little master yourself?

(B) Can I sit still while the words of the poet, words I learned as a school boy when I was taught to glory over the achievements of the Abolitionists, keep ringing in my ears:

---

*At the time mentioned the actual value of the factory at Detroit was estimated at $32,000,000. So $68,000,000 ought to be ample allowance for the remainder.
"If there breathe on earth a slave,  
Are you truly free and brave?"

(A) No, I suppose not, but how shall we get free?

(B) You economic slaves possess some rights the chattel did not. What one of these rights do you consider the greatest?

(A) I can work where I please; the chattel had to work where his master said.

(B) Can you? Suppose you step into that store there and say to the owner, "I came in to go to work for you." What will he say?

(A) Oh, I did not mean that quite as broad as you take it.

(B) No, he would likely say, "Why, man, I have not advertised for help. I don't need you." You meant to say you could take your choice of two places offered. But you do not chose even here. The employer chooses. Had you not better guess again? Or better let me tell you.

(A) All right, what is it?

(B) Would you not consider the right to get together with other economic-slaves into a political party and vote to change the very laws that make you a slave, a very important right? Your right of suffrage?

(A) Yes, I will agree that that is some right. But how shall I vote?

(B) Will you commit this to memory?

You have, in deed, the vote our fathers gave;  
Deem you they dreamed you'd vote yourself a slave?

(A) Yes, I'll let that ring in my ears as you have let—

"If there breathe on earth a slave,  
Are you truly free and brave?"

ring in yours. But how shall we vote to get free?

(B) Suppose we had votes enough, we could amend the constitution of the United States of Amer-
ica, according to that document itself, could we not?

(A) Certainly, it was amended to change 4,000,000 chattel-slaves into economic-slaves. I should think it worth while amending it again to free 80,000,000 economic-slaves.

(B) Grant the votes have been found then the amendment is written thus:

ART. 1, Sec. 1.—On and after this day, no judge or court of equity in the U. S. A. or the jurisdiction thereof, shall ever again recognize the relation of employer and employee, of landlord and tenant.

Sec. 2. Every court shall recognize that two or more men working together are co-operating, and that each and every citizen therein shall have an equal vote in deciding who the officers of that co-operation shall be, and how its business shall be conducted.

ART. 2, Sec. 1. All occupations shall be divided into two great classes. The first class shall include all efforts creating articles that are capable of being kept until used without material loss or decay. The second class shall include all other avocations.

Sec. 2. Any citizen shall have the right to join any group in class one at will, and they must receive him.

Sec. 3. Any citizen shall have the right to make application, pass such examination, as is required to show fitness for duty, in any group of class two, and be placed upon a waiting list, from which the call is made in the order of enrollment.

ART. 3, Sec. 1. The Nation, State, or City shall elect pricing boards, to regulate interstate, state, or city prices, respectively.

Sec. 2. These boards shall have power:

1. To approve all examination requirements in class two.
2. To set unit prices on all articles in class one and change same, at intervals prescribed by vote of the citizens, according to the law of supply and demand.

3. To set a reward for all services in class two and change same, at said intervals, according as the length of the waiting list, in each group, varies from the normal.

ART. 4, Sec. 1. Individual workers shall receive a life lease upon their proportional share of the individually used and fixed equipment and natural wealth released by previous lessees from time to time.

Sec. 2. Home users shall have life leases upon homes, based upon principles that will treat all citizens alike.

Sec. 3. No lease shall be transferable but may be cancelled and new ones taken from time to time, as provided by majority vote of the people.

ART. 5. The unit prices shall be based upon a paper currency, its volume regulated by the Sec. of the Treasury, so that it will buy the same amounts respectively of forty staple articles as were obtained of each for 2½¢ at the time of its adoption.*

*Suppose these articles are taken: wheat, corn, oats, rye, cotton, flax, hemp, wool, sugar, tobacco, iron ore, coal, kerosene, copper, zinc, tin, prints, linen, silk, rope, woolens, paper, glass, paint, tin plate, leather, cutlery, platinum, alcohol, turpentine, copper wire, three iron products, lead, aluminum, gold, silver, flour and corn meal. Take 2½ cents worth in each of the twelve regional bank districts of a specific grade and quality; add these amounts together and divide by twelve. The quotient will be 2½¢ worth on an average in all twelve places. A record of these amounts, their grade and quality are then kept in the Treasury Department. Let the Secretary of the Treasury take quotations every three months in these districts for each of these quantities. Now if they are just worth a dollar for the total then the money is stable. If they are worth more, the dollar is below par. If they are worth less, the dollar is above par. In the first place the quantity of money must be reduced by calling in some that is in circulation, and in the second place
Let us see what effect this amendment would have on business. ART. 1, Sec. 2 saying: "Every court shall recognize that two or more men working together are co-operating, and that each and every citizen therein shall have an equal voice in deciding who the officers of the co-operation shall be and how its business shall be conducted" will have the same effect on business, will it not, that the action of our Revolutionary forefathers had on the government itself? Before the Revolution, King George III. claimed the divine right to rule America and tax it for his benefit. But the Declaration of Independence pulled up that old claim by the roots, and flung it in the teeth of all the kings of the world, and after the Revolution the Colonists found themselves with the right to choose their own officers from President on down, and the right to establish such government as seem to them best.

So this part of the Amendment would extend democracy to business, thereby making all businesses democracies, big or little, according to their size. The law then saying to the former owners: "You are no longer the Economic Masters," and to the employees, "You are no longer economic-slaves; but you are all fellow men co-operating in this line of work. Go ahead and choose your officers and carry on your business."

In a group of a hundred men, at least five would wish to be the highest officer (call him president, superintendent, or whatever they like). Now suppose I was one of the five and after the first vote was counted I found I had next to the least number of votes. I would realize that some offer on my part was necessary to attract the votes my way. I would

the quantity must be increased by sending out more. This would cause the money to remain a true measure of value and not constantly fall in purchasing power like it has done since 1897. So that the value of deposits and life insurance has become about 30% of their former purchasing power.
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at once take my old ratio of pay as an employee, add to it what I felt the extra responsibility was worth and offer to take that ratio of the product for my reward for the position. Say my old wage ratio was X and I added A. Then if they elected another man and paid him X plus A plus B, it would be because they thought that he would manage things so much better than I, that after giving him B more than I, they would still have more left for themselves; in other words, the one chosen would earn, in their opinion, what he received more thoroughly than I would have earned my offered amount; he thereby being the cheaper man. If he earned what he received, then he could not make a profit out of the efforts of any of us under him, could he?

(A) No, he could not.

(B) If he, the principal officer could not make a profit, no other officer could legally do so either, could he?

(A) No, he could not do so legally.

(B) Then, if the officers could not make a profit legally, who could?

(A) No one.*

(B) Then would not all these men be economically free? You remember our definition of a slave as that man is a slave who is legally compelled to earn a profit for another. The extending of democracy to business makes it so that no one can legally compel another to make him a profit, that it sounds the death knell of economic-slavery. Do you see it?

(A) Yes, I see the death of Economic-Slavery. But how would the relations of different occupations be adjusted?

(B) Two great classes of business are noted in

*If the rivalry for leadership became so keen that those who led gave more than they received there would actually come into practice the saying, “Whosoever will be chief among you let him be your servant.”—Matt. XX-27.
Art. 2, Sec. 1. In this first class, you will perceive that if an extra man comes along and goes to work in any group whatever, there will be no waste; even if they were making all that was being sold before he came, because the product can be laid away and kept until used. But if this man is denied work everywhere, as happens in panicky times under the economic-slave system, his time becomes a total loss. This right to go to work without saying “By your leave,” makes the citizen a man who will fear no want. Therefore, for the first time in the history of the world every man** will be free to choose his avocation, so that the square peg will find the square hole and the round peg the round hole, and the citizen will not be compelled to stay in a rut for fear he will not get an opening anywhere else.

The law of supply and demand is thought by some to have been set aside by the monopolists of today. The law cannot be set aside. What they are able to do is to prevent the law working upon goods, by deflecting it upon men. An employer (K), seeing that the market will not demand so much of his goods as formerly, instead of waiting for the over production that will follow, if he keep right on, as he has been producing; goes out into his shop and says to his foreman, “We will have to cut down our production, I estimate, about 10 per cent; look over your workmen and discharge one-tenth, being careful to pick the least productive.”

If the reduction in this line is caused by society using something else that much more, these discharged individuals may find employment in the line of the new demand. But if it is a time of panic (i.e. of mal-adjustment of production to use, so common and glaring under production for profit) then these human beings are turned out to rot, as far as the employers, as such, are concerned. So I say they

**Only the rich or well-to-do can now choose.
do their best to shift the law of supply and demand from goods to men. The law must work somewhere. Do you not see this, that the present society cares more for profits than for men?*

(A) Yes, it is plain to me.

(B) "What constitutes a state?

Not high raised battlements or labored mound,
Thick wall or moated gate—
Not cities proud with spires or turret crowned,
Not bays and broad armed ports
Where, laughing at the storm, rich navies ride,
Not starred and spangled courts**
Where low browed baseness wafts perfume to pride,
No, but men, high minded men,
Men, who their duties know, but know their rights,
And knowing, dare maintain." (Jones.)

Let us so shape things that MEN shall be the dominant idea of our society, our state, our country.

With the pricing boards doing their duty, the increased price where goods are being used faster than made, will induce those who feel that they can do as well in one occupation as another to shift to the one needing the increased production. And if the increased production seems permanent, it will induce many of the boys (at least three per cent of the entire working force) who are starting in life to seek these occupations.

Suppose that the normal or necessary waiting lists in the second class to be ten per cent of the number employed, then a waiting list of fifteen per cent would show a small error in over valuing in that occupation, while forty, fifty, or sixty per cent would

*"Ye cannot serve two masters, etc.
Ye cannot serve man and Mammon."

**Or gold leafed libraries of Congress.
show a large error, on the other hand, a waiting list of two or three per cent would show an error in under valuation of the services quite noticeable. With these pricing boards doing their duty (raising the price where consumption was greater than production in the first class, and where the waiting list was below normal in the second class and reversing the process where goods were accumulating in Class 1 and the waiting list was above normal in Class 2), rewards would seek a level so that for an average effort men would get the same reward in all walks of life. Now as each group would be a democracy within itself, it would be in a position to reward its superior men above that average, and its inferior men below it.

"Then let us pray that come it may
That sense and worth o'er a' the earth
Shall bear the gree an all that
That man to man the world o'er—
Shall brothers be for a' that."

(A) Then all men would not be rewarded alike?*

(B) Here is a body of say 100 men producing some article. Suppose you could walk in today and submit this question for the employer. "Hear ye, you employees of this concern, the owners wish to know how many of you would like to see all of you receive the same reward and will vote to make the pay the same for all with the total being the same as it is now—please cast your ballots into this box, marked simply 'Same' and 'Now.'" How many votes would you get for the "Same"? Not a majority. Why have so many different grades of pay grown up? It would be simpler for the bookkeeping department to pay all alike. Why the diversity of pay? You must keep in mind that the employer often

*Brothers don’t mean equal pay but treating one fairly and not eating up his labor.
makes more profit, as you illustrated, on the higher salaried man than on the one poorer paid. The extra pay is held out to the more powerful man (physically or mentally or both) as a bait to get him to exert that extra ability for the master on which the greater profit is made. It is manifest that in the nature of things, the individual will do only his share, if all are rewarded alike. There must be some reward. Honor, acknowledged leadership, or extra pay. Now the position of leader is confined to one. Honors, if given to very many, lose the force intended. But pay can reach to all manner of differentiations and therefore stimulant become possible to thousands that could not be reached by leadership or honors. So, democratic management of business will have to start just where monopoly of opportunity is compelled to drop the helm with a varied graduation of rewards.

Many amongst the working classes, seeing the reward of the skillful set at a living wage and those less skillful paid in proportion to their production (which fact pays them at slow starvation rewards), feel, that to reward men under free conditions according to their accomplishments would injure the less skillful. But such would not be the case, except it would cause them to appear (what they are) less capable than the others. When all men are born with an equal opportunity to use, not only the natural wealth of the world (the single taxer's ideal), but the up-to-date equipment of his day, born not only the child of nature, but the citizen of his day, then rewards according to achievement will be fair and just, and in line with the development of the race and according to the law of the survival of the really fittest, and best types.

Assuming that the desire to possess an article is the greatest stimulant to produce it (or an equivalent to exchange for it); and that labor is not a joy in itself but a means to an end; and that all healthy
men like the possession of proofs of excellence (if they possess it) and therefore will not exert more effort than necessary to produce their share whatever it is (if equal, equal effort, if greater, greater effort): then it can be shown mathematically, that the poorest workman will be better off (actually, not relatively) under free conditions that reward him according to his achievements than he would be, if all were rewarded alike.*

At the time of the change to democratic production, the only agreement possible among the workers would be, to take that old scale of wages found at the time in each industry and use it is a ratio for the distribution of the product. Taking the lowest wage as a divisor and dividing it into each of the wages up the scale, we would have 1, a, b, c, d, e and so on, in which each letter a, b, c, and e was

*To illustrate suppose we take the four great divisions of Agriculture, Mining, Manufacturing, and Commerce. Suppose we have 3X men in agriculture, 3Y men in manufacturing, 3Z in mining, and 3V in commerce. Now suppose ¼ of the men are above the average, ¼ average and ¼ below the average in each industry. Represent the product of a superior worker by S, the average by A, and the other by P. Now as the men in commerce do not create products, but distribute those that the others make, we will have (S + A + P) X agricultural products, (S + A + P) Y manufactured products, and (S + A + P) Z mining products to distribute.

Suppose that we take so great a difference between the efforts of these men as to suppose A equals 2P, then S being as much greater than A as A is greater than P equals 3P and (S + A + P) = (3P + 2P + P) = 6P. Now if we express our product in equivalents of the poor man's effort, we will have 6PX Agricultural, 6PY manufactured and 6PZ mineral products.

The four superior groups of men (i.e.) the S men in the four occupations), take one-half of the total S = 3P or ½ 6P; that is 3PX agricultural, 3PY manufactured, 3PZ mineral. The average men take 2PX + 2PY + 2PZ. Leaving for the poor men just what they had produced, 1PX + 1PY + 1PZ. But P's effort is greater when he desires to equal better men; therefore he is better off than if all were rewarded alike and his desire to equal better men was not aroused as they refused to do more than their share.
of greater numerical value than the one just preceding. These values would be the ratios.

Then to arrive at the distribution of the rewards. From the total product, first would be deducted the raw materials purchased from other groups, the fuel, oil, and immediate repairs necessary to keep their plant going the amount set aside by those chosen as directors or managers of the group, to replace the worn out equipment, and buildings, to increase the size of the plant if demand for those goods was increasing and Society (through its price fixing bodies) was offering to give this group the wealth with which to increase its plant, by giving it a larger reward for its product; not because the product was becoming harder to make, but because society wanted the article and because society saw that if it wished the product to increase it must furnish the wealth in the form of an excess unit product price. After all these items were cared for the remaining product would be subject to distribution according to the above ratios.*

(A) Suppose that these managers decide to use this increased product price not to increase the size of the plant, but in excess rewards to the producers; what would society have to say to that?

*Represent the number of men in each group from the bottom to the top by A, B, C, D, E, F, etc., and multiplying by the ratios in their respective order we have $[1A + aB + bC + cD + dE]$; then the Net Product $= [1A + aB + bC + cD + dE] =$ Reward of one of the poorest Workers—time being same for all.

Suppose 1, a, b, c, d, e, to be 1, 1.25, 1.5, 1.75, 2, 3, and A, B, C, D, E, F to be 10 12, 14, 8, 4, 1, and Net Product to be $85,200$ then $85,200 = [10 + (1.25) 12 + (1.5) 14 + (1.75) 8 + (2) 4 + 3] = 1,200$.

$[10 + (1.25) 12 + (1.5) 14 + (1.75) 8 + (2) 4 + 3] = 71$. $85,200 ÷ 71 = 1,200 = $Basic ration in 1, a, b, c, d, e. Then 1, a, b, c, d, e become $1,200, $1,500, $1,800, $2,100, $2,400, $3,600, respectively, total pay for each grade $= $12,000, $18,000, $25,200, $16,800, $9,600, $3,600 respectively, or a total of $85,200 entire amount distributed.
(B) What would happen? As the report of all institutions would be public property, this increased pay would cause a great rush into that industry if it were in Class 1. The plant not having been properly extended the increase of men would cause night shifts, the older men would have to take their turns at night work. Poor equipment and crowded conditions would increase the labor for a unit of produce, yet the exaggerated reward of the previous report would induce an over supply of men, and consequently an over production of the product which would cause waiting on the part of the workers for the unsold portion of their effort and a decline in the price of their article. From this temporary apparent advantage would arise overcrowding, poor facilities, night work, and in the end a falling reward, whereas, had the management been wise, set aside the intended productive wealth, in the form of an increased capacity, while rewarding themselves, a little above the average, there would have been only a normal stimulant to outsiders to come in. The necessary equipment would be there for them to use. Society would have received its increased product without an over production. The workers would have had good day time working hours, good and convenient equipment, no waiting for the sale of an over supplied product and no cutting down of the unit price of the product. Just one experience of that kind would satisfy the directors that it did not pay to attempt to hog things under free conditions.

American business concerns and especially the Railroads have shown glaring examples of this hogging of the increased reward of society in the form of dividends to stockholders by a clique who wish to show big dividends in order to unload onto the gentle investing sheep of the capitalistic world. One trial by a group and its resulting consequences would teach the directors that they must be long sighted
or else they would pull the wrath of their fellow producers down upon their own heads.

Now it is plain that in the three lowest grades of most shops, there is the greatest number of workers. As they have the power of numbers, they can compel changes (not contrary to the nature of things) in their favor. They could cause to be established in their group or in co-ordinating groups, a school to teach efficiency so that they could become capable of higher lines of work, and as they became fitted, to force, either work in that capacity or reward on a parity with those therein. As there would then be an over supply on the waiting list, even in a division of a group in Class 1, this over supply would tend to reduce its (the divisions) relative importance in sharing the reward. And as opportunities would be open to all, a vast lifting up of those now denied opportunity would occur.

(A) Would democracy work in business?

(B) Democracy has been in force in America for the last one hundred and forty years. The government of these United States is the greatest business in the world. Do you wish to abandon what democracy we have and go back to a kingly form of government? The mistakes in America have been from the lack of more democracy and not for the lack of kings. Then, if citizens are capable of voting for officers to manage the greatest business in the world, why not capable to choose the offices in their daily business of life? These men thy will know personally, will come in contact with them almost daily, will therefore, know them, a thing that is impossible in the choice of government officials today. Remember that the change to democracy will not kill off the men hired now by the masters to plan and run the industries for them, neither will it kill off these masters themselves and after democracy has triumphed, these men will have the same desire to
eat as yourselves, and rather than starve, they will use their ability to produce just like other men.

(A) But this seems so different from what is customary I hesitate to go so far.

(B) "Whoso would be a man* must be a non-conformist. Self-reliance is conformity's aversion. God offers to every mind its choice between truth and repose." (Emerson.)

(A) But how can you take the capital from the rich—would it be fair to do so?

(B) We do not have to take the property from the rich. We would only need to cease giving it to them. For example, I now have title to an apartment house, the tenants are in possession. I am not. They give me, through my agent monthly amounts. They vote to have their government send its officers at my behest and crack them over the head and throw them into the street if they fail to provide this monthly gift and refuse to get out when requested by my agent and upon continued refusal to the officers.

Just so the employers are not in possession of their shops, mills, and factories. Pat has the key. He opens up in the morning to let in the workers, then the managers. Possibly the title holders will visit the place once a year. But there are thousands of title holders who never saw the property to which they have title. Just as the idol worshiper bows to his stone god and his fellow believers would kill you if you scoffed at his idol, so the hypnotized title deed worshiper piles up gold to his idol holder and rushes to the arm of the law to compel the unbeliever to pay cash homage also. Cease to vote yourselves the profit bearers to the rich, and they will be powerless to use your government to enslave you.

As to fairness, let me illustrate by my own case.

**"A man's a knight who lives the rights and fights for it till he dies."—Geo. McDonald.**
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By present notions when I was an employee and received my pay I had obtained all that was fairly mine. Knowing that profits are made from the workers, I did not accept such a claim.

When I had saved up a club (known as capital) to knock the chestnuts out of the hands of the gatherers, I started into business. After two years in business, I began to spend all of my old pay plus the percent of profit shown by the U. S. Mfg. reports to remain in the hands of the employers as figured upon the total wages and salaries paid. Now as I was doing exactly the same kind of work and less of it (not then having to keep the books as I had done for my employer) I felt that now all my effort is being consumed from month to month and what I saved was the profit on the effort of my employees.

But it became impossible to keep peaceable relations with friend wife and children, when they knew I was making good profit, and they being average Mammonites could not be contented with such a method of figuring living expenses. So we spent part of the profits of the labor of others. Yet I saved $50,000 (which my children and I still have) of these profits. Whose wealth is this morally? Yes, it is ours legally.

And as long as this Economic-Slave system lasts, I feel I can morally keep my part of it, only on condition that I use the income to enable me to fight for freedom of the Economic-Slave.

Twenty-seven years ago when I began expressing these ideas, I was told, "Oh you are just a sore head because you have nothing." So I resolved to play the game and get something so that I could show that I was not just sore because I personally was poor but that I was and am still sore because such bad laws are permitted to remain in force.

Now the thoughtless cry* "Oh you are not con-

*Just like the Jews of old. See Matt. II, 18, 19.
sistent because you do not give away your property.” But I do not ask any rich man to give away his property; it is not his to give. But what I ask is that the economic-slaves reclaim their property and make it impossible for their government to ever again to defend the master and man relation under the guise of employer and employee.

Suppose I buy a piece of land that I do not intend to use myself. Why do I want it? I hope to enslave others for profit. Suppose it is in the vicinity of a growing town whose growth depends upon some natural opportunity. Suppose shortly after I purchase, some invention occurs to make the product of this town valueless. The town ceases to grow, my hopes for exploitation dies with it. Who rewards me for my lost investment? Suppose I complain, I will be informed that all purchases of property are subject to changing conditions, that I was not compelled to buy, and having bought and conditions changing, I must make the best of it.

So, if you, economic slaves renounce your idolatry and refuse as a people to continue old concepts of property, will that not be a changed condition that the hoped for profit monger will need to abide by? Why should he whine, especially when he claims to be an upholder of the “Declaration of Independence of America” which says “We hold... that all just governments derive their power from the consent of the governed.”

The man, who devotes his time to property acquiring, bets his life against the good things he might do, that you slaves will always bow humbly to your servitude, and will not rise up like men and say, “We shall be free.” Who has judged best, he or I? Again the present Congress of the U. S. A. has asserted that the Government has the right to compel its citizens by the hundreds of thousands to sacrifice their lives in battle, when Congress says it is necessary for the best interests of the majority. Will you
hesitate to have a future Congress compel its citizens to sacrifice their titles (even if they had produced it all themselves), when it is for the good of the greatest number? Is the rich man's title (not to what he uses), but to that he holds for extorting profits from others, more sacred in your eyes than the lives of your fellowmen?* If so, you will maintain what is.

(A) What about rewarding inventors under democratic management of business? Could that be done?

(B) Why not as readily as now? Patent rights to make of course could not be permitted. The only ground on which rewards for ideas can be defended is the greatest good of the greatest numbers of mankind. So all society need do is to so reward inventors as to cause others capable who would not invent to put forth an extra effort above the average that they would not do if rewarded alike. This is the same argument used to justify different pay as a recompense for superior production from day to day.

If it is granted as a fact in human nature, that men will not as a class do more than the average unless some stimulant such as leadership, honors, or superior reward is anticipated (and my twenty-five years devotion to the ideas herein expressed convince me that the vast majority of men as now constituted act according to this fact) that men who act from ideas of right, justice, and fair play are so few that I give as my reasons for supporting these ideas when it is manifestly against my immediate financial interest, that I enjoy the spreading of these ideas, the same as a good checker player enjoys a game of checkers; to give the other, love of truth, right, jus-

*Over 67,000 of the flower of American manhood had their lives confiscated in the late love feast of European Christian-dom. And enough wealth was confiscated to build a flat for every family in the U. S. A., so that there would be one room per person. And it will cost as much more to pay the tax collectors to pay the debt.
tice, and fair play only raises a sneer of unbelief. So to keep up the stimulant to men to think out new ways, and better tools and equipment, it will be necessary to reward men for accomplishments along these lines.

But it is not necessary to give monopoly rights, or the power to profit tremendously. It is plain that a man who must exert his capacity daily to make a living for himself and family would, if he had the ability to invent a new tool or devise a simpler method of work, be glad to exert this special gift of his, provided that his share of the saving would relieve him of this daily task. Let society, for its own good, furnish in every city of any size, a school for inventors; equip same with competent teachers who keep a record of all patents and all attempts at patents; furnish power and tools and materials free to inventors to use under the care of these instructors. So when a successful effort was attained, let the reward be some per cent of the saving, say ten, until the value of such per cent reached the average reward of effort, then declare a life annuity to the inventor for that amount. This would set such an inventor free to make other inventions which would raise his reward step by step to the equivalent of the best paid worker anywhere.

One great error is the calling of the present day conditions that of individualism. This is the day of private monopoly. He who can monopolize something and get a large group of economic-slaves under his command can become a very rich man in a very short time. Henry Ford is a striking example of the absurdities of our system. No one as I have heard has anything but praise for the man himself. What he has accomplished, is by means of the law, and not by winkings through the loop-holes of the law.

Mistaken definitions also lead to wrong thinking. The common definition of Capital, as "Capital
is wealth used to create more wealth," leads to mistaken and muddled up conclusions. Capital should be defined as that part of a man's wealth, or his title to land, not used by himself, but held with the hope of compelling others to yield him a profit thereon.*

According to the original definition a restaurant owner is not a capitalist because his equipment is not used to produce wealth but to consume wealth. Yet in practice he is considered a capitalist as the second definition makes him. Again the small farm owner who uses his land and tools is not a capitalist but simply a wealth and land user, not a profit taker. There will be no capital in the sense of the second definition under democratic control of production, no profit taking.

(A) What about saving under democratic business, if a man can get no rent, profit, or interest, will he have any inducement to save?

(B) Do you believe money really makes money?

(A) Yes.

(B) Then had the man of Gallilee said to his followers, "Here is a piece of Silver (equal in value to our dollar) put it out at 6% compound interest payable quarterly, and 1,900 years from now divide the amount among those professing my teachings." Could such a debt be paid?

(A) Why not?

(B) Because, had you as many worlds as ours would make dollars, if it were all gold and of the

*It is the harness he uses to hitch his brother up to grind out profits for him.
same weight, and they were all coined into dollars they would not pay the debt**

Yes, a man may wish to take a trip to see the world. He may wish to study music or painting, to become an astronomer, an explorer, or do any one of a hundred useful and laudatory things, which will require a reserve of wealth to carry him through, therefore, he would save for that purpose that seemed good to him.

But the real saving is done by the groups. Their managers do the saving out of the gross production and the amount distributed is intended to be the actual spending money of the citizens. They can spend it as fast as they get it or save it for a future spending as suggested above but to save that they may be able to extort profit from their fellows, (No, thanks!) We do our own saving.

(A) But, suppose I save and buy a little equipment and as I have a home under lease for life, I can

**Number of dollars from lump of gold weight of the earth = cu. mi. x cu. ft. x wt. cu. ft., water x SP gravity of earth x 7,000 gr. in lb. avd. and this prod ÷ 27.8 gr. gold in one dollar. But to multiply add Logarithms and divide subtract Logarithms.

\[
\begin{align*}
256,000,000 \text{ cu. mi.} & = \log 8.4082399653 \\
(5,280 \text{ ft.}) (5,280) (5,280) & = \log 11.1679017675 \\
62.321 \text{ wt. cu. ft. w.} & = \log 1.7946344134 \\
5.59 \text{ sp. grav.} & = \log .7474118079 \\
7,000 \text{ gr. lb. avd.} & = \log 3.8450980400 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Prod. of above = no. gr. W. = \log 25.9632859941

\[
\begin{align*}
\div 27.8 \text{ gr.} & = \log 1.4116197060 \\
\end{align*}
\]

Quotient = $ in lump = \log 24.5516662881

$1 at 6% quarterly for 1900 yrs. = \$1.015 \times by itself 7600.

\[
\begin{align*}
\log .0064660422 \times 7600 = \log \text{ of the Amt.} \ 1 \text{ for the time} = 49.14192072. \\
\end{align*}
\]

Dividing Amt. $1 by above Quotient or no. of $’s in one lump = no. of worlds.

Subtracting Log. of Quotient from Log. Amt. $1; we have \log 24.5902544319 Rem, showing no. of worlds needed greater than no. dollars in one world.
place this equipment in my house, and ask two young men to come and help me. I will promise them as much as they are making where they are working. Suppose they come with me and we produce quite a bit more than they were getting in their old place. Now, can’t I keep all above my promise to them and make a profit on their labor?

(B) If they are wise to the laws under which they live they will say to you, "We grant you an extra reward as a leader in this industry, but after setting said extra aside, we are each entitled to one-third of the remainder." You say, "Oh, I will not permit that. You can have only so and so—what you were making over there." You invoke the aid of the judge to enforce your rights, but the judge replies, "The law of the land says that you three are co-operating and each man has an equal voice as to the distribution of the product. These men being in the majority have decided what they are willing to give you as your extra reward for leadership, for your actual work as they see it. If you do not like that, go it alone, or go back to work where you were. Their decision is binding and this court must affirn it. So you can only get such reward as they are willing to give you as a leader or officer of their small group."

The people have refused to allow their government to back up economic-slavery.

Many rich women have much trouble with their house servants. It would be simpler for them to have chattel-slaves that could not leave them when they got angry, thereby discommoding the ladies. Why do not the capitalists pass a law to have chattel-slaves for servants? Simply because as subservient as you demi-reps are, you have opinions on the chattel-slavery question that the capitalists could not violate without opening your eyes and thereby losing your support in the big profits to be made out of the economic slaves, now the custom, and to the wrongs
of which your eyes are not yet open or you have not yet grasped the means to stop this wrong.

To say that it is your own fault that you have not saved and become a Capitalist, does not touch the fact that most Capitalists inherit their start and that all wealth is given away every generation, because the dying cannot take it with them. If all men had equal brain power, they could not all own a Pennsylvania Railroad System, an American Steel Trust, and the like. It would have been as sensible to have made the retort to Sam Adams, Patrick Henry, Thomas Jefferson and their fellow revolutionary agitators: "Quit kicking because King George III. is lucky enough to inherit the right to rule; organize your own conquering bands (as William the Conquerer, his forbear did) and go out and conquer yourselves a kingdom." Such talk would have been absurd for they could not all be the King, but by throwing off the King's power they all ceased to be subjects* and became equal vote citizens. Just as you cannot all own a steel plant, a railroad system, etc., yet you can cease to be economic-slaves and all become free co-operators, each getting reward as the result of his effort has yielded fruit.

To illustrate to you the kind of system we live under I am going to give you a little climbing contest.

This is a Fourth of July Contest. Here we have twenty short ladders and one long one. There are twenty nice young fellows and my son ready to climb. I say to these twenty young men, I own these ladders and if you climb on my ladders you must pull for my son who is going into this race. Of course these are meek sons of Republican and Democrats who are used to the ownership game. None of them protest that such a proposition would not show individual ability, but would show the power of owner-

---

*The word subjects from two Latin words meaning to pass under the spear, gives a clear idea of power maintained by arms.
ship. In order to make these twenty young men pull for my son, ropes from hooks over the shoulders of the climbers pass to pulleys on shafts at the bottom of the ladders, and these shafts are so ratcheted to a drum at the foot of the long ladder that this drum surface is turned by each climber so that the combined turning equals one-half of the total climbing of all the twenty. From this drum a rope ascends to the top of the long ladder, turns over a pulley and comes down to a slide at the bottom. This slide has a chair upon it and on this chair I place my son. This slide you perceive must go up one-half a rung for each rung climbed by any of the twenty actual climbers. We will suppose that the climbers are arranged in order of their climbing abilities. The best on the left and the poorest on the right. The one on the right being so poor a climber that expressed in terms of life it takes all of his six days' pay to keep him a week, so that each Monday morning we find him at the foot of the financial ladder. This fact we have worked out in this climbing contest by arranging that when he, the poorest climber, gets up six rungs, he strikes a lever that drops all the climbers back six and my son back \( \frac{1}{2} \times 6 \times 20 = 60 \) rungs. We will suppose for the sake of mathematical simplicity that they are uniform excess climbers over the effort of the poorest just according to their position on the ladders. That is, after every drop back a line from the heels of the best climber to the heels of the fellow on the sidewalk strikes the heels of all the others. This, interpreted in financial terms means that I am expecting all these twenty young fellows to live as cheaply as the poorest fellow has to do, and to save all the rest as would be financial paragons should, and not to live better than the poorest climber does as most of the unthrifty workers do.

Also that my son can spend ten times as much as any one of the others. Is it not nice to be the owner's son.
Ha! Ha! Sammy! If you had brains you would be up where I am!
With these conditions in mind, you (whom I am going to conceive to be the best climber, in other words the foreman for my son) finally reach the top of your ladder as shown in the diagram. As you look down the line and see all the climbers below you, you feel some pride in your climbing ability. But just as your self-satisfaction begins to rise you hear a noise and looking up to the top of the twenty-story ladder, you perceive my son dangling his heels and through a megaphone he is shouting down to you, "Ha! Ha! Sammy! if you had brains you'd be up where I am."

This seems hard but this is a little thing, 20 employees. Suppose I could leave my boy 60,000 like the Ford factory had even two years ago. Now when the poorest climber's lever dropped you back six rungs, my boy could have the joy ride of \((\frac{1}{2} \times 6) \times 60,000\) rungs. Expressed in living terms, he could live 30,000 times* as nice as any one of you pikers and when you (as the best climber in 60,000) reached the top of your ladder, he would be 60,000 stories high. You would need a powerful telescope to see him up so high and he could no longer megaphone to you but would have to send down a wireless and the message ought to be "What a bunch of stupid fools you are down there to keep this thing going."

You have, indeed, the vote our fathers gave, Deem you, they dreamed you'd vote yourself a slave?

That man who never inherited any property, and who now does not own his own means of shelter and employment, who votes to continue the present

---

*You say he cannot spend all this. Yet see what a corruption fund is left in his hands to pay for editorials, preachments, teachings, oratorical efforts and movie productions to maintain his mastery. And then it offers the opportunity to set up things, clothing, furniture, bric-a-brac, autos, yachts, etc., as the goal of human ambition. It enshrines mammon as the (God) of human worship and hence any opposition thereto is ungodly.
system (by voting the republican or democratic ticket) says of himself by that act: “I’m a bastard son of old Mother Nature and therefore have no right to share in her bountiful supply of farm lands, forest, mines, quarries, business, or home sites.” And you see he has none of these things. Of course, any bastard with money can buy if the legitimate sons will sell, but had he been a legitimate son he ought to have shared. And furthermore, he says of himself by that act, “I’m glad that the legitimate children of old Mother Nature, who have the earth fenced in, can find a means of making me profitable to them by hiring me and putting me to work or else I would, deservedly, starve to death.” And any man who votes these tickets, says by that act, “I’ll stand behind this bayonet and help the few who have the earth fenced in, to rob the many of any right to the earth and compel them to walk up and offer to serve these few and earn them a profit or I’ll help starve the many to death.”

What more wasteful way of disposing of your ballot than voting for that which your capitalistic masters will give you in spite of yourself, ramming it down your throat with a bayonet if you don’t take it quietly as long as they are in possession of the powers of your government.

(A) Does not Municipal Ownership and Government Ownership do just as well as this Democracy in business you have just outlined?

(B) Certainly not. Government ownership is really state capitalism with the government guaranteeing a fixed rate of income. The industry is dominated from the top by politicians in sympathy with the particular party that is in possession of the governmental machinery. There is no spontaneity within the organization so directed. Its management is unresponsive to the wishes of the men carrying on the actual work. Its authority must come from the general government.
has other things to do besides attending to the needs of that particular organization, while under the democratic management of the business the main and only business of its organization would be to attend to the needs thereof. The democratic idea would permit of co-ordinating divisions with authority over its own portion. The individual would be more interested as he then works for results which are bettered with good management and earnest attention to detail by each individual. Whereas, as a part of a State machine in which he receives a fixed wage, receiving his orders from above, being dependent on those above him for his position, he must be less free and therefore, less easily moved by ideas of betterment, mostly not caring at all because his reward is fixed. His job, depending upon those above him, must make him (not a free agent, a real democratic citizen) but a cringing, subservient, order obeying tool of a political machine.* Democratic management makes every individual a partner in the business. It will put vigor into every one who has a spark of manhood; it will stimulate individual thinking and planning for the good of the whole organization because it will provide reward for the ideas that are found to be practical.**

By providing co-ordinating groups that are in position to direct all those details (not affecting the other co-ordinating parts) which lie within themselves, democratic management will lead to trials of small betterments that the great head of the organization has no time to look into because (as his time

*It was seeing this that made some writers call it "The Coming Slavery."

**It is not meant to say that State Capitalism is not better than Private Capitalism.

The Plum plan is an effort to avoid this governmental machine, by giving the workers actual control in the railroad management.
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is limited) he will need to attend to the greater things.

If the individual members of a great organization have life, then the whole organization will be full of healthy growth. Every advantage that accrues to private owners by being there and caring for each detail will be present to the group and where the private owner has to contend with the time serving spirit of the employees paid by the day, the group will be composed of interested individuals having the motive to do their best as the owners have today. As no man will be paid a fixed salary or wage, but all will share in the net production, so all will be interested in making that net amount to as much as possible. Each group will have to all intents, a contract to furnish society with its product for the next period at a given price. Every economy instituted within the group will increase its net reward. Thus you see, by making authority depend on the good will of those below, flexibility, minute economies, and thorough good will, can be maintained. Government by the State or Nation will then return to the Jeffersonian ideal of preserving order between the great group of producers and would not attempt to do business because of the gigantic task necessary to arouse the whole nation in order to make a simple change contrary to the wishes of the partisan clique at the time in possession of the U. S. machinery. It should be plain to anyone that the greater the size of the body of people to be reached in order to make a change the more difficult it is to make the change. Hence, the danger of National management of any business. And while we are on this idea, I want to show you the folly of reform parties, just to change a little here or there. If old parties will not make changes, and it becomes necessary to build up a new party, see that the new party stands for gigantic changes (basic in character) or else you will be in the ridiculous position of a manufacturer who built
a great factory, installed a steam plant with engines to transmit the power to a gigantic trip hammer, only to find that all he was permitted to do, was drive a tack. So I say if you are hoping to do something, seek that group who have changes which if accomplished will recompense society for the gigantic labors necessary to build up a new Party.

(A) But would you advise a man to vote against the interest of his employers who have given him a chance to make a living? Does he not owe loyalty to his employers?

(B) You have forgotten that you agreed that "All the employer cares for the employee is for the money he hopes to make out of him." In fact, your employer has, by taking advantages of the financial laws of our country, actually prevented you from employing yourself, so that you must work for some master like him or starve. This loyalty idea is one of the most damnable ever perpetrated upon mankind. Be loyal only to truth, right* and justice. Never be a loyal slave. Remember your masters have been employing you with your own means which unjust laws have enabled them to seize before you were born.

(A) How would these home leases be paid for?

(B) Home leases could be sold just as life insurance is now sold, to-wit: one payment, ten payments, twenty payments, yearly payments, or monthly payments for life. As land would cost nothing to society, home costs would only include buildings and roads, and grading and shaping the land. Naturally each home user would be compelled to pay his proportional share of these first costs (in proportion to amount used), the repairs from time to time, and in a growing community his share of the increased property necessary to provide homes for the increased population.

*"A man's a knight that loves the right and fights for it till he dies."
(A) Could not a parent save up and buy a home for his child and thereby give him a better start in life than the homeless one, who would be compelled to pay on his life lease by the month, and of course pay for the extra bookkeeping necessary to keep track of these monthly payments?

(B) Certainly, the one who paid one payment would save the bookkeeping, as he ought, because he has saved society that much labor.

(A) Then all men would not start exactly equal?

(B) The idea is not to compel men to start equal, but to compel them to stay off of the backs of their fellows. If their parents wish to carry them as a voluntary love offering, who shall say them nay? The idea is not a dead level of equality. That is a capitalistic bug-a-boo to scare timid slaves back to their masters' pens, managed by Republico-Democratic herders. The parent saving would only make it possible for the child to enjoy a part of what they had produced. It could not put him in the position of a master compelling others to earn him his living as such capitalistic savings do today. The male spider allows the female to eat him up after her young are hatched out and then she permits the young to eat her up. Now this act of the old parent spider does not affect me at all. It is their own hides and not mine that are eaten.

(A) How would taxes be raised for the support of public officials?

(B) In those things like homes; dues-collectors, and bookkeepers, etc., would be paid from collected amounts in the line where the service was rendered. But those duties like administering the laws, schools, etc., would be paid from funds raised in such manner as seemed most just to the people. To my mind such sums could be raised equitably by making a direct tax upon all groups of workers ac-
cording to the number in the group. As this total sum would come out of the group funds, it would fall upon all according to their income, i.e., according to their ability to pay. It is very probably that 1,000 men on an average would make one-tenth as much in one group as 10,000 men in another group, because your 1,000 group would contain its superior men and its inferior men just about in proportion to the 10,000 group.

(A) Whom would such a change benefit?

(B) In the first place it is plain it would benefit all those who are now economic-slaves but especially those economic-slaves that are now receiving from their masters the greatest salaries and wages who are really producing the goods (and are not being paid fancy salaries just to buy their influence to keep the slaves in order).

These men would have their masters taken off their back and they would become the honored and loved heads of co-operating groups receiving their old pay plus the per cent that formerly was taken as profit, plus the amounts now wasted in useless advertising, middlemen, and the like. In my climbing contest, the one whom I assumed as the best climber would no longer be subject to the taunts of (my boy) the capitalist, that "If you had brains you would be up where I am!" These men of real power today are the most exploited as your own illustration showed, between the two applicants for a position, the one receiving A plus b yielded an excess profit over the other of 10% A plus 60% b. Then there comes the small captains of industry who starting as economic-slaves have fought their way onto the backs of a few economic-slaves, but who are rent payers, exorbitant profit payers for their food, clothing, and enjoyments to the gigantic monopolists. The fact that these men have fought their way up a step or two under these fierce conditions show that under
free conditions they would attain to places of leadership and honor and a reward that would make them look like a man amongst the best of men.

“If ye do not feel the chain,
When it works a brother pain,
Are ye not base slaves indeed
Slaves unworthy to be freed?”

(Lowell.)

Take a comparison. Suppose we place Rockefeller’s fortune before us and represent it by a silver dollar. Now place the man’s fortune (who attained to $50,000 worth of wealth) beside it in proportion to its size. What will it look like?

(A) Like a pin point or almost nothing.

(B) Then this man (and all men of less wealth if they maintain this system of economic-slavery, by their votes), will vote to enable Rockefeller to wring profit from his relatives and friends, together with his fellow-citizens, and pile up a fortune so big that it makes him look like a financial nobody. But if he votes to establish a condition where no man can exploit his fellow, thereby making a place where each can receive according to his applied ability, he being a man of real capacity would no longer look like nothing but would appear as he really is, a man amongst the best of men. That man who is afraid to make the change, admits that he lacks the ability to stand upon his feet and prove himself a man.

"'Tis as easy to be heroes as to sit the idle slaves.
Of a legendary virtue carved upon our fathers' graves.

New occasions teach new duties,
Time makes ancient good uncouth,
They must upward still and onward,
Who would keep abreast of Truth.”

(A) This argument of yours may be alright
for the fellow who has no hope of being a rich man some day, but for me I still have hope.

(B) Would you consider a man sensible who made an even bet on one chance in a hundred?

(A) No, I would not.

(B) What percent of a chance have you? If you are only an average man in ability and energy you have less than no chance at all. Every ten years' census report shows a smaller percentage of men owning their own homes and businesses. And at that many small businesses are only side lines owned by an employee to help eke out a decent living. He never expects the little business to become big; never expects to quit his job and attend to the business (Only when he gets so old that he becomes a candidate for his employer's scrap heap). All these little businesses should be eliminated from a business classification and put into one called "Auxiliary Aids to a Living Wage."

Look at this excerpt from Table 1, Page 31, Volume VIII. of the 1910 Census on Manufacturing:

Proprietors and Firm Members...... 275,952
Number of Establishments............ 270,082
Number of Salaried Employees....... 792,168
Number of Wage Earners............. 6,639,631

But from these proprietors you can subtract most of the individual business (140,605) and the firms (54,265) because it is becoming more and more difficult for them to maintain their hold. So the corporations are the real business concerns as the report shows.

See Table 1, Page 135.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number of Establishments</th>
<th>Number of Emp. per Estab.</th>
<th>Number of Wage Earners</th>
<th>Value Added by Manufacturer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>140,605</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>804,883</td>
<td>968,824,072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Firm</td>
<td>54,265</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>794,836</td>
<td>951,383,741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corporat’n</td>
<td>69,501</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>5,002,393</td>
<td>6,582,207,117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Taking the value added by manufacturer and dividing it by the number of wage earners, we have $1,195, $1,200, and $1,314 respectively for each mode of ownership. Showing that Individual production is 90.9% and Firm production is 91.3% as efficient as Corporation production; or while corporations have only 75.7% of the number of wage earners they have 79% of the total value added.

Again take Table I, Chapter X, Page 180 of Manufacturing report:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value of Product less than $5,000</th>
<th>% of No. of Establishments</th>
<th>% of No. of Wage Earners</th>
<th>% of Value Added by M. Earners</th>
<th>Rater of Efficiency as per Wage Earners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>34.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.772+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>.857+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>16.5</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>.896+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000,000</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>.956+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 1,000,000</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>1.170+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Last column is mine, found by dividing the fourth column by the corresponding figures in the third. Now, young man, this is the way your chances look toward becoming a capitalist of anything like importance, i.e., one whose income from his property would compensate him for the losses by wastefulness of this monopolistic society. First, you are propertyless. You have first to save up out of your wage a small capital. Only a small percent of men are so constituted that they can save. Only one in ten can save to amount to a capital value. What are your chances of staying in business after you have launched your enterprise? The statistics show that 95% of those who attempt business fail. These figures back here deal with those who stick. The number of Individual Establishments is 53.2% of all. Yet the number of employees is only six on an average, showing that at least 26% of those in business are of the class who are ekeing out an addition to their
wages. This then leaves 74% of those in business to be considered. But Table I, Chapter X, Page 180, shows that 35% of these are practically in the discard. So we are prepared to show you your chances. They run thus: 10% (Savers), \times 5\% (those who do not fail at the start of business) \times 76\% those who are not of the class of ekers of additional wage to make it a living one) \times 65\% those shown by last citation to be really in business. 10\% \times 5\% \times 76\% \times 65\% = .247\%, or less than one chance in 400. But that is not all—the last column in my last table shows that 1.1\% of the establishments are doing 36\% of the business at a ratio of 1.17 as to labor employed, while the second group is only .845 as to labor. So you see it will be only a question of time when these gigantic enterprises will drive the little businesses out or compel them to consolidate with them, and put the present owners in as salaried employees in the big concerns. All this time you are paying tribute to those whom you dream that you will equal. Suppose you succeed in getting to be one of these little fellows in Class 2 and 3 in our last table, and are worth somewhere under $50,000, what will you look like? Now if you save while young, you deny yourself most of the joys of young manhood while the sons of the masters are having a fine time. Then if you succeed you are living with your energies nailed to the grind so that you are a money-making machine, almost up to (if this machine like life does not hold you until) the time to put on your wooden overcoat. But what of those who have seen their savings swept away in failure? Does the prospect look rosy enough to continue to vote yourself an Economic-slave?

(A) But would there be an incentive for a man to do his best after all businesses are made democracies?

(B) The comparison between the present capitalistic monopoly systems and that of free opportu-
ity is somewhat similar to that of a kingdom and a republic. Take Ulysses S. Grant as an example. Under a king such a poor man would never have been given command of the forces of the country as he was under Lincoln. But suppose he had been some aristocratic person sufficiently well-known to the throne to obtain such a position. Then under the king when the civil war was over, would he have gone back to private life awaiting the public acclaim to make him the supreme officer for a short period of eight years? No, the South would have been divided up into dukedoms given to Sherman, Thomas, Sheridan, etc., and Grant would have been made the Lord of the rebellious territory, and his children and children’s children would have claimed the divine right to succeed to the misrule. King defenders and courtiers used to contend that only by such rewards would men of “Military Genius” be induced to exert themselves to defend the realm. But here we have the descendants of one who is acknowledged by historians to be one of the four greatest Military Geniuses of the World, living as common citizens.

Do you suppose that Henry Ford dared dream (when he was working on his model auto) that he would be worth at any one time $3,000,000 (his yearly salary as President of the Ford Company)?

It is not the dreams of gigantic success that stimulates men to do. Men who have these overheated dreams are usually the failures, because the success that they are able to attain in so minute as compared with such dreams that they could only become discouraged. I heard Mr. Thos. White (the father of the owners of the White Automobile Company, of Cleveland, Ohio) say, that when he started in business that he had set $10,000 as his hoped for wealth on which he expected to retire in old age.

Where conditions are such that all young men in the country can see an equal chance to climb to places of trust and honor, and not as now, when the
vast majority are born the profit makers for the few, then progress will spring forth in a way never dreamed of by even the most hopeful of today.

It is not the great differences in reward that stimulate; it is the small differences that do not seem so great a hill that any boy cannot climb it with diligence.

Take a game of baseball. Which game do you enjoy the most, and why. The one that starts off with 10 runs in the first inning by one of the teams while the other side does not get a man to second base, or the one the score stands—

```
  0 1 0 0 1 0 0 0 0
  0 0 1 0 1 0 0 0 1
```

The latter. Why? Because both teams have hope all the time; every member is alive and playing.

Take again another example on the race track. You have seen records made against time (as they call it) by a trotter or pacer. Mostly they have a running horse (called the pacemaker). Does the rider of this horse cause him to outdistance the pacer? No. Because if the running horse gets too far ahead the pacer does not feel that she can catch up, so the stimulant to do her best is removed and she falls below her old record instead of excelling it as hoped. Notice this is in line with my contention that to reward all men exactly according to their applied ability gets the best results for the poorest worker, because the next best man is his pacemaker. The formula to each one according to his needs and from each one according to his ability, I believe has been the unprogressive element in the experiments of Harmony, Zoar, and all other groups working upon this formula and not their holding opportunities in common. This utopian idea was taken up by Church Societies, because churches are built mainly upon ideality and not upon reasonable deductions from scientific data. Its equal reward idea appeals strongly to
the poor, uneducated worker; hence its hold upon many trade unionists and utopian socialists.*

(A) Will the trade union man approve of a system that rewards men (not all alike) but according to the actual amount of goods or service he has rendered to society?

(B) Trade unions are organizations of employees (Economic-slaves) who have found that they individually have no power against those who have all the means of life monopolized by deed. In order to hold men together it is found necessary for unions to build up a sense of common cause against their exploiters. As a body they must act together or they are easily beaten. Therefore, when they set a price for their services it must be the price for which all are to strive or else there is division amongst their ranks. Unions, therefore, set what they call a minimum scale. Many of them say you can pay any man you wish more, but this is the minimum any trade union man can accept.

Now it ought to be plain to any one (union or not) that this minimum is not all the poorest worker produces because his employer we saw does business (not from love of humanity) but for gain. Therefore, he will not keep any one upon his payroll (for long) who costs him all that his labor produces. Now if his employer makes a profit off the poorest producer, that producer must produce more than the minimum wage he receives.

Under democratic management of co-operatively owned society that poorest worker would receive more than the minimum scale of his union. As I have shown before, this poorest worker is helped

*They make a virtue of what is only a necessity of economic-slave action, and proclaim it as the cornerstone of their new Utopia. Surely no one claiming that all past history has been determined by economic urge shall be led to disregard this all-powerful force and proclaim its suppression by a religion of Equality in Reward.
rather than injured by having every one rewarded according to achievement, when under free conditions, where every one gets all he produces. Now the union man, as long as he remains a profit-maker, cannot raise his common cause to the level of the effort of the poorest employee. All the really superior workers are either held back or else exploited out of all their superiority together with the increment made upon the poorest. Now, if he is really after the good of the worker, he will not hold him in economic-slavery when he understands what his vote really does to the worker.

I shall liken the workers to a people living in a fertile valley surrounded by mountain fastnesses in which once dwelt bands of robbers. These robbers at times swept over the valley and carried off the bigger portion of the products of the workers. Seeing this go on from year to year, some of the more fearless of the valley dwellers organized bands to resist these marauders. Finally the mountaineers drove a bargain with the valley men that if they should have tribute paid to them, they would cease these marauding excursions. Now as time passed the population in the valley increased until there were five or six times as many valley dwellers as mountaineers. Some among the valley dwellers began saying “Why this tribute? These mountaineers did not create this valley. We are five times as many as they. Why not organize an army (party) and charge upon these mountaineers with fixed bayonets (ballots) and end their tyranny?” The mountaineers seeing that it would end their tribute, began looking about to discover means to continue if not perpetuate their hold upon the valleymen. Looking over the officers of the organization that once had been their enemy, they found that very few of them understood the possibilities of this new idea. So these mountaineers began appointing these men to positions and would meet with them and feast them. The officers also
were made to believe that this idea, while being impossible, would disrupt their organizations. Being a trait of human nature to believe that whatever is, is right,* and also being satisfied with themselves because they were officers over many of the valleymen, they fell readily into the attitude wished by the mountaineers. Others among the valley dwellers were secretly envious of the luxury of the mountaineers and wished it greatly for themselves. These hopes were fed by the mountaineers by an occasional marriage with a particular strong character in the valley and by money doled out to others, keeping them anxious to leave the present order alone. It finally got so that many valleymen went around openly making addresses that brought forth great praise from the leading mountaineers, and their newspapers lauded these men to the skies. Now as these men were officers in the old organizations which their predecessors had builded up, many believed them the true friends of the valleymen, not realizing the enormity of their disloyal trading with the enemy. This is the way the matters now stand. The valleymen all feel that something is wrong, but there is diverse prejudices, personal axes to grind and many ambitious to be received into the good graces of the mountaineers. Will this vast population permit anything to keep it paying tribute to conditions “by force and cunning got”?

So now, it behooves the union man to see to it that his organization is not used by his enemy (the capitalist) as an organ of reaction, or to maintain the present system of exploitation. To ask a man who sees the present dangers to be satisfied, simply with a union label is almost as bad as asking him to wear the brand of economic-slavery proudly upon his cap where every master can see his subserviency.**

*Custom reconciles us to everything.—Ed. Burke.

**Ancient slaves were branded on the forehead so that they could be readily recognized.
But while Unionism is not perfect, no man who will investigate its efforts can deny that it prevents labor from being crushed down into a yet lower servile attitude. So every worker who has the good of laboring men at heart must not attack Unionism with the idea of destroying it; but must join his efforts thereto and strive, while holding fast to the good it has accomplished, to push the organization forward to the abolition of economic-slavery.

When any union puts itself on record as being ready to use every means in its power, to abolish economic-slavery, and proves it by placing officers in charge who are awake and who are striving with all their energy to end this tyrannous exploitation, then I shall be moved not only from a sense of duty, but by a sense of pride, to use that label.

(A) Would this change be fair to the men of brains who have planned and built up the great businesses?

(B) You must remember that the several businesses will have to go on (if the workers are to have a living) and as these workers will be just as anxious to have good management as any set of stockholders could be, it will follow as a matter of course that those men who have really been the brains of an institution are known to the working force and will be given the place where head work is needed.

Would any man doubt for a minute that a Thomas A. Edison or a Henry Ford would not be retained as the head of their institutions? But as they alone did not make the whole institution (any more than your body could get on with your brains only) so they ought not to be monarchs of the business, but should be subject to the choice of the group, just as the President of the U. S. A. is subject to the choice of the people. Edison, Ford, and Schwab would be relatively as great men then as now. Just as President Wilson (being the elected head of the
greatest nation on earth) outinfluences King George V. in the world’s doings.

(A) But should not the present owners have some consideration, especially the old men who have tried to care for their old age?

(B) Logically they should have just that consideration that they have provided for their honest hardworking employees. They have provided poorhouses, old ladies’ and old men’s homes. To these they should, of course, be welcome.

(A) Yet admitting that they have erred in in their judgment, should not they have some concession because it was the law?

(B) No. “Let’s respect no hoary wrong
     More for having triumphed long.”

Because the workers have been taught to think the thoughts of their masters, and see things through their eyes and sympathize with their striving to enslave, is why you are so solicitous for the rich. No man but a fool has not had his choice to strive for money or for duty. Why be more sympathetic with him who chooses money than with those who choose duty?

“I followed duty now
Down to no bower or roses led the way,
But through the streets of Towns where chattering cold
Hewed wood for fires whose glow was owned and fenced.
Where nakedness wove garments of warm wool
Not for itself; or through the fields if led
Where Hunger reaped the unattainable grain,
Where Idleness enforced saw idle lands,
Leagues of unpeopled soil, the common earth
Walled round with paper against right and man.”¹

“When I read o’er the bitter lives of men
Whose eager hearts were quite too great

¹. Parting of the Ways.—Lowell.
To beat beneath the cramped mode of the day,
And see them mocked at by the world they love,
I marvel how their hearts bear up so long."

No, those who strive to maintain the present
wrongs should consider themselves lucky if they
should escape the same usage they mete out to those
who strive to change the world to better things.

"Count me o'er earth's chosen heroes,
They were souls that stood alone
While the men they agonized for
Hurled the contumelious stone;
Stood serene and down the future saw
The golden beam incline
To the side of perfect Justice,
Mastered by their faith Sublime."

Oh, where we find one who submits gracefully
when his wealth is drafted, I should advise giving
him a gold cross of service, as I understand the gov-
ernment contemplates giving to the family of those
who die in battle.

(B) But of the conscientious objector?
(B) Just so long as he is only an objector he
would need no care. But if he seized a sword and
resisted, then he would be subject to the laws meted
out to overt acts of Rebellion.

Is Democracy in Business un-American?
Let us pause at Bunker Hill and list to the song
of the bullets from the guns of the Colonial Rebels.*
Did they sing hosannahs to the "divine" right of in-
heritance by kings to trample on mankind?

Again, let us harken at Gettysburg. Were the
heroes who triumphed there, sustained by the knowl-
edge that their acts made secure the vested right of
men in the heart-beats of man? Shall the fathers

2. A Glance behind the Curtain.—Lowell.
3. The Present Crises, Lowell.

*The British general, reporting the death of Gen. Warren,
said: "His death was worth that of a hundred ordinary rebels."
who perished at Bunker Hill, and the heroes who fell at Gettysburg, have died in vain? No!

Democracy in Business is rather the beloved son of America, sold by his grasping brethren into the Egyptian Darkness of Greed, Pride, and Lust of Power. And he must need come forth with his corn guaranteeing all men freedom from profit-takers and reward according to the results of their applied ability, to prevent Columbia's fair name as "Friend of the Oppressed" from perishing from the face of the earth.

Shall we be so base as to offer to the returning heroes of the World War, to men who have seen their comrades lay down their lives by the hundreds of thousands, to stop the world conflagration started for Greed and Lust of Power; shall we offer to THESE the role of profit-makers for those who claim Vested Rights in Nature Herself? "I know not what course others may take, but as for me," "I'd rather be a dog* and bay the moon than such an" American.

(A) Do you really believe that this vast change will come about?

(B) Do I believe intelligent young men will continually vote themselves economic-slaves? All the great minds of the past say, "They will not."

"Ignorance never settles a question."—Disraeli.

"Men trample on Man, and they make him a brute."—W. C. Smith.

"Thought alone is eternal."—Lytton.

"And step by step since time began, I see the steady gain of man."—Whittier.

Cursed be the social lies that warp us from the living truth!

*A yellow dog, not a red one.

— 56 —
Cursed be the sickly forms that err from honest nature's rule;
Cursed be the gold that gilds the straightened forehead of the fool! —Tennyson.

* * * *

"Yet I doubt not through the ages
One increasing purpose runs,
And the thoughts of men are widened,
By the process of the suns.”—Tennyson.

* * * *

"Never elate while one man's oppressed.—Pope.

* * * *

“Aristocracy is always cruel.”—Wendell Phillips.

* * * *

“Selfishness is the greatest curse of the human race.”—Gladstone.

* * * *

“Laws grind the poor, and rich men rule the law.—Goldsmith

* * * *

“No one can be perfectly free till all are free.”
—Herbert Spencer.

* * * *

“The people will come to their own at last.”
—John Hay.

* * * *

“The crest and crowning of all good Life's final star is brotherhood.”
—Edward Markham.

Additional numbers can be had at 339 S. Taylor Ave.,
Oak Park, Ill.
"Whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, (i. e., to secure life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness equitably to all) it is the right of the people to alter or abolish it, and to institute a new government, . . . in such form as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness."—Declaration of U. S. Independence.

"Congress shall make no law, abridging the freedom of speech or of the press."—1st Amendment Constitution.

"The right of the people to be secure in their persons, houses, papers, and effects against unreasonable searches and seizures, shall not be violated."—4th Amendment.*

"Neither slavery, nor involuntary servitude, except as a punishment for crime, whereof the party shall have been duly convicted, shall exist within the U. S."—13th Amendment duly proven in court of law.**

*Contrast this amendment with the throwing of 60,000 New York citizens in jail in order to discover 199 draft evaders.

**Some think this 13th Amd. violated by the draft act. But I agree with the capitalistic masters that voting the rep-democratic ticket is due proof of a crime (see p. 37). How read you these amendments, which are part of the oath of office of all U. S. officials?