

HX

86

.H85

SOCIALISM

“The Creed of Despair”



Debate

HUGO vs. CAREY





Class HX 86

Book H85

Copyright N^o _____

COPYRIGHT DEPOSIT.

SOCIALISM

“THE CREED OF DESPAIR”

Joint Debate

IN

FANEUIL HALL, MARCH 22, 1909

BETWEEN

GEORGE B. HUGO

President Employers' Association of Massachusetts

AFFIRMATIVE

AND

JAMES F. CAREY

State Secretary Socialist Party of Massachusetts

NEGATIVE

H X 86
1485

COPYRIGHT, 1909, BY GEO. B. HUGO

All rights reserved

PUBLISHED MAY, 1909

First Impression

© *Mar 29 1909*
Cl. A. *235053*
JUL 26 1909

© *July 22 1909*
Cl. A. *247460*
JUL 26 1909

WHY?

In an address delivered at the annual meeting of the Employers' Association of Massachusetts, I characterized Socialism as "The Creed of Despair" and "A Menace to Modern Civilization," which, being reported in the daily press, was quickly noted by the Socialist Party Club of Boston. A challenge was immediately issued to publicly debate the question whether Socialism was "The Creed of Despair" and "A Menace to Modern Civilization," my opponent to be Mr. James F. Carey. This challenge I at once accepted, stipulating, however, that I be informed of the particular brand of Socialism we were to discuss; also that tickets be printed for each side and the hall divided. The Debs platform was given me as their special creed, and Faneuil Hall was selected for the debate, Socialists occupying one side and Anti-Socialists the other.

Immediately succeeding the debate, which occasioned much interest among followers of both sides, I received many inquiries in regard to publishing it. The Socialist Party Club submitted copy for publication, which, being incorrect and slackly handled, I refused to countenance, notifying them of my reasons and of the existence of my copyright. (They, nevertheless, proceeded to publish it, ignor-

ing the law in question, quite in accordance with established Socialistic tenets.) In addition to the many errors, however, I objected strongly to the use of the union label under my name, and to be inflicted upon my friends, many of whom are averse, as I am, to the badge, label, or tag of any organization or collective group organized for purely selfish ends. I thus, in justice to myself and friends, felt forced to publish the debate, but I shall feel amply repaid for the time expended in its preparation, should the perusal of this little book impress upon even one mind the fallacies and impossibilities of Socialism.

GEO. B. HUGO.

BOSTON, May 25, 1909.

“Why don't you vote the Socialist ticket? . . . Because down deep in your hearts there is the lingering hope that some day you will have some of these wage slaves working for YOU! . . . But, when the time comes that all hope is gone of having wage slaves under your domination, then you will become Socialists!”

IN OTHER WORDS, WHEN MAN ACKNOWLEDGES TO HIMSELF THAT HE IS A FAILURE, WHEN HOPE IS DEAD, WHEN DESPAIR SETS IN, THEN SOCIALISM HOLDS OUT ITS HANDS AND CRIES, “ACCEPT OUR CREED, THE CREED OF DESPAIR.”—

George B. Hugo.

SUBJECT OF DEBATE:

“SOCIALISM: THE CREED OF DESPAIR.”

The affirmative presented by Mr. George B. Hugo, the negative by Mr. James F. Carey, Mr. George W. Coleman, publisher of the *Christian Endeavor World*, acting as Chairman.

OPENING REMARKS BY CHAIRMAN COLEMAN.

This is certainly a very interesting occasion, as is evidenced by the large crowd that has gathered, and so early in the evening. Inasmuch as we have a battle royal on this evening, which is to last two hours, the best thing that the Chairman can do is not to take up any time in making a speech.

You will want to know something about the conditions of the debate: the affirmative are to have thirty minutes, the negative thirty minutes; the affirmative in rebuttal twenty minutes, the negative in rebuttal thirty minutes; and the affirmative in closing ten minutes. The management have been very careful to arrange this thing in as fair a way

as possible. As I understand it, the house is divided against itself. I hope the roof won't fall. [Laughter.] As near as I can make it out, the goats are on one side, and the sheep on the other [laughter]; and on which side are the goats and on which side the sheep, I will leave you to determine. [Applause.]

They were also careful in choosing the presiding officer to choose somebody who was neither one thing nor the other. They chose a man who is not a Socialist and a man who is not an Anti-Socialist. So I suppose those on either side can call him "half baked." But his retort would be that it is better to be that than raw on one side or burnt black on the other, and especially as there is always a chance for a man who is "half-baked" to get well roasted before the evening is through. [Laughter and applause.]

The topic for discussion is "Socialism: The Creed of Despair." The gentleman who is to discuss it on the affirmative side is a man who has his convictions, and is not afraid to speak them. There are, undoubtedly, thousands and tens of thousands who agree with him, but not many of them who have the nerve to set forth their opinions as strongly and vigorously as he does.

I take pleasure in presenting to you Mr. George B. Hugo, President of the Massachusetts Employers' Association, who will have thirty minutes on the affirmative side of this question. [Applause.]

But, before I introduce him, I want to remind you that the speakers are not the only ones this evening to exercise restraint. They know well enough that to lose their tempers would be to give the other side an advantage. The only thing we have to do is to see that they have fair play, and I am quite sure that that will require a good deal of restraint both on the part of the goats and the sheep. [Laughter and applause.] I take pleasure in presenting to you Mr. George B. Hugo. [Applause.]

AFFIRMATIVE OPENING.

GEORGE B. HUGO.

This is real social, anyhow. I am amused at Chairman Coleman stating that he is half-baked; in other words, a neutral. Napoleon always said that neutrals ought to be shot. So, if there is any shooting to be done, we will have to shoot the neutral. [Laughter and applause.]

I am an individualist. I acknowledge no master on earth except the law! I am an individualist who favors the utmost social and economic freedom consistent with the freedom of every other individual. [Applause.] In other words, my freedom, my liberty, my rights, cease the moment I encroach upon the freedom, liberty, or rights of another individual. [Applause.] This is the fundamental theory of freedom, religious, political, and economic,—the true conception of freedom and ideal individualism. In defence of this ideal I shall attempt to puncture the tires of the menacing red devil of Socialism before individualism is crushed to death. [Applause.]

Socialism from beginning to end can be summed up in one sentence: *Socialism is the puny attempt of visionary mortals to change nature's unalterable law.* Socialism is an emotional debauch, the morphine stimulant of a decaying civilization [groans from

Socialist side], the opium exhilaration, intoxication, coma, and death of a nation adopting it. [Applause from Anti-Socialists.]

The economic struggle confronting us is not between Capital and Labor, but between individualism and collectivism, between the man who has and the man who has not, between intelligence and ignorance, between mental power and hand power. It is the struggle for supremacy, between the mental giant representing intelligence and capacity—the ideal in civilization, all that is noble and worth while, the soul of life—and the physical giant representing ignorance, incapacity, and brute force, seeking only the happiness of the beast, a satiated belly, soulless materialism. Properly defined, individualism means progressive civilization, order, and liberty. Collectivism means retrogression, chaos, compulsion, and, at its best, state servitude. [Applause.] *As religion and humanity constitute the soul of true civilization, so individual ownership of property is the material foundation of civilization.* When collectivism, or Socialism, with its unbalanced intellectuals, its mushy sentimentalists, its vicious, its discontented, its failures in life, attacks the private property of the individual, it becomes a menace to modern civilization and cannot be tolerated. [Applause.]

What is property, or capital, and how is it created? *Capital is the result of labor performed by an individual in excess of his living requirements.* To illustrate: If eight hours a day is necessary to provide

food, clothing, and shelter for an individual, or for an individual and those depending upon him, and the individual worked but eight hours a day, there would be no surplus or capital remaining. Should he, however, work for ten or more hours, whatever remained over and above his requirements of that day would be so much surplus wealth or capital. Thus we find that all capital is primarily created by excess labor. There must be no misunderstanding about the term "labor." It is probably safe to say that 90 per cent. of those who accept the theory of Socialism understand "labor" to mean only physical results, the work of the body. They place no value on intellectual labor, which is the great source of wealth to them. In other words, they must be able to see, feel, hear, taste, or smell results, or they have no value. This is the common conception of the term "labor" by the mass of physical workers, and is generally accepted by the unthinking.

Thought, the greatest force in the world for the uplift of mankind, not being a tangible substance, is considered of no value in the socialistic scheme. Creative power, ability, and directing capacity, the result of thought and absolutely essential for progress in the industrial field, the brains and head of the body politic, are to be chopped off, and the tangled mass of legs, arms, and trunks are to automatically perform the world's work. By some unknown mystical process, nature's laws will be changed.

Greed, avarice, and all human ills are to disappear. Frail humanity will shake off its defects, mankind will become God-like, and perfect equality will be the order of the universe. What a beautiful picture! But what a pipe-dream! [Applause and laughter.] Emotionalists look upon this picture with frenzied enthusiasm, suffering humanity grasps at this straw of quackery for relief, while sane men look on with compassionate sympathy and dread of the inevitable consequences. The cumulative experience and wisdom of the ages are to be superseded by a fantastic scheme of topsy-turvy-dom called Socialism,—certainly a cheerful outlook for the individual! [Applause.]

The cry of mediocrity,—“Labor creates all. Labor is entitled to all it produces. Labor is entitled to all the land. Labor is entitled to hold all the machinery,”—these are the stock claims made by Socialists. Give labor land, machinery, and all the raw material in the world, including factories and plants of every description, without a master mind to direct its operation, it would be as helpless as a child in swaddling-clothes, as dangerous as a train of cars and engine on the track with steam up, the throttle in the hands of incompetence. God only could save that train from wreckage! [Applause.] *It must be conceded, then, that intelligent direction is of more importance to industry than physical labor.*

With the facts fundamentally established that capital is the result of excess labor, both physical

and intellectual, and further established that both are necessary to create capital, the question of distribution arises. How shall it be distributed? The method of distribution raises two questions:—

(1) Shall the capital produced by labor—both physical and intellectual—be distributed in proportion to the amount each individual creates?

Should Socialism answer No, then what becomes of its claim that labor is entitled to all it produces? If, however, it answers Yes, there can be no disagreement about existing conditions. Now for the second question:—

(2) Shall the capital produced by both classes be cast into a common pool for equal distribution among all workers, regardless of the amount each individual has created?

This question is the meat in the cocoanut, the rock upon which Socialist and individualist split. Should Socialism answer Yes, its demand for equality of opportunity is untenable by the fact that common justice demands that the equal right or opportunity to take from the common pool carries with it the obligation of an equal contribution to the common pool. If, on the other hand, the obligation of equal contribution is to be ignored, then individuals con-

tributing the larger shares of capital to the pool will be at a decided disadvantage in the socialistic scheme of equality and equal opportunity. [Applause.] J. Phelps Stokes, acknowledged authority on Socialism, is quoted as saying, "We don't ask people to join the Socialist Party, unless they understand Socialism is just and fair." I should like to ask if the individuals contributing the larger share of capital to the common pool would be treated "just and fair" under this arrangement?

"But," say the more advanced of the fifty-seven varieties of Socialism [laughter], "we concede that intelligent direction is essential, but the difficulty is that these directors receive an unjust proportion of the capital produced. In other words, hand labor does not receive a just proportion of what it produces, which recalls to my mind the story of the walking delegate of the Hack Drivers' Union during a strike in San Francisco. In conversation with the prosecuting attorney, after the conviction of a peaceful (?) picket caught in the act of using one of those peaceful instruments of persuasion, commonly called a "black-jack" [laughter], he said to the district attorney, "You know very well that labor does not get a just proportion of what it produces." The attorney replied, "Oh, I don't know about that." "You know they don't." "Now let us see," replied the attorney. "You are a hack driver. What do you produce?" The hack driver scratched his head a moment, and then replied: "What do I produce?"

Motion." [Laughter from Anti-Socialist side. Mr. Hugo, addressing Socialists, "That does not seem to strike you funny, does it?" Prolonged laughter and applause.]

But let us analyze the statement that hand labor does not get a just proportion of what it produces by a concrete illustration. Supposing that a hundred hatters (very apropos just now), working independently, can each make one hat a day, paying \$2 for material and selling at \$4, leaving \$2 for their pay. Then an individual comes along, invents machinery, puts up a factory, and induces the hundred hatters to go into the factory and work according to his direction. The hundred hatters turn out two hundred hats a day instead of one hundred, with a value of \$800 instead of \$400, in less time and under better conditions than when working separately. Who created and who is entitled to the difference in value? The hundred hatters or the individual who by his inventive genius and directing ability created the difference in value? But let us go a step farther, and assume that he paid the hatters twenty-five cents a day more than they could make separately, and reduced the price of hats to consumers twenty-five cents also. Could either the hatters or the purchasers of hats claim that they had been injured by the change? Will not even the most rabid Socialist concede that the individual is entitled to the extra value he created? But, as this illustration involves machinery and a factory, some question might be

raised in the Socialist mind about ownership of the machinery.

I will get a little closer to earth by giving another illustration. Supposing two men own apple orchards side by side. One by care and scientific application of the art of raising apples produces a better grade of apple than his neighbor's, so that he receives five dollars a barrel for his apples, the other receiving only three dollars for apples of an inferior grade. The difference is a difference of product, one superior to the other. Is the individual who raises the better apples entitled to the difference in value? Should he pay his farm hands more for doing the same work that his neighbor's men are doing? in other words, divide the fruit of his own genius with the men who chanced to be working for him instead of for his neighbor? Did he not produce the difference in value, and is he not entitled to all he produces according to the Socialist theory, that labor is entitled to all it produces? Could any one claim that the greater share in this transaction is not a just proportion to which the individual is entitled? I think not. [Applause.]

John Spargo says, "When you say 'Equality of Opportunity,' you express the whole aim of modern Socialism." I would like to ask if both these men who owned the orchards side by side did not have an equal opportunity to raise the same quality of apples? The opportunity was the same; but was it not the difference between intelligence and ignorance,

ambition and laziness, will to do and unwillingness to do? Nature's inequality of the human being. Does any one believe that nature's law would be changed by the adoption of the socialistic scheme of government? Does this not prove that Socialism is but a visionary ideal, without a practical working basis? As a purely economic proposition or, as some put it, "a bread-and-butter proposition," its realization of equality is a practical impossibility.

I shall now quote from the Socialist Party Platform handed to me by my Socialist brother, Mr. Carey, as his particular brand of Socialism, so that I should not discuss one of the other fifty-six kinds only to find that my arguments did not apply to the right one:—

“Human life depends upon food, clothing, and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture, and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing, and shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery, and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.” [Laughter and great applause.]

Then in the last paragraph we find:—

“To unite all workers of the nation and their allies, and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist Party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist Party does not strive to substitute working-class rule for capitalist-class rule, but by working-class victory to free all humanity from class rule, and to realize the International Brotherhood of Man.” [Prolonged applause from Socialist side of house.]

Now that sounds well, especially the words “battle for freedom,” “to free all humanity from class rule,” “the Brotherhood of Man.”

We as individualists accept this plank, and, paradoxical as it may seem to you, I am on this platform to-night to uphold this sacred principle of freedom. [Applause from Anti-Socialists, laughter from Socialists.] So long as there is a spark of life within me, I shall be on the firing line of the battle for freedom, the battle to free all humanity from class rule, and to practise the Brotherhood of Man. [Applause and laughter. Speaker addressing Socialists, “You don’t seem to believe that.”]

But how does Socialism live up to this plank? By catering to organized labor, the tail to its kite. With few exceptions every Socialist is a unionist, and every unionist is a Socialist [voice from

rear of hall, "Not so"], though he does not always know it. [Laughter and applause.] I never could quite reconcile the two, but Socialism indorses organized labor, accepts its label, that odious mark of servility, coercion, and tyranny printed on the very tickets which brought you in here to-night. [Hisses.] Speaker with much feeling, "Hiss! Hiss! That's the language of the snake, the danger signal of the viper!" (Applause.) When quiet reigns again, continues] And, thus indorsing organized labor, Socialism stands sponsor for its inhuman acts. Organized labor, one of whose spokesmen, the notorious Shea, stood upon this platform and said, "The time has come when a man must be a member of a labor organization or be in the hospital." He went to Chicago, and made a record of killing eighteen men and injuring four hundred and fifty others. I want to ask you, Is this freedom? Is this the Brotherhood of Man? [Applause.] Organized labor, which denies boy or man the opportunity to learn a trade. Is this freedom? Is this the doctrine of the Brotherhood of Man? [Applause.] Organized labor that kills, slugs, and terrorizes individuals who do not do its bidding? Is this freedom? Is this the practice of the Brotherhood of Man?

How do you as Socialists reconcile yourselves to these inhuman acts? Is the battle for freedom to be won through organized labor troops of compulsion, led by the Socialist generals of discontent, who mistake slavery for freedom? Is humanity to

be freed from class rule by the rule of despotic mediocrity? Is humanity to sell itself into slavery for food, clothing, and shelter? This the black slave always had. [Applause.] This is the brotherhood of the beast,—the cow, horse, and dog,—not the Brotherhood of Man. *Civilized men will never sell their freedom to any collective group, be they capitalists, unionists, or Socialists, for food, clothing, and shelter.* [Applause.] Individual freedom means more than a satiated belly. It will not give up its individualized entity, and become an automatic instrument under the domination and control of any collective group. [Applause.] Socialism is a menace to modern civilization. Why?

(1) Because it is a step backward,—retrogression.

(2) It would destroy man's power of individual choice.

(3) It would relieve man from the personal responsibility and moral obligation which he owes his fellow-man.

(4) It would reduce man to the status of an automaton.

(5) It would destroy Free Will, the foundation of moral accountability to God. [Applause.]

(6) Because it is an economic fallacy and a spiritual delusion.

There may be those who are willing to shift upon the State the responsibility they owe to themselves

and their fellow-men. But let me say there can be no escape. The debt we owe to life is a debt that each individual must pay himself. [Applause.]

Mr. COLEMAN, Chairman.—Your Chairman, having been duly shot, has come to life again. [Laughter.] The speaker did not quite use all his time, and that leaves me a moment in which to urge upon us all fairness in giving the speakers their full rights. [Applause.] When we are in a fight to the finish, as we are to-night, we must learn not only to give blows, but to receive them. I now present to you Mr. James F. Carey. [Prolonged applause.] He cannot wait for me to put on any frills.

JAMES F. CAREY OPENING THE NEGATIVE.

I really trust that those who have a leaning toward any one of the fifty-seven varieties will be quiet while I am talking, because it takes up some of my time, and the Socialists can really make a better argument than noise. [Cries of "Louder."] Don't be afraid: you'll hear me.

It is extremely difficult to argue in defence of a position that has actually not been assailed. Although Mr. Hugo may believe that the annihilating process has well begun, as a matter of fact he has not assailed Socialism. [Voice in the front row, "Will Mr. Carey answer a question?"] In order to understand Socialism, in order to understand what arguments and objections may be made against it, mere generalization and phrases are not effective. To indulge in numerous phrases and general statements is by no means a method of arriving at the truth or falsity of a position. I say the gentleman who preceded me, whatever else he did, he certainly only indulged in generalization and in phraseology, that Socialism is this or that or something else. Let me give you a little information in regard to a few principles, which every one of the "fifty-seven varieties" are agreed upon. That's the remarkable thing [applause] that you cannot under-

stand. [Laughter.] Some of you are yet in the primary class, judging by your applause of the statements which he made, and I will, therefore, come down to your level and talk to you.

Here is the situation: Man, in order to live, must have food, clothing, and shelter. Even a capitalist has to have that. If you don't believe it, try it for a while. [Laughter.] Try to get along without them. Man, finding himself upon the earth, with those needs that were absolutely primary and necessary, must have looked about for means to satisfy those needs. There was the earth, containing within itself the things necessary to satisfy human needs. How could man extract those things from the earth (meaning by "the earth" the material universe within his reach)? By the application of his labor. He had to dig roots and pluck wild fruits from the trees. He did so, and existed. Slowly, by the very pressure of his economic wants and his desires to be freed from a constant struggle for food, he developed methods by which he could produce more than he could before. Instead of relying upon wild fruits and berries, he learned to turn the earth with a crooked stick and plant a few seeds and reap a scanty harvest. Instead of depending upon an occasional animal that he might kill, he learned to domesticate animals for his use. And that process has gone on. Man, facing the ever-present need of satisfying his material wants, and finding that they cannot be satisfied except by the application of labor to mother earth, has gone on

from the beginning of the first man, until to-day, improving the means by which his material needs are satisfied, and in proportion as he has developed these means, he has made it possible to free himself from the continual pursuit of merely material wants, and to free himself, in part at least, in order that he may engage in the higher and nobler effort of art, literature, and those things which distinguish man from brute. [Applause.] Now the point is, at this moment, that at one time or another, by a slow creeping process, by force or fraud, by the exercise of brutal power on the part of strong men or strong tribes, men stepped between their brothers and the earth, and declared that the opportunities to labor belonged to them as their private property, and by slow process seized upon the implements of labor, until to-day the men and women of the working class, the men and women who perform the useful service of the world, in order to secure the means of satisfying their material wants are compelled to secure the consent of the owners of the tools of their labor and the opportunities to labor. [Applause.] What is the status of the working class under that arrangement? They cannot live unless they have access to the tools and the opportunities to labor. These tools and the opportunities belong not to them, but to a class other than they. Mr. Hugo desires freedom. Let us see if the working class, under this arrangement, are free. If I own the means by which you live, I own you, because by withholding those means I can

doom you to starvation and death. [Applause.] The capitalist class to-day own the means by which the working class live, and by withholding them they can and are, to-day, dooming thousands of workers to starvation and premature death. [Applause.]

I stood on Kneeland Street, where the State Employment Bureau is, this morning, and it was packed to the edge of the sidewalk with men willing to work for almost nothing more than a mere existence. Why? Because the means of their labor, the opportunity to labor, was in the hands of a class other than themselves, and no man can be free unless he owns the means of his own existence. [Applause.]

Let us again view the situation of the working class. The working class confront the capitalist class, the owners of the opportunities of labor, and, in order to gain access to them, they must submit to certain conditions. What are the conditions? They must agree to sell their labor power to the owners of the tools of labor. For what? For the value they create? No. For wages, and the wages are not determined by the amount they produce. If two men went to any shop or factory to-day or to-morrow, both equally skilled, both competent to do the same work, and the owners want but one man, what is the ordinary process in capitalist circles? Two men, one job: one wants fifteen dollars a week, the other wants twenty-five. Who is hired? [From the rear of the hall, "The fifteen-dollar man." Applause.]

The wages paid to the working class are determined not by what they produce, but by the struggle between the workers for the jobs. And the man against whom the greatest economic pressure is placed is the one who will work the cheapest, and that becomes, generally speaking, the standard of wages in that particular trade.

Now, in passing, let me say a word concerning the trade-unions. Unfortunately, Mr. Hugo is incorrect when he says the leaders of the trade unions are Socialists. If they say they are, then they would lie; but they deny it. But, if they are not, they ought to be. [Applause.] A dear friend (?) of Mr. Hugo, Mr. Samuel Gompers of the American Federation of Labor, says worse things about us than he has yet, and upon this very platform at a national convention of the American Federation of Labor, at which I was a delegate, President Gompers annihilated us, and now we are going to have it done to us again. [Laughter and applause.]

Now mark you! Men do not belong to trade-unions because they like to, because they like to put in their nights. It is an economic necessity. I assure you that in those trades where there is no power of resistance against the ever-present downward tendency the wages have gone down to the lowest possible level. [Applause.] There is no need of arguing about that. Go to the cotton-mill towns. Why, you could not organize them with a barrel of glue. [Laughter.] And what do you find the

wages? Four, five, six dollars a week, less than six dollars a week on the average the year round. The trade-union movement is the instinctive protest against the economic pressure upon wages. That all trade-union men are not angels is self-evident. How can you expect them to be when they have no examples above them? [Laughter and applause.] The trade-union men, so he has affirmed, in their strikes, have killed somebody, have wounded somebody. I don't know of any case. He has affirmed that they have done so, and he has said that it was something like eighteen, I think. Let me say to him that he and his class by their failure to use safety appliances in mines, shops, and factories killed and wounded last year in this country two million workingmen. [Applause.] And let me say, further, that his class by poisoning the food and poisoning the drink and adulterating everything that we use have sent down to death thousands of the race, and have sent them down in the name of the only God they have, whose name is Profit. [Prolonged applause.]

What do you think of an industrial system based upon individual greed for profit? The individual capitalist has no choice in the matter. He must buy labor as cheap as his competitors or go out of business. If there are one hundred men in business and ninety-nine of them are angels,—if you can imagine an angel in business [laughter],—and the other one was an ordinary business man, the ordi-

nary business man would set the standard of the business ethics in that trade, and all the others would be compelled to go down to his level in order to succeed commercially.

Take the daily papers,—lies. The advertisements of the stores,—lies. Take the labels on goods,—lies. Each capitalist says that the other fellow's goods aren't any good, and they are not any good. Each says: "Mine are good, buy of me. I don't put in salicylic acid: I put in arsenic." [Laughter and applause.]

Now, then, let me give you something of the constructive part of Socialism. I have showed you, I think, briefly, something of our analysis of economic conditions. What do we propose? What do we say further? These tools of labor, born of the very need of humanity to satisfy its needs, have grown, developed, from the simple crooked stick to the gigantic gang plough, from the rude wooden-wheel ox-cart that lumbered painfully short distances to the mail express. The cumulative genius of the race has produced wonderfully complex machines. The change in the character of the tools of industry has been simply this: In the early days the tools of labor were individual tools. A man could own and operate them alone. The simple shoemaker's tools; the stage-coach; the sailing vessel. A man alone could operate and therefore could properly own them. To-day the tools of industry have grown into gigantic social tools that require the collec-

tive and co-operative labor of the working class for their production, their preservation, and for their operation.

The change in industry, so far as tools of labor are concerned, has been a change from individual tools to social tools. No commodity to-day is the product of disassociated labor. Everything we use is the product of the collective labor of society. The Socialists point out the tremendous revolution in the character of the tools of industry, pointing out that those tools are socially necessary, pointing out the danger of permitting a few men to own the means whereby the many live, and ask for the completion of the revolution by bringing about the social ownership of the social tools. [Applause.] There is our position. When we appeal to the working class, whom do we mean? We mean the producing class. It is not the Socialist who would say to the workers that they have no brains. Sometimes one might be led to believe so, because they insist upon voting the same way their masters vote. [Laughter and applause.] Mr. Hugo would give you to understand that there is physical labor, and that it is simply hands and legs and muscles, that's you; and then there is mental labor, that's him. [Laughter and applause.] It is absolutely incorrect for any man to distinguish between mental and physical labor, because all productive labor is a combination of both. Do you think a man can make a pair of shoes without any brains? Do you think

a man can make a cigar or build a locomotive or run a locomotive without brains? No. But I will tell you one thing a man can do without brains. If he gets shares of stock enough in some productive enterprise, and some of his guardians put in an efficient slave driver as boss, he will get rich. [Laughter and applause.] There is no distinction in the Socialist philosophy. We do not distinguish, we simply say that any man or woman that performs useful service to society belongs to the working-class, whether he paints a house or paints a picture; whether he digs a sewer to prevent disease or writes a prescription to cure disease [laughter], he belongs to the working class. And the collective labor of that class produce all the wealth of the world. And under this system they receive in return wages or salary, or what amounts to wages or salary, and the surplus above that passes into the hands of the capitalist class. If brains determined the amount of wealth that a man has, compare Mr. Rockefeller's brains with Mr. Hugo's. [Laughter and applause.] And I say that I don't agree that that is a correct standard. I don't agree that Mr. Rockefeller has a sixty million dollar a year brain, and Mr. Hugo perhaps a five or ten thousand dollar one. [Applause.] And, because I believe that, I have a right to kick about the arrangement, and he should be kicking also. [Laughter and applause.] The statement that labor produces all value, he agrees with. It would be certainly very difficult for him to prove other-

wise. The question is, Does labor receive all value? If he affirms that it does, I deny it. I deny that the producers of the wealth of the world to-day receive the wealth of the world. You never saw a rich workingman [laughter],—never in your life. The average wage is four hundred and fifty dollars a year, about nine dollars a week. How long would it take you to get rich on that? How can you get rich? Simple enough. If you can manage to get five hundred or a thousand dollars together, and then get possession of some of the opportunities to labor, you can levy tribute upon the productive energies of the working class. Suppose that I and Mr. Hugo and a few others seized an oasis in a desert by which the trail ran that men travelled, and we put up a sign, "This oasis is ours." And then you come along staggering from thirst. We would say, "Well, we will hire you for so much water a day for attending to this thing." It is our brain that does it, you know. And then we hire a few others as soldiers to protect us in owning it. Then we hire a few others as lawyers to interpret the law in our favor. Then, when any weary and thirsty men come that way, we say the price has gone up, owing to the spots on the sun. [Laughter and applause.] Then we leave the oasis for a while, and we organize a stock company. We water the stock. We go down to Wall Street and State Street and float the stock. We put a manager in charge. Then we sail the world around, and the income flows in. By

reason of our brain? Perhaps. But not by reason of any productive labor that we performed.

Can you see that this is in essence the position of the capitalist class generally? Do you imagine that Mr. Rockefeller made the oil, built the pipe lines, or the refineries? Do you imagine he did? Not at all. He gets sixty million dollars a year. Where does it come from? From the hands and the brains of the producers of the wealth. What does he give in return for it? He swore before a judge,—and he is an honorable man,—he swore that for years he had done nothing in the oil business, that he didn't even know where the office was, and yet he has an income of sixty million dollars a year,—more than all the working men and women in this whole State receive. Is that the reward for productive energy? Whatever the merits of the case, and I conclude by reminding you, the fact is, to-day an economic condition confronts us where a part of the human race own the means of labor. They are called the capitalist class. Individually, they may be good fellows. I have absolutely nothing against the capitalists as men. I am against the system, that is all. [Applause.] Now, then, those who are not in ownership we call the working class; those who have labor power, that they must needs sell it to the owners of the means of labor. The price paid to the workers is wages. The wages represent a part of what they produce, and whatever is produced above the amount of the wages is absorbed by the

capitalist class, and out of that difference they build colossal fortunes, they riot in luxury, to the disgrace of the human race. Out of that difference they threaten and menace the morality and virtue of the human race. And out of the development of the tools of industry comes an ever-decreasing need of labor. Men are displaced, they are rendered useless, and out of that come tramps, yeggmen, and the lower class. There is the dregs on the bottom, and the top is the scum,—the idle rich and the idle poor. They both rot: they fester in their idleness. They, and they only, are a menace to society, and they are being perpetuated by the existence of the private ownership of the tools of industry and the maintenance of the wage system. [Applause.]

GEORGE B. HUGO OPENING THE AFFIRMATIVE REBUTTAL.

My distinguished opponent has the African Dodger beaten to a frazzle. [Laughter.] If you will notice, he did not touch any one of the subjects that I brought up. [Applause.] He talked about noise. He gave you words. I don't know which of the two you prefer, words or noise. He didn't advance a single argument. He told you of conditions that every child knows, but he did not tell you how to cure them. I notice another thing,—that he has his crowd well trained. [Laughter and applause.] He must have rehearsals frequently. Next time I come up here I will have my crowd trained. [Applause.] He said I had made general statements. I didn't suppose I had. I gave concrete illustrations. He evidently forgot them. But he is not going to escape this time. [Applause.]

In order to live, he says, labor must get the consent of the owners of tools. My experience has been that we have to get labor's consent. Most employers who have anything to do with a labor organization have to walk around and see the shop steward, to see whether the men will work or not. Though they are not Socialists, they ought to be, Mr. Carey claims. [Applause.]

Then he spoke of the State Employment Bureau, where he noted hundreds of men seeking employment. I wonder it never occurred to him that, if "labor creates all," as Socialists say, why does it not create work for itself? This proves the fallacy of the claim, and shows that labor needs and expects some one to provide and direct its work. Could Brooklyn Bridge have been built by the workmen who cut the granite blocks and made the cables? Could they have constructed this masterpiece of engineering skill without the genius who conceived and the master mind who directed the work of the laborers? [Applause.] Take all the material in this building, and put it in a heap, put your laborers there, see what they will create. [Applause.]

He cited another horrible example,—“Two men, one job. One will work for fifteen dollars a week, the other wants twenty-five. Which will they hire?” A man in the rear answered, “The fifteen-dollar man.” Probably true. But I would like to see one of these Socialists go into a hat store, and pick up two hats of equal grade, one priced three dollars, the other four dollars. Which would he buy? [Great applause.]

Mr. Carey “had no idea that labor organizations had ever killed any one.” And he lives in Boston, where only a year ago last summer we had a teamsters’ strike. We did a little killing on our own account then. But Mr. Carey never heard of it. He speaks of the “mistakes” of organized labor

through its leaders or individual members. I want to say that there is not a record in the history of organized labor where a man has ever been expelled for killing! But we have record after record where they deify and make heroes of the men who did the killing. I cannot reconcile the two, as I said before. I cannot understand how a Socialist, one of these Brotherhood-of-Men fellows, can go out and kill people, crack them on the head with brass knuckles, and so forth, and still claim to be a Socialist.

Mr. Carey said that I knew nothing of Socialism. Then I have not studied out his right brand. I thought I had him cornered when I read his platform. Well, I want to go further and state that HE doesn't know anything about Socialism. [Laughter and applause.] Why, I can put up a better argument than he has. All he talks about is, "We want the tools." He did not get at the problem. I expected that he would ask me some questions, but he didn't do it. [Laughter.] I have prepared a few for myself that I supposed he was going to ask me. These questions were put by Mr. Kirkpatrick to Mr. Corey in New York. Corey did not answer them, but I shall.

"Do you believe," Mr. Kirkpatrick said, "that all workers who are willing to work should have work? If you do, how are you going to provide work for all the willing workers of maximum efficiency and productivity on the individual

system of wages?" (Kirkpatrick's is probably another brand of Socialism.) [Laughter.]

Now the answer to that is, By the removal of all artificial barriers placed on industry through governmental interference with the private business of the individual, and by enforcing the laws against all organizations of both capital and labor when they interfere with the rights of individuals, be they business men or workmen. In other words, *Let the natural law of supply and demand take its course, and give each individual an equal opportunity to work out his own salvation.* In a word, perfect economic freedom.

Another question: "Why should the children of the present capitalist generation fall heir to the modern mills, factories, shops, and railroads?"

I might answer by asking another, Why should any other person's children fall heir to them? But my answer is, Because the family is the natural unit which makes up a civilized state. The individual, in protecting his family, by the same act protects the state. The interests of the individual and his family and the state are mutual, based on the fundamental truth that property is the foundation of a civilized state. By protecting the property of the individual, the state protects itself. The private

ownership of property by individuals is the cohesive power which holds the state together.

And now, Mr. Carey, I have prepared twenty questions that I want to ask you. I don't expect that you are going to remember them, so I have put them on cards, numbered from one to twenty, and I don't propose that you shall dodge them.

(1) How will the Co-operative Commonwealth determine the income of each worker?

(2) Will each worker, skilled or unskilled, receive the same income?

(3) If all receive the same rate of compensation, will not such a system forever rob the superior workers of a part of their superior ability?

(4) And will not this conflict with the oft-repeated assertion of Socialists that the workers will receive the full product of their toil?

(5) If each worker should receive the full product of his toil, who will support the vast horde of non-productive workers?

(6) And, if each worker received the full product of his toil, some will have large incomes, others small; and will not this be economic inequality?

(7) As the capabilities of the workers will differ under Socialism, just as they now differ in our socialistic public school system, how and

in what way will it be possible to determine the true value of each worker's toil?

(8) How much more should a college professor receive than a railway brakeman?

(9) If we are to reduce the working time to four hours per day under Socialism, as Socialists assert, will it not require the services of 1,500,000 more railway workers to perform the same service that 1,300,000 now perform? And will not this cost the nation \$800,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000 annually more than the present labor cost for our transportation?

(10) Would not coal and everything else cost double if we reduced the working time to four hours a day?

(11) Then how about the non-productive workers,—*i.e.*, the strictly government officials? Will it not require the service of a million boards of arbitration and several million book-keepers to keep track of the hours, income, skill, etc., of each worker, in order to determine whether the Socialist nation is robbing somebody or paying too much to somebody? And who but the workers, the real toilers, will pay all these bills?

(12) If we are now able to produce only \$650 per worker per year by working eight to ten hours per day, how will we produce \$2,000 per worker per year by working four hours per day? How are you Socialists going to get possession

of all the land, railroads, business blocks, church and school properties, machinery, etc.? Will the Socialists confiscate or purchase all capital now used in production and exchange?

(13) Will the man who invents a machine worth millions to society be paid a life income (a new form of royalty) or how will he be rewarded?

(14) Is it not true that of the 1,500 million people on earth no two are alike? One man is a success, the other a failure. One is industrious, the other a spendthrift. One sober, the other a drunkard. Will the industrious, sober, and saving man be willing to divide with and help to support the lazy man, the drunkard, and the spendthrift?

(15) What will you Socialists do with the farming lands and the five million owners of these lands? Will you divide the land into five, ten, or fifty acre tracts and parcel it out to each farmer, and will each farmer be compelled to account to the State for what he raises? Will the intelligent farmer receive the same income as the ignorant farmer? Will an account be kept of what each farmer produces and the quality? If so, will it not require an army of expert book-keepers to see that each farmer gets the full reward of his labor? Or will the Socialist State farm the lands in large tracts, with Socialist farm bosses and Socialist farm hands?

And which will you be, Mr. Carey, a boss or a farm hand? [Laughter and applause.]

(16) As farmers now work with the best machinery and produce an average of \$700 per capita per year, will it not require the services of twice as many farmers to produce the same amount of farm wealth if we reduce the working time one-half? Or will not food cost double what it now costs?

(17) Will the single man be compelled to labor as many hours as a married man with six children, or how will you arrange this?

(18) If the single man had less work, that is "a soft snap" compared with the family man, would not most men desire to remain single? And would not this policy destroy the family, the best institution known to the human race?

(19) Will the great inventor, the great writer, and the great organizer be rewarded for their superior service to society, and who will determine what and how much such reward should be? If highly rewarded, will you not soon produce the same economic inequality that now exists? Or, if all are to be placed on the same equality,—and that is just what Socialism will do,—will it not destroy all ambition, remove all incentive? Will not the race degenerate?

(20) Is not Socialism, after all, a fantastic dream, utterly impossible and impracticable? And can any sane man suppose that the great

mass of the sane men will ever vote for such a system? [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Carey, I am willing to allow you the remainder of my time in order that you may answer these questions. [Applause.]

Mr. COLEMAN, Chairman.—Mr. Carey now has thirty minutes in rebuttal.

“Do you, as Socialists, for one moment believe that the unjust taking or confiscating of property by the simple act of the stroke of the pen will be accepted peaceably by those who own the property?”—*George B. Hugo.*

“It is not in keeping with the traditions of this hall [Faneuil Hall] nor with a person who would call himself an American, to talk very loudly about confiscation. . . . The government confiscated the slaves from the Southern slaveholders.”—*James F. Carey.*

“This speaker failed to point out that the emancipation of the black slave—just as it was—involves our nation in Civil War at a cost of blood and treasure unequalled in modern times.”
George B. Hugo.

JAMES F. CAREY OPENING THE NEGATIVE REBUTTAL.

It strikes me that the Chairman is in error when he says "thirty minutes for rebuttal." I have nothing to rebut. Does the gentleman think he is debating with me or with Mr. Kirkpatrick? Does he think that to ask a lot of questions as to what may be done to-morrow is a means of argument? It may be. Suppose I should say, I have four hundred and forty-seven questions to ask you, Mr. Hugo, as, for instance: What will the capitalist class do to-morrow? What will be the price of coal two weeks from to-morrow? What will be the ad valorem or specific tax on birds' nests in the new tariff schedule? The gentleman, and some of you, quite likely, misunderstand. Supposing that you were to have stopped George Washington when he assumed charge of the Continental forces. You say, "Now here, George, I have got twenty questions to ask you, more or less. What do you want?" "Well," George would say, "I will tell you, we want to have the government owned by the people instead of by a king." Very well. "There are fifty-seven varieties" of your kind. I want to ask you twenty questions. [Laughter.] How will you run Ward 8 in Boston? [Laughter and applause.] How will

you elect a sheriff? Will a senator of Massachusetts get as much as a member of the House? And, if not, why not? Now what would George say? I think George was a pretty reasonable man. George would have said that the people will meet these conditions as they arise, after we establish the collective ownership of the government. [Applause.] Perhaps Mr. Hugo may not consider that an answer. I know some persons who have not thought seriously of this matter,—I mean it without prejudice,—who have studied Socialism only to see if they can find a weak spot in it, might say so, but they don't grasp the idea: they don't grasp the philosophy of it. It would have been impossible for any man in the Continental Army to give you any answer to such questions. They affirmed in politics what we are affirming in industry. They said that the machinery of the government should be the property of the people; and we say that the machinery of industry should be the property of the people also. [Applause.] We stand for a republic in industry. A republic in industry is necessary for the achievement of the highest degree of individual liberty.

Now will we confiscate? Again I say that, when the people determine to establish the collective ownership of the means of production and distribution, they will determine at that time the terms. And, if he still insists that we are going to confiscate, and gets you all frightened about it, let us discuss for a moment the question of private property,

and ascertain what is the true title to property. If a man possesses something that he did not produce, or that the producer did not give him, or that he did not produce the equivalent of, how did he get it? You go down to the police station, and ask for a night's lodging, and you have a diamond ring. The captain or sergeant in charge will say, "Did you produce that?" "No." "Was it given to you?" "No." "Did you produce its equivalent?" "No." Next morning you are up before the judge for stealing. The true title to property must be based on one of those three things,—that you produced it, produced its equivalent, or that the person who produced it gave it to you. The first right to property is that you produced it. Capitalism denies the first necessary principle of private property, because it denies to the worker the right to the full value that he creates. The capitalist's private property is built up out of the accumulation of the surplus value that they have exploited from the working class. [Applause.] Shall we confiscate that? Let us see.

It is not in keeping with the traditions of this hall nor with a person who would call himself an American to talk very loudly about confiscation, for the three brightest periods in the history of the United States are three periods of confiscation. First, the Pilgrims and the others came here and confiscated the land from the Indians, and ruined them in addition. Second, the Colonists confiscated the govern-

ment from the king, and gave him a licking in addition. [Applause.] Third, the government confiscated the slaves from the Southern slaveholders. [Applause.] The Southern slaveholders had just as legal a right and just as moral a right to the ownership of the slaves as the capitalist class have to own the means by which the slave lives. [Applause.] King George had as moral a right to the government of this country as Baer has to the coal mines or J. Pierpont Morgan to the Boston Elevated Railroad. It is not for the capitalists' defenders to talk about confiscation, for the whole history of the capitalist class since they first assailed feudalism has been a period of confiscation of all forms of property already accumulated, and then the confiscation of the property produced by the working class. Now what shall we do? Shall we confiscate? For my part, I say, "No." But I am not telling you what you may do when you become a Socialist. Do you know that the four or five hundred thousand Socialists in this country to-day are not the ones who are going to settle it. If we said we would do this or that or something else, that would not have any legal binding effect to-morrow. The people who determine to establish the collective ownership of the tools of industry will accomplish it in the best way consistent with the occasion. You know that Lincoln made an offer to the Southern slaveholders to pay them for the slaves, and it would have been done, and the slaves would have been free; but the

slaveholders refused, and so Lincoln, assisted by a few others, took them away from them, and gave them a licking. Are you going to denounce Lincoln? Are you going to denounce the men who took the government away from King George? Then why not wipe out all memories of those things? They were revolutionists. They were opposed to existing authority. They denied the right of any man to own the thing that was necessary for the public good. It is just as necessary that the people own the means by which they provide their bread as that they own the means by which they elect a councilman. Once you get that in your mind, you will begin to see more plainly. [Laughter.] Now, then, I would be pleased to answer any question that is within possibility; but, as nearly all those questions have to do with what the people may do, I cannot possibly answer. I would be dealing in Utopia, and Socialism is far, far from being a Utopia. [Applause.] And, further, Socialism is not of "fifty-seven" varieties. If the gentleman will read the platform of the German Socialists, of the French Socialists, the Italian, the Irish Socialists, of the English, the Japanese Socialists, of the South African, of the Cuban, and Porto Rican Socialists, of all the Socialists of the world, numbering all together fifty million men and women, he will find in them all the demand for the abolition of class ownership of the means of social production and the right to the ownership of those means by the collectivity. [Applause.]

How shall wealth be distributed? How shall the proceeds of labor be distributed under Socialism? We can only say, first, that any criticism against the possibility of unjust distribution under Socialism must guard itself against the necessity of proving that it is justly distributed now. I have no doubt (and I say this without meaning any personal application of it, and I trust Mr. Hugo will not understand it to in any way apply) that a robber objects to any interference with what property he had, and most strenuously objects. He don't want his private property taken from him. Society takes it from him, and sends him to jail in addition. But the question of the right of an individual to a thing is to-day denied by society. Society denies absolutely the right of man to his property. Take the amendment that is pending to the State Constitution to establish State prohibition. It would wipe out with one sweep all the property of the liquor dealers in the State of Massachusetts. [Applause.] Now you see that, under the capitalist system, the capitalists have used the State, and do use it, to absolutely annihilate private property. Take in the matter of foodstuffs. The other day I saw where they threw into the river or some place, destroyed at least fifty thousand bottles of absolutely pure (?) catsup, made out of flour and aniline dye. [Laughter.] So that, if a man is to defend the right of private property, the absolute right to private property, he must first of all keep his skirts clean, and

not defend a system that denies the right of private property. [Applause.] The system that exists to-day is a denial of the right of private property and the affirmation of the right of class ownership of property. Suppose you save your money to build a little house. You work for ten or twelve dollars a week, and you build a little house for yourself and family. You certainly have earned that, and it is yours as clear as any man can own anything. Have you an absolute right to that? No. Tomorrow morning the government, which Mr. Hugo defends, comes down and says, "We are going to run a street through your house." You have to go. Your right to that property is conditioned upon the right of the State to take possession of it for any public purpose. You have no right to object. Suppose you don't pay your taxes for a year or two. Up goes the red flag of the auctioneer, and you have no private property, and there you are. We would establish a system of private property, for the Socialists are not opposed, as some imagine, to the possession of private property. The small business man finds some of his business gone by the combination of larger firms in the same business. When they moved the Park Square Station, or, rather, moved the tracks to Atlantic Avenue, the private property of the individual who owned property on Park Square went down in value, and was transferred over on to Dewey Square. One class of owners lost, and the others won. What guarantee

to the right of private property have you got now? The working class have no guarantee of private property. The fundamental right of private property is based on labor, and the working class are denied, from the start of the race, the exercise of that fundamental right,—the right to the value they produce, without which no man has a moral or natural (if there be such a thing) right to property. We must give up more of our energy than we get in return in the form of wealth. We must give to a capitalist a part of what we produce. The existence of the capitalist class itself is a denial of the right of private property and the affirmation of the right of class ownership of property. And let me distinguish further. When we say we believe in the right of private property, we say that to get away from the old notion that the Socialists believe, as Mr. Hugo suggested, in putting in all you want and taking out all you could, or something like that. Well, that is Theodore Roosevelt's definition of Socialism. Mr. Roosevelt may know a whole lot about some things, but he has not yet learned it all. [Laughter.] Whatever they may say, these gentlemen who are illy-informed, we distinguish between kinds of property. Now here is a thing which is socially necessary, and here is a thing that is individual in its character,—an individual thing. We don't want to be collective owners of your shoes or of your hat or your tooth-brush; but we do want to be collective owners of the tooth-

brush factory, in order that all may have a tooth-brush. [Laughter.]

Now, then, we ask for the social ownership of the implements that are socially required in industry and the right of the workers to the opportunities to work, which is to-day denied. Thousands and thousands of men and women this country over are denied the right to the opportunity to labor,—are denied the right to produce the things that they suffer and starve and die in need of. There is only one condition upon which the capitalist class conduct industry, and that is that out of the energy of the workers there must be a surplus given to the owners, and, if that surplus is not forthcoming, then the doors close, even if the nation perishes. [Applause.] We would own the tools of industry socially necessary as social property. We would give to the sons and daughters of the race the right to the opportunity to work and the right to the full social values that they produce. Who will get it? Shall this fellow get more than that fellow? And, if not, why not? This alone I can say, that the distribution of the wealth produced will be in the hands of the producers, and not in the hands of the parasites, as now. [Applause.] To-day the distribution of the products of labor is not in the hands of the producers. Two or three men get together in an office, and they say, “Well, we will cut down the steel workers—125,000 of them—10 per cent.” Do they consult the steel workers? No. Two or three men get

together and say: "We will cut down the cotton operatives. They are getting nothing now, but we will cut 10 per cent. from that." [Laughter and applause.] Do they consult the operatives? No. Two men get together and say: "Winter is coming on. We will raise the price of coal a dollar a ton." Do they consult any one? No. To-day the distribution of wealth is in the hands of the parasites. We would place the distribution of the wealth produced in the hands of those that produce it. [Applause.] And I am sure that Mr. Hugo and I will get a "squarer deal" than we are actually getting now. [Applause.]

Now he complained that I did not tell him how we are going to do it. Well, I will tell you how we are going to do it. Side by side with the industrial development that transferred the individual implements of yesterday into the giant social instruments and took out of the small isolated shop the disassociated laborer and introduced him to the complex system of to-day,—made of the independent producer no longer an independent producer, but a cog in a great machine,—that development from individual labor to collective associated labor has gone on side by side with the development in government, until to-day the machinery in this government and in a growing number of countries is an instrument in the hands of society and not of kings. These two lines of development, the one creating the industrial change, the other putting into the

hands of an increasing number of the members of society the power of the ballot, will bring slowly, but inevitably to the conscience of those who suffer, by reason of the private ownership of the social means of industry, the power they hold, and they will go to the ballot box, and at the ballot box in their unvanquishable numbers they will secure possession of the government and then exercise a privilege and power which the capitalist class themselves invented, the "right of eminent domain." [Applause.] Mark you, sir, the right of eminent domain was injected into the power of government by the capitalist class,—by the bourgeois of France first. They added to government the right of eminent domain. The right is continually being enlarged upon by the capitalist class in their own defence. The working class, realizing their political power, will secure possession of the government and will play out the hand that the capitalist class began, and they will take this power and use it to transfer from the capitalist class to society the means of production and distribution, in accordance with the right of the government. [Applause.] No government could exist over night without the right of eminent domain. Not only is the property of every citizen at the mercy of the government, but the life of every citizen is at its command.

They can dress you up in a soldier's uniform and send you where they please, to shoot and be shot. The right of eminent domain in the hands of the

working class and those who ally themselves with them will be the means for the transference from the capitalistic class of the means of production and distribution to the members of society. That is how it will be done. That is the way we propose to do it. And, when it is done, then the conflict between the classes which exists to-day will disappear. That conflict which Mr. Hugo deplotes, and the whole credit for which he gives to the trade-union movement, is not the fault of the workingmen, but it is inherent in the system,—the class ownership of the tools of industry. The interest of the worker being to get as much in return for his labor as possible, and the interest of the capitalist being to get as much out of labor as possible, create a conflict which cannot be remedied except by the abolition of the cause of the conflict. [Applause.] And the cause of that conflict lies in the class ownership of the tools of industry. Socialism will lay the foundation for the brotherhood of man by abolishing classes in society and establishing the right of social ownership of the means of industry and the right of the producers to the full social values they create. [Applause.]

GEORGE B. HUGO CLOSING THE AFFIRMATIVE.

I have always been told that when you put up a practical proposition to a Socialist, you can't find him! I knew he would not answer those questions [Laughter and applause] because they were unanswerable. He says to us: "Oh, come along. Let's jump overboard, and, when we strike the water, we will discuss the question of swimming." [Laughter.]

Well, I don't want to lose sight of our subject, "The Creed of Despair." I made the assertion that Socialism was the creed of despair, and I will give you its history, how and why I came to that conclusion. While in New York some time ago, I walked down Broadway in the evening. When I reached 39th Street, I was attracted by a Socialist speaking on the street corner. I stopped, became interested, and listened for two hours, profoundly impressed with the fervor, intensity, and sincerity of this speaker, and two others who followed him. My mind was open. I wanted to know and analyze their statements; in other words, to get at the root of their theory, if it had any root.

The first two speakers pointed out the many inequalities of modern life, dwelt upon the unequal

distribution of wealth, showed the misery, poverty, and crime in the world, holding the capitalistic system which recognized individual ownership of property responsible for it all. In a word, civilization was a failure! Closing their harangues with appeals to the surrounding crowd (just as Mr. Carey did) to vote for the Socialist candidate for office. They saw effects, and diagnosed the cause to be the capitalistic system. It remained for the third speaker to tell just how they were going to rid themselves of capitalism and bring about the era of the Brotherhood of Man. I quote from memory, but I was so astounded by the remarks that they remained indelibly impressed upon my mind. He said: "You men walking down Broadway believe that you are free men, a clever lot of men, but you are not. You are nothing but a lot of wage slaves!" [Applause from Socialist side of house.] "Look about you. See the automobiles whizzing by while *YOU* walk!" "See the magnificent buildings with which we are surrounded, while most of *YOU* live in *HOVELS*!" "Who created all this wealth? *You*! *You* created it, and all you need to do is to take it."

I had waited two hours to learn the method of procedure, and now felt rewarded for the time I had spent. "The way to do it," he continued, "is not to start a riot or to attempt to take it by force, for, if you do, the police will pounce upon you and club you into submission, or the troops will be called out, you will be shot down like so many rats, and they

will probably hang me. Now that's not the way. The way to do it is to elect the Socialist candidates to office, and take by law the property which belongs by right to you! [Applause.] He went on, and said, "This sounds revolutionary," just as our friend Carey did. "But did Abraham Lincoln hesitate to sign the Emancipation Proclamation? Did he not take property by the stroke of the pen? Will any one deny that this was not a legitimate confiscation of property? Now, all you need to do to get your property is to vote the Socialist ticket, and we will do the same thing!" [Applause from Socialists.]

Here was a plausible plan, a definite statement of just how Socialism was to be put into operation; in other words, lawful confiscation of private property, *robbery by the ballot!* After showing how easily this could be done without violence, without disorder, he answered his own next question, "Why don't you vote the Socialist ticket?" by saying, "I will tell you why, because down deep in your hearts there is the lingering hope that some day you will have some of these wage slaves working for YOU!" [Socialists applaud.] "But, when the time comes that all hope is gone of having wage slaves under your domination, then you will become Socialists!" [Applause.] In other words, *when man acknowledges to himself that he is a failure, when hope is dead, when despair sets in, then socialism holds out its hands and cries, "Accept our creed, the creed of despair!"* [Great applause.]

But this speaker failed to point out that the eman-

cipation of the black slave, just as it was, involved our nation in Civil War, at a cost of blood and treasure unequalled in modern times.

Do you, as Socialists, for one moment believe that the unjust taking or confiscating of property, by the simple act of a stroke of the pen, will be accepted peaceably by the individuals who now own property? [Applause from Anti-Socialist side.] If you do, undeceive yourselves. You may build your air castles, go into emotional ecstasies over visionary ideals, dream utopian dreams to your heart's content, but remember that when you attempt to actually take property by the process of collective robbery, individualism will rise in self-defence, and, if need be, crush you! [Applause and laughter.] *Individual freedom and the private ownership of property will not be superseded by slavery and the collective ownership of property without a struggle.* Civilization may tremble in the balance, the struggle may be intense, but the oak of individualism is too deeply rooted in the soil of freedom to be destroyed by all the collective underbrush in the forest of humanity. [Great applause.]

Mr. GEORGE W. COLEMAN, Chairman.—The meeting is dismissed.

[Voice from right of hall, "Three cheers for Mr. Carey."] Cheers given. [Voice from left, "Three cheers for Mr. Hugo."] Given.

DECLARATION OF PRINCIPLES OF THE EM-
PLOYERS' ASSOCIATION OF MASSACHU-
SETTS.

ORGANIZED FOR LAW AND ORDER AND INDUSTRIAL
PEACE.

"The Laws Aid the Vigilant, not the Negligent."

1. No closed shop.
2. No restriction as to the use of tools, machinery,
or materials, except such as are unsafe.
3. No limitation of output.
4. No restriction as to the number of apprentices
and helpers, when of proper age.
5. No boycott.
6. No sympathetic strike.
7. No sacrifice of the independent workman to
the Labor Union.
8. No compulsory use of the union label.

*"The combined moral and financial resources of
this Association will be given to safeguard these prin-
ciples."*--GEORGE B. HUGO, *President.*

*"I find every one of these principles to be in de-
fence of private and public liberty."*--CHARLES W.
ELIOT, *President of Harvard University.*



LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 027 293 793 A