JK 273

Bunkoed B' Gosh!



THOMAS KEEFE



BUNKOED B' GOSH!



THOMAS KEEFE

JK2-3

(Copyright, 1920, by Thomas Keefe. All rights reserved, including foreign rights, and rights of translation.)

DEC 27 1920

© C1 A 6 C 7 1 1 9



THOMÁS KEEFE

The Drafter

Who volunteers as Get-To-Gether Secretary for everybody, everywhere.



Breaking the Ice

"Truth, by whomsoever spoken, comes from God."-From the Latin.

CHAPTER ONE

We often hear of the average man. We hear that the average man is for this, and the average man is for that.

A President, on the high seas, returning from Europe with a league of nations treaty, wirelesses the National Senate not to discuss the provisions of that treaty until he has had opportunity to explain it to that body.

It must be that the President deems explanations to that Senate necessary. Certainly, he wouldn't wireless if he didn't. Either the President considers the treaty complicated, or the Senate dull. The President has read the treaty; and he knows the Senate. So, take your choice.

A day or two after wirelessing the Senate, the President lands in Boston. And he makes a speech. In that speech he declares that he believes that the average man, the man in the street, is for the league of nations treaty. So? Well, it must be, then, that the average man, the man in the street, understands that treaty.

A man, certainly, can't be said to be for something that he doesn't understand. Or, if he may be said to be for something that he doesn't understand, of what importance is it that he is for it, since he doesn't understand it?

No, the average man, the man in the street, understands that treaty and is for it. That is what the President must mean. And the President knows the average man, too.

So, we have it: National Senate, a little dull, needs explanations; average man, brighter, needs no explanations: opinion of the President of the United States.

"Actions speak louder than words," it is said; and the President, fully advised, not only acts but speaks.

Well? Suppose the average man, the man in the street, is for the treaty; what of that? What has that to do with it?

Why, there is the further implication, that, if the average man is for it, it should be accepted, ratified; and that all well understand that. That is what the President means.

And so, we have another conclusion: what the average man wants done, should be done.

Put these two conclusions together, and we have: the average man is brighter than the National Senate, and, what the average man wants done, should be done.

That being the case, can anyone tell me why the average man should not be in the National Senate, to ratify the treaty, and to do whatever he wants done? I can tell you why he isn't there: it's because he is being Bunkoed B' Gosh!

I would like to meet that Average Mann. If I should meet him I would try to get him off some place where we would be all alone; just he and I. If I could do that I would give him a talking to. I would talk to him like a Dutch Uncle.

I would begin by telling him a little story. It's about a game that was once played up in the north country, and not so long ago; one of those games known as a bunko game.

The story goes: One day one of those workers in the woods, to whom the name, lumber-jack, is applied, drew his wages and went to town. He hadn't been long in town before he landed in a saloon.

When he came into that saloon he found there, the saloon-keeper, the bartender, and one other, a man, who, seated at a table, was engaged in a game of solitaire, a traveling salesman, whiling away the time until the arrival of his train.

The lumber-jack refreshed himself, and then, being in a playful mood and craving excitement, inquired for a game. There was no game. But the saloon-keeper, anxious to entertain his customer, and, with an eye to sales, offered to match coins with the lumber-jack for the drinks.

His offer was promptly accepted. Each produced a silver dollar and they proceeded to match.

Now, the game of matching coins is played in this way: One takes the even side, and the other takes the odd side. Each lays down a coin, concealed by the hand. The hands are then removed. If the coins show the same side up, the even man wins; otherwise the odd man wins.

The game is absolutely fair, since chances are absolutely equal.

This game between the lumber-jack and the saloon-keeper went on for a little while, but was soon changed to matching coins for the dollar instead of the drinks. And, it was not long before the bartender took a hand, thus making it a three-handed game.

In a three-handed game it is the odd man who wins. And that game is absolutely fair, since chances are absolutely equal.

The three-handed game then continued for some little time and with no marked change in the fortunes of those engaged.

Soon, however, the saloon-keeper excused himself for a moment and retired to an adjoining room, and shortly, he called the bartender to him on some pretext or another. They exchanged a few words, and the bartender returned, followed in a moment by the saloon-keeper; and the three-handed game was resumed.

But, remarkable as it may seem, the resumption of play was followed by a disastrous change in the fortunes of the lumber-jack.

Thereafter, as often as he laid down a dollar, he lost it. And it didn't make a bit of difference which side of the coin he laid down; either the bartender or the saloon-keeper was always odd, and took the money.

The play continued until the lumber-jack had lost all his money. The saloon-keeper then

treated the drinks, and the lumber-jack drifted out.

The salesman arose and followed him out. He overtook the lumber-jack, and led him around the corner where they were all alone. There he talked to him for a long while.

He told that lumber-jack just what had been done to him. He told him that, when the saloon-keeper and the bartender were in that side room, they had come to an agreement, formed a plan, whereby it was arranged that one of them should always lay the coin down with a certain side up, and the other with the opposite side up, so that, thereafter, no matter which side of the coin the lumber-jack laid up, he was always matched, never odd, and therefore always losing, never winning. The lumber-jack had been Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Having told the lumber-jack of the trick that had been played upon him, the salesman did not stop; but he went on and told that lumber-jack how, if he ever engaged in a three-handed game of matching again, he could avoid all danger of being so cheated again.

He told that lumber-jack, that in a three-handed game, he must always insist that the coins be, not laid down, but tossed into the air and allowed to fall upon the floor, so that it will be a matter of chance as to which side of one's coin shall be up.

The lumber-jack, his face bearing an expression, a mixture of suspicion, insolence, and puzzlement, listened to all the salesman had to say. But when the latter was through, the lumber-jack only gave him one long, searching look,

turned upon his heel, and walked away, without a word. Nothing in his manner nor in his actions indicated whether he refused to believe, doubted, understood, or had determined to think the matter over.

The lumber-jack went back to work and soon had earned some more wages, which he drew and went to town again, bringing up in the same saloon. The same bartender and the same saloon-keeper were present, and it was not long before the three-handed game of matching coins was proposed. The lumber-jack accepted. But this time he insisted that each man toss his coin into the air and let it fall upon the floor. Either the idea had sifted through, or the lumber-jack had determined to play the game in a way that he knew to be fair.

After telling this story to Average Mann, I would ask him what he would do if he were to match coins with that bartender and that saloon-keeper: whether he would allow them to lay the coins or would insist that they be tossed into the air?

And I have faith enough in the intelligence of Average Mann to believe that Average Mann would reply that he would insist that the coins be tossed into the air.

Upon his so replying, I would say to him, "Well now, Average Mann, I want to show you that you are the victim of a plan arranged for the express purpose of depriving you of every chance, and which does in fact deprive you of every chance, just as the plan arranged between the

saloon-keeper and the bartender deprived the lumber-jack of every chance to win.

To make it clear to you may require more words than were required by the salesman to show the lumber-jack, but if you will lay aside all your prejudices, and consider points as I shall raise them, with such reasonable open-mindedness as one should exercise toward another who seeks only to show that other where he is being cheated, I think that, when I am through, you will see clearly that you are now being, and have always been, as thoroughly bunkoed as was that lumberjack: or, if I should fail to convince you that you are being bunkoed, that at least, I will have raised such a reasonable doubt in your mind, such suspicion, that you will conclude to insist, that the game you are engaged in, be played in a way that you know to be fair.

What I wish to show you has to do with you and your government, and your relation to that government. Now, there are men who will prick up their ears at any new proposition for making money, who will listen attentively to any new proposition in regard to their business, but who will turn a deaf ear at once when the word government is mentioned.

Such men are of two classes: first, those who know very well that there are many wrongs in the government, but who also know very well that they do not lose because of those wrongs, but gain because of them; and, second, those who know that the wrongs are there and that they suffer from them, but who long ago have given up in despair of ever having them righted.

Those of the first class are as uninterested in new ideas of government as the saloon-keeper and the bartender would have been in tossing the coins, if the salesman, during the course of the game, had proposed it. They are satisfied as it is, thank you!

Those of the second class, those who give up in despair of ever having wrongs righted, may be compared to a child, who, wishing some water, attempts to carry it in a sieve, and, on failing each time, gives up, and decides there is no way in which water may be carried.

You, Average Mann, do not belong to the first class, I know, for you are not getting what you are entitled to. And, I am pretty sure, you do not belong to the second class, for, I have been watching your attempts at making things right, and, I believe that you know of the wrongs and are searching for a remedy, looking for a way to right them. And while I have been watching your attempts, Average, and noting your repeated failures, I have come to the conclusion that you, like the child attempting to carry water in a sieve, are using the wrong means to accomplish your end; you are going at it the wrong way; you know there is something the matter, but you do not seem to realize just where the trouble lies.

So, Average, I hope that you will attend carefully while I explain to you the Greatest Bunko Game On Earth.

The Greatest Bunko Game on Earth

"Be not so bigoted to any custom as to worship at the expense of truth."—Zimmerman.

CHAPTER Two

And let me say at the beginning that I shall not attempt to have you discard any political principles that you now hold. Whatever political principles you hold are yours, and you have a right to them. It matters not, whether you are prohibitionist, or wet, socialist, or single-taxer, nonpartisan leaguer, or farmer-labor man, republican, or democrat; you may keep right on being just what you are, and yet, agree with the views that I hold. What I shall propose to you is only another way of settling the same issues, another way of getting at and finding out the majority opinion.

Take the case of the lumber-jack again. When the three-handed game was being played, the issue was, who should get the money. And that issue was settled by laying the coins, and that manner of settling the issue was fair until the saloon-keeper and the bartender organized against the lumber-jack, and so deprived him of every chance to win.

Now, when the salesman talked to the lumberjack he didn't preach to him the wrong in gambling. He didn't try to convert the lumber-jack to another principle. He only explained to the lumber-jack, how, if he wished to match coins three-handed again, he should insist it be done so that there would be no danger of his being cheated. In other words, he showed the lumber-jack another way of settling the same issue, and a safer and better way. And that is all that I wish to do with you, Average; show you a different, a better, and safer way of settling the same issues.

Now, you, Average, are engaged in a sort of game, a venture, a venture called government. Government is organized to establish justice between man and man, between groups of men and other groups of men; to see that all get a fair deal. That is the great purpose of government.

But, we see the farmers organizing, the laboring men organizing, the bankers organizing, and numerous other classes organizing, according to their interests. Inquire of any of them why they are organizing, and you will be told that it is to get their rights, to protect their interests, to get a fair and square deal, justice. A government was organized to establish justice. Then other organizations are formed to fight that government for justice, to get it to go to work and establish justice.

Now, Average, if you employed a servant to work for you, you would expect that servant to go to work with a good will, and do willingly, what he was employed to do, wouldn't you? If you had to stand right over that servant and watch him every minute, and prompt him, and prod him on to do just what you had employed

him to do, you would consider him a very poor servant, wouldn't you?

Well, Average, that is just the way your government works at establishing justice. It doesn't work at the job at all unless those who suffer injustice, organize, and spend a lot of time and money, prompting it, and proding it on to do just what it was organized to do. Surely, there is something wrong about that government. It doesn't work willingly and freely at the job. And such a vast sum is paid for the purpose of government! It will cost sixty dollars for each man, woman and child in the nation, this year, for the national government, only!

A just government, Average, a successful government, one that performs its duty, freely and willingly, will be on the job all the time, and whenever and wherever it sees injustice, it will at once take steps to remove it. It will not wait until those who are suffering from that injustice, organize, and prod it. It will be looking round for injustice, ever ready to pounce upon it and overcome it, as a cat looks for a mouse. And it will know about injustice as soon as they who suffer from it know about it. It will see injustice threatening, and will take steps necessary to ward it off.

For instance, Average, your government knows that, whenever it goes to war, the cost of living will go up. And it knows why that is, and what to do to prevent it. But when the cost of living went up your government took thousands of dollars of your money to investigate why it went up—bluff investigations to fool you. And it has taken no steps whatever to prevent a repetition of

the same thing in case of another war. The right kind of a government wouldn't act that way, Average.

The people organized a government to establish justice, fairness. It is because that government doesn't do that which it was organized to do, because it doesn't establish justice, doesn't establish fairness, freely and willingly, that other organizations must form to prod it.

A government will establish justice, fairness, only if it is just and fair itself. And a government will be just and fair only when the method of getting the government is just and fair. No fair government can ever be built upon the foundation of an unfair method of getting the government.

It is because the foundation, the method of getting the government is unfair, that our government is unfair, Average. And, because of the unfairness in the method of getting the government, men who pay taxes to support that government, are compelled to pay other money to other organizations, formed for the purpose of fighting that government for justice.

That is much like hiring a man to do certain work for you, and then, because he won't do it, doing it yourself, but yet, paying him as though he were doing it.

Government may be likened to a game, Average. And that being the case, I want to show you how you are being cheated as the game is now played. I want to show you how the method of getting the government is unfair to you. I want to show you that you are being deprived, to your

great injury, of your rightful chance of being in the government, and so, being in a position to protect your own interests.

And after I have done that, I propose to show you, just as the salesman showed the lumber-jack, how you may continue at the game of government and have it absolutely fair to you and to every other man; so that each will have his equal chance. I shall show you the proper method to use to get a fair government, the fair way, the only way to get a fair government; that is all.

Average, you have read the Declaration of Independence, of course? And you remember the declaration, "All men are created equal"?

Now, by that declaration it wasn't meant that all men really are equal in all respects. But it did mean that all were to be treated as equals, were to be treated equally by the government, and were to enjoy an equal share of the good of government, as well as bear an equal share of the burden of government. That is no more than fair, that is justice.

Now, that Declaration of Independence, Average, corresponds to the agreement made by the three men who were to match coins.

The rules of the game of matching coins were known to all when the game began, and it was impliedly declared, understood, that each should be equal in the game, that is, each should have an equal chance to win or lose, should be treated equally. That, too, was fair. But, Average, the whole effect of that declaration was changed by the plan adopted by the saloon-keeper and the bartender.

Again, after the Declaration of Independence, came the Constitution, which is only another plan, a plan of government. And that Constitution actually annuls the effect of the declaration that all men are created equal.

Before the Constitution was adopted, and under that Declaration of Independence, there could have been no question, Average, that you were entitled to be treated as an equal, and were entitled to an equal voice in making the laws.

One great partnership was declared, and it was declared that each was to have an equal share in the government. And, if all the people should meet to make the laws, you would be in the meeting, with a voice equal to that of the best. And if all the people should attempt to meet, and it should be found that all couldn't get into the meeting place, you, Average, would, certainly, be entitled to an equal chance to get in. If admission were by card you would be entitled to a card as well as any one else. That is what the Declaration of Independence means, or it means nothing.

But the plan was made afterward. The Constitution was adopted afterward. And then? Why, it was provided that the lawmakers should be chosen by election. And, Average, what is the purpose of election? Isn't it to get Best Mann to make the laws? Certainly it is.

So then, your Constitution implies that some are better than others, doesn't it? And we have the conflict: the Declaration of Independence declaring all men equal, and the Constitution impliedly declaring that some are better than others.

And you, Average Mann, you are not Best Mann and you never will be. So, isn't the plan which provides for the election of lawmakers, a plan which excludes you, which forever takes from you the chance you had of going into the meeting where the laws are to be made? Doesn't that Constitution take from you, all voice, and all chance of ever having a voice in making the laws? Doesn't it occur to you, Average Mann, that that Constitution, in that respect, is very much like the plan that the saloon-keeper and the bartender adopted, to take from the lumber-jack his share of the chances to win?

It was decided to choose lawmakers, Average, because it was realized that all the people couldn't get into the meeting place. There were too many entitled to go in. And so, it was determined to choose a convenient number from those who were entitled to go in. That is fair, if the method of choosing is fair. It was determined to elect them. And that, Average, is where you were Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Election is an implied agreement that only Best Mann shall go in to make the laws. You, Average, will never go in to make the laws. That is the effect of that agreement.

I'll carry the comparison between the plan adopted by the saloon-keeper and the bartender, and the plan of government adopted, still further. When the saloon-keeper and the bartender adopted their plan the lumber-jack wasn't present. If he had been of course the plan never would have been adopted. And you, Average, you were not present when that Constitution, that other

plan, was adopted. If you had been it never would have been adopted.

That Constitution was made by Best Mann, elected because he was Best Mann. And it was ratified for the states by Best Mann, again. Average Mann never had anything whatever to say about it. And all men were created equal!

So, you see, Average, your situation under that Constitution is very similar to that of the lumber-jack after the saloon-keeper and bartender had organized. The lumber-jack wasn't present when the plan was adopted which deprived him of every chance to win; and you were not present when the plan was adopted which deprived you of every chance to win, to go to the lawmaking body, to ever have a chance in making the laws under which you are to live, to have your share in the government, that government that is to treat all alike and is to establish justice, willingly and freely.

You ought to see, Average, that surely, something is going to be done to you in there that you will not like, or Best Mann wouldn't be so careful to keep you out. When the boys all go inside and slam the door in your face, when you start to go in, you may be pretty sure, Average, they are going to discuss something more in there than how to give you a square deal.

Notice, Average, I mention only lawmakers. That is because we are governed by laws, and no matter what body makes the laws, call it board, congress, legislature, assembly, or council, it is the government, and the whole of the government.

As the intellect governs the human body, so the lawmaking body governs the political body. And as the wishes of the intellect, the government of the human body, are transferred into acts by agencies, which are servants of the intellect, but no part of it; so the wishes of the lawmaking body, the government of the political body, are transferred into acts by agencies, men, who are servants of the government, but no part of it, only officers. The government does as it sees fit: the servants, the officers, what they are ordered to do.

Now, Average, when the salesman first explained to the lumber-jack the fraud that had been done to him, the latter was puzzled, and perhaps he didn't see clearly right away. But it came to him.

So, with you, what I have been trying to explain to you may seem like a play with words, a trick, a specious argument. But I assure you it is not. You are being defrauded, just as surely as was the lumber-jack, and I ask, in justice to yourself, that you pay attention to me, hear what I have to say, and consider the whole matter at your leisure. For, I have implicit confidence that it will all come clear to you.

I tell you, Average, getting a government by election, electing lawmakers, is, both in theory and in practice, a fraud upon you, just as unfair, just as palpably a fraud, as the fraud that was practiced upon the lumber-jack, and that the result has been equally disastrous to you.

The plan that was adopted by the saloon-keeper and the bartender took from the lumber-jack every chance to win, and as a consequence,

he lost all his money. That other plan, the Constitution took from you every chance to have a voice in your own government, and with it, as a consequence, it has taken from you about everything else that belonged to you, and the taking still goes on.

Choosing lawmakers by election is unfair to you, Average Mann, because election excludes you. Election virtually says, "Average Mann, you never can come in here." And yet, in there, is where the laws are being made, where the government is being conducted, which is to treat you fairly, and in which you should have your share.

Those laws are presumed to suit you, Average, to be what you want. Best Mann admits that they should be what you want, and asserts that he is trying hard to make what you want, trying, oh! so hard! And yet, he won't let you in to make them yourself. Average, you're Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Self-determination? You, going round the world fighting for self-determination for others? Why, Average, you haven't even self-determination for yourself. The plan of government provides that you are to be ruled, absolutely, autocratically, and forever, by Best Mann.

You think you have a voice in the government? You vote? Yes, you do vote, Average, in the election booth. But is there any governing ever done in the election booth? Are any laws ever made there? Not a one. What good is your voice to you if it never can be heard where the laws are being made? In the government? You vote on

constitutional amendments only after Best Mann says they are agreeable to him, not before.

And you have an equal vote? Yes, Average, you do, in the election booth. That far equality was pursued, just far enough to take it away from you, forever.

Doesn't it strike you as being a little odd that you should have as much to say in the election booth as Best Mann has? Doesn't it seem to you, that, if it is necessary to have only Best Mann to make the laws, that Constitution was a little reckless when it arranged so that you could match Best Mann's vote in the election booth, and thus offset it?

You have as much to say in the election booth as Best Mann has, but after that he does all the rest of the saying, while you do all the rest of the kicking. Where saying counts he does the saying, all of it. Where saying amounts to nothing, you have as much to say as he has.

That, Average, is because election is only a device to make it seem to you that you have an equal share in the government, while at the same time that device is working, like a cream separator, to separate you from that share forever.

First, you are given an equal share, "All men are created equal." And then, immediately, you are pushed into a game devised for no other purpose than to take that same share away from you forever, and it never fails.

Suppose the bartender and the saloon-keeper, after the lumber-jack had lost all his money, had staked him, and all the money had been divided up equally between the three, so that the game

might go on again. They would have given the lumber-jack his share, and then, taken it away from him again, immediately, at the game. That would have been very cheap generosity on the part of those two, wouldn't it, Average? Well, Average, that is the way you were staked; staked, then pushed into a game devised for no other purpose than to take that same stake away from you, and which did at once take it away from you, forever.

It certainly didn't cost Best Mann much to make that declaration, "All men are created equal," now, did it, Average? And it certainly didn't make much difference to you, did it, Average?

Oh! You can't see that you haven't a share in the government?

Well, now, tell me this, Average: Did you have any share in declaring the war? Did you have any chance at all to go to the Congress that did declare that war? Did you have anything to say about whether there should or should not be war, in your election booth? Could you in any manner indicate your wishes in regard to the war, in the election booth? Certainly, you couldn't. That Best Mann, in congress, told you that you wanted war, that it was good for you; and you got it; and you'll have to pay for it.

And prohibition. What did you have to say, Average, about that eighteenth amendment? You had not a word to say. You got it because it was good for Best Mann: he said it was good for you, that you wanted it, and you got it.

Remember, please, Average, that we are not

discussing whether the war was, or was not advisable. Neither are we discussing whether prohibition was, or was not advisable. Nor, are we discussing whether you were in favor of both, or either. The point, that I wish to drive home to you, is, that you got both, whether you wanted them or not; and that, since you had nothing whatever to say about either, you haven't self-government.

Since you didn't have anything to say, and didn't have any chance to have anything to say, about such important matters as war and prohibition, certainly, you must see that you haven't any voice in regard to anything else that is really important, no voice whatever in the government, in reality; and, more than that, absolutely not the ghost of a chance of ever having a voice, so long as that Constitution provides that lawmakers shall be elected; for election is to keep you out.

Election doesn't treat all men equally, Average. It is no more suited to allowing you a voice in your own government than is a sieve to carrying water. It is for just the opposite purpose—to deprive you of your equality in the government, of your voice in the government. And it does. It is a perfect contrivance.

Men make burglar proof vaults to keep burglars out, but they sometimes get in. The men who framed the plan of electing lawmakers, framed it to keep you out, Average, and it works perfectly, never fails. You never get in.

Election of lawmakers is as unfair to you, Average, as slavery was to the black man. In slavery the black man had no chance, was deprived of

every chance; in election of lawmakers you have no chance, are deprived of every chance.

If there were no law, no government, you would have as much right as every other man, naturally.

You have, naturally, just as much right to say what the laws shall be as any one else, Average. That Declaration of Independence merely affirms a natural right, Average. And it seems to me, Average, that you should see that that Constitution or plan of government, which provides for getting a lawmaking body by election, deprives you of a natural right, as well as a declared right, the right of being treated as though all men were created equal, the right of having an equal share in your own government, or to have an equal chance to have an equal share.

That Constitution is as far from the Declaration of Independence, as the Treaty of Versailles is from the Fourteen Points, as a politician's performance generally is from his promise, as practice generally is from preaching.

That Declaration of Independence was a promise, a promise made to Average Mann, that all men should be treated as equals. It was very like the Fourteen Points.

The Declaration of Independence and the Fourteen Points were each promulgated while a war was going on, and each was a promise of what should happen when that war would be won, a promise made to Average Mann, to spur him on, so that he would willingly do the task to be done, bear the burden to be borne. And, like all other promises that Best Mann has been making Average. age Mann, they were not kept when the campaign was over.

Best Mann is an habitual promise breaker, Average Mann. Thieves of the underworld keep their word with one another better than Best Mann keeps his word with you, Average Mann. He seems to have no regard whatever for his word given to you, Average Mann. And a man who hasn't any regard for his word isn't better than you, Average. He is no man at all.

Average, if there was in your neighborhood a man who so regularly broke his promises, as Best Mann breaks his promises to you, who was in the habit of lying to and deceiving his neighbors, as Best Mann is in the habit of lying to and deceiving you, who was as careless with everything entrusted to his care, as Best Mann is with everything of yours that is entrusted to his care, nobody would neighbor with that man. He wouldn't have a friend in the neighborhood. He would be known as a low-down, disreputable cuss, and he couldn't be elected dog-catcher in his own town. And that is the kind of man election places over you to rule you, Average Mann; to act as your guardian!

And so, Average, the first promise made you was broken, soon broken, the promise implied in the declaration, "All men are created equal." And you lost your share in the government.

How about your share of the burden? Does that separator, Election, operate on burdens, too? Did it also separate you from your share in the burden of government? Let us see.

What man declared for war? Best Mann. Who fought it? Average Mann. Who made a profit out of it? Best Mann. Who will pay for it? Average Mann. To whom will it be paid? Best Mann. Whose wealth was decreased by the war? Average Mann's. Whose was increased? Best Mann's. And who prays for the end of all war? Average Mann. And to whom is entrusted the task of making an end of all war? Best Mann.

Oh! Average! Average! you bear all the burdens, and you are not in position to relieve your self of any. Don't only pray. Pray and think. Don't let them lay the coins down: make them toss them into the air.

Average, you remember, don't you, the evening you went down to the opera house to hear that candidate for congress, during the campaign? Yes? Well, he said a lot of things, didn't he?

And now, I'll leave it to you, Average, if it isn't a fact, that, when you simmer that whole speech right down, what that candidate was trying to put over, the idea that he was really trying to convey to your mind, was, that if you would vote for him to go to congress, and he got there, he would vote as you would vote if you were there? Certainly, he didn't tell you that he would use his own judgment and vote as he saw fit. And he wasn't trying to convey to your mind the idea that he would vote opposite to the way you would vote, if you were there.

No. He would vote the way you would vote, if you were there, so that the voting would be done by him for you, just as though, you were there yourself to do it. That is what he would have you believe.

Now, Average, can't you see the joker in that? What's the matter with you? Can't you answer, yes, or no, when your name is called? Couldn't you sit in a seat in congress, and, when the roll is called for a vote on war, prohibition, tariff, railroad rates, or a peace treaty; couldn't you answer, yes, or no, as suited yourself?

Of course, you could. And if you did do that, it would be just the same as if that candidate were there to vote for you, instead, wouldn't it, if he kept his promise? Of course it would.

Then, can you tell me why he wants to vote in your place, for you, so badly? And can you give me any reason why you should continue to let him do so? Average, you ought to see that if you let that man go and vote for you, in your place, you'll be Bunkoed B' Gosh!

When you were drafted to go over and fight for self-determination of all nations—except such as our allies might wish to exploit, as colonies, under the new name of mandatories—there wasn't then, any candidate around trying to get you to give up your place to him, was there, Average?

Come out of it, Average. You're entitled to an equal share in the rights as well as equal share in the fights.

You know about that selective conscription law, the draft, don't you? You were in it? Well, you have heard how very fair it was then.

What was there so very fair about it, anyway? Why every man had to take his chance, at least, on the face of things.

Now, if it is very fair that every man be compelled to take his chance when the bitter is being passed, doesn't it seem that every man should have his chance when the sweets are being passed? Demand it, Average, and don't talk about anything else until you get it.

And you know, Average, how it has been said that selective conscription worked, too, don't you? And working that way, it was only election, running backwards, Average: a game of "Get out, if you can," while election is a game of "Get in, if you can."

And that is why the one got you, Average, so quickly, while the other never will. That's why you got to France, all right, but will never get to congress. And that is why the American people was represented, in France, by an army of men, who were, some black, some white, on the outside, but only on the outside. And that is why the American people is represented in congress by men all white, on the outside, at least.

Now, Average Mann, you know that is the truth, and being the truth, you know that, either in France, or in congress, the American people was misrepresented, falsely represented.

A picture that looks like you, Average, represents you. And a picture that doesn't look like you, doesn't represent you. But a picture that purports to look like you and doesn't, misrepresents you, falsely represents you.

That being so, Average, you know that the American people was represented in France, truly represented; and that the American people is now,

and has always been, misrepresented, falsely represented in congress.

Election must, and always does, result in false representation. False representation is not resorted to for a good purpose, but only for the purpose of deceiving someone to his injury, and it is you, Average Mann, who is being deceived to your injury by that kind of representation in congress.

The only true representation of a large mass of units is a smaller mass, taken in such a way, that the smaller mass differs from the larger only in the number of the individuals in it, a sample. So, true representation for the people must be a body in the nature of a sample of the people, and may only be obtained as samples of other masses are obtained, never by picking and choosing.

If your neighbor, Average, desiring to sell you some of his potatoes, should pick out some of the best and bring them to you for a sample, and you should buy of him, relying upon that sample, you would be very much disappointed, when he came to deliver the potatoes, wouldn't you? Perhaps, you would claim misrepresentation. Then why should you consent to misrepresentation in congress? You are never satisfied with it.

And now, Average, who, would you say, rules? Best Mann? No. No.

Average, I venture to state that you do not know your United States Senators, nor your member of Congress, that is, to know them. You are not even acquainted with them; and you wouldn't recognize them if you should meet them on the road. Perhaps you have seen their pictures, but

all that you think you know about them, is merely hearsay. You know them by reputation; that is all.

So then, we arrive at the point that election for the purpose of getting Best Mann to make the laws, results only in getting Reputed Best Mann, the man with the reputation of being Best Mann.

Reputation is largely a matter of advertising, Average. Best Advertised Mann becomes Reputed Best Mann. Election brings Best Advertised Mann to make the laws.

It costs money to advertise, Average, as you well know, and a new element comes into election, money. Rich Mann has that. Also, Rich Mann owns, or controls, in one way or another, nearly all the great daily newspapers, and nearly all the great weekly and monthly magazines. And Rich Mann owns the great news gathering agencies, and the means of transmitting news, the telegraph and cables.

Having, thus, practically, a monopoly of the means of publicity, it is within the power of Rich Mann to make, and unmake, reputations. He can give a man a good reputation, and he can take it away from him.

Rich Mann advertises his friends as being good men, just as you and I advertise our friends as being good men. And Rich Mann, at least, does not advertise his enemies as being good men, but rather as being fools, idealists, radicals, grafters, or, worse yet, traitors.

You, Average, you read what Rich Mann wishes you to read, and you are influenced thereby. When

election comes round the man with the good reputation runs for congress, and you, Average Mann, you have seen his name, he is so well advertised to you, that you say, "I know that man and I believe he is a good man." To congress he goes.

He is Rich Mann's creature. Rich Mann made him and he can easily unmake him.

That congressman dare not take your side, Average, if Rich Mann opposes, even though he may know Rich Mann is in the wrong. That congressman votes in accordance with the wishes of Rich Mann. And you are depending upon him to protect you from Rich Mann!

Such may not be true in every instance, Average, but it is true in the majority of cases, and congress speaks through a majority.

Average, I will show you that what I say about advertising is true: The greater the number of people in a government, and the more extensive the territory governed, the greater is the power of publicity, for the more you must rely upon publicity only. And the less the number of people in a government, and the less extensive the territory governed, the less is the power of publicity, for the less do you rely upon publicity, only.

And your national government is far more unsatisfactory to you, than is your village government; your state government is far more unsatisfactory to you, than is your township government; and, your large city government is far more unsatisfactory to you, than is your small city government.

The more you really know about the men you vote for, the better government you get. The

more you rely upon publicity, the more you are only advertised, informed, about the men you vote for, the worse government you get.

And that, Average, is because the smaller the government, the less the power of publicity, and therefore, the less the power of Rich Mann in that government; and, the greater the government, the greater the power of publicity, and therefore, the greater the power of Rich Mann in that government. And all that is because Rich Mann owns or controls the means of publicity.

The whole plan of government is very conveniently arranged for Rich Mann's control of it. If he can't always get the laws, that he wants, put through, he can very easily prevent any from going through that he doesn't want.

And, if by any chance, a law objectionable to Rich Mann should slip through one branch of the legislature, there is the other branch where it may be stopped. And if not there, perhaps the executive will kindly veto it for Rich Mann. Executives are inclined to that practice.

But, if all else fails, there is yet the supreme court, which may declare it unconstitutional, or interpret it in his favor. This, the court may do by a bare majority vote, as it has frequently done, sometimes by a vote of five to four, and again, by a vote of four to three.

So, Rich Mann has many chances to protect himself from laws objectionable to him. There are four places where he has a chance and he is very powerful in all four places.

Political parties lend themselves handily to Rich Mann's control. There is the old advice, "Divide to rule." It may be the Devil first gave it. Certainly, it is well followed. The people is well divided. All to the good, with Rich Mann!

All parties require money to conduct a campaign. Rich Mann has the money. Parties must nominate candidates acceptable to him or there won't be much money for them. He influences the nominations of the parties, contributes money to each, let's not his left hand know what his right hand doeth, and, no matter which party wins, he has friends in power.

And this whole system is securely fastened upon the people by the Constitution which took your share in the government away from you, Average.

And now, Average, from what I have said do not think that I am trying to rouse you to hatred of Rich Mann. He is not really to blame. He does what he can to have the government conform to his wishes, even as you and I do. But he has much more power in the matter. And that, Average, is because of election. To make him take his stand with the rest of us, to bring him back even with us, election must be done away with.

Election is only a contest. And Rich Mann is fortunately situated to engage in that contest. If he engages at all he is bound to win. And it is as absurd to hate him for that reason as it would be to hate the young men, if the choice of a government were left to a foot race, another contest; for, the young men would always win that contest.

Don't hate Rich Mann. Hate contests to get a government. For, by no contest may a fair government be had. Hate election.

Leaving the choice of a government to election is as unfair to you, Average Mann, as leaving it to a foot race would be to the one-legged man. The one-legged man would have no chance to win a foot race.

You and Rich Mann do not meet in the election contest upon terms of equality. You may speak only to your neighbors. While Rich Mann, by reason of his means, may speak to millions.

We think we are so far ahead of the Mexicans, Average. That is a mistake. In Mexico, changes in the government are obtained by winning contests. The opposition organizes, and so do those in control. Money is gathered. Men are hired to shoot off guns. The contest takes place, and the winners of that contest become the government. Of course, the losers cannot reasonably expect a fair deal.

In our civilized nation we have a set time for the contest. We are regular. Men organize. Money is gathered. Men are hired to shoot off, not guns, but their mouths. The contest takes place, and the winners become the government. Of course the losers cannot reasonably expect a fair deal. They never got it yet, and they never will, in that way.

It seems to you that the people is to blame in election?

No, Average, the people is not to blame. The people does not do it. The people never does anything, as I shall show you. The people never elects anyone. It is impossible for the people to transact any business. And that, Average, is why representative government is resorted to. The

people is so numerous that there can be no meeting of it. I will show you, Average, that the acts which we attribute to the people are, fairly, not the acts of the people at all.

People, Average, is a collective name, like army, herd, school, flock, and board. An army is only an army when the soldiers of that army are collected, gathered together; and a herd of cattle is a herd only when the members of that herd are collected, gathered together. So with school, flock and board.

Average, the school board of a country school district consists of three members. If you should go out to sell a map to that board, and should go, first, to one member, and get him to sign the contract, then, to another, and get him to sign, and then, to the remaining member, and get him to sign, you would have a contract signed by all the members of that school board, a contract that would be apparently the contract of that school board.

But, if, when you came to tender the map and get your pay for it, the board should refuse to accept it, and you should sue upon the contract, the court would decide against you. You would lose your case, for the very good reason that the contract was not authorized at any meeting of the board. The board didn't make the contract.

That board can act only at a meeting of the members. And this rule is founded upon common sense. The members should meet, to act as a board, so that the members may discuss the matter, and inform each other of any facts in the case, that any one of them knows, and thus, all come to

a common understanding as to what the facts are. Each should know what the others know. Otherwise, that contract may be signed by each of the members, acting separately, with the understanding that a certain fact is true, which, if there were a meeting, either one of the other members might inform him isn't true.

And so, with the people at election, only each individual's choice in the matter is had. In one town men may be voting for a man with the understanding that the man is to keep them out of war, while in the next town men may be voting for him with the understanding that he is for going into the war.

If those men could meet to act, they would vote with a common understanding of what the facts are, and if a dispute as to the facts should arise, they would settle the facts—they might call the man himself before them to get it straight. There wouldn't be so much pussy-footing as there is in elections now.

In our recent presidential election there was a prominent senator from California, a "bitterender," working strenuously for a certain candidate for president, because that senator understood that that candidate was against any league of nations; and there was another prominent man, an ex-president, strenuously working for that same candidate for president, because that expresident understood that that candidate was for a league of nations. Which prominent man was wrong? Which was fooled? Which worked for just that to which he was opposed? Time will tell. Time will show that one, or the other, of

those two prominent men, worked under a mistake of fact, and with him millions of other men.

And so, Average, if the court will decide that the school board did not legally make that contract, that the contract is not the act of that board, because the members acted separately, what do you think it should decide, to be consistent, in regard to the alleged act of the people, the members of which act separately? The people never meet, cannot meet to transact any business because of the great number, and because it cannot meet, government by representation is resorted to; and yet it is said, the people did this, and the people did that.

Every principle, every reason involved in the case of the school board, is involved in the case of the people, and enlarged, because of the vast number of individuals which would have to meet to have the people present.

There must be a meeting of the people. If that can't be had, then, the next best thing is a meeting of as many as can conveniently be had. If all the people can't get in to the meeting, let in as many as can conveniently be let in, and take such measures that all will have an equal chance to get in. That is the only fair way. That is the only way in which a meeting may be had that may reasonably be presumed to act as the whole people would act if it could meet. That is the next best thing to a meeting of the people.

No, Average, that action which we call the action of the people is not the action of the people at all, and there is no reasonable probability that it is such action as the people would take if it

could meet. That action is the action of a scattered herd, running hither and thither, moved by this false story and that false story, without means of learning the truth, stampeded, and kept in a continual state of doubt and dispute by Rich Mann, who is the only one possessed of means sufficient to enable him to disseminate information, and misinformation, to all the individuals of the mass. Falsehood is relied upon, while those individuals in the mass, who know it to be what it is, cannot successfully combat it, because they lack the means to that end, means which are possessed by Rich Mann, only.

And that, Average, is why you may see the vote of a township, composed entirely of farmers, coming in, fifty-fifty, each man paired with another, so that the effect of the township vote is nothing at all, while those farmers are all interested in the same way, and, if voting on a matter in the legislature, would probably all vote the

same way.

Now, from what I have been telling you, Average, you might gather that Rich Mann rules. But that is not true either, Average. We haven't got to the real ruler yet.

Rich Mann is rich because he wants to be, because he wishes money, and he is, in the majority of cases, dominated, ruled, by Money. Often he is really insane over Money. Insanity knows no right nor wrong. Insanity is indifferent to the woe and misery of others.

Now, we have got to the real ruler, Average. It is Money. Rich Mann is the slave of Money. He is so busy chasing after it that he hasn't time

to live, and grudges the time to die. Money rules Rich Mann. Rich Mann rules Best Mann. Best Mann rules Average Mann. Thus, you, Average Mann are ruled by Money. Money has neither conscience nor soul. It is a Monster! You, Average, are ruled by a creature without a conscience or a soul, a Monster! You go here and you go there, you do this and you do that, when that Monster says you shall.

The Constitution took self-determination away from you, Average, and made a Monster your master. That is the final result of electing law-makers, of getting a government by election.

Election of lawmakers is the point upon which you must concentrate your attention, and all your attention, Average. For, that is the foundation upon which is built the whole structure of unfairness that you see around you. Election of lawmakers is the point where the turn-off from Fairness was made, the turn-off which leads to this Wilderness of Injustice and Unfairness.

There is no use wallowing round in this Wilderness of Injustice and Unfairness, seeking for Justice and Fairness. You must go back to the turnoff, go back to the road that you know is Fair. That is the only road to Fairness and Justice. You know all about the road and you know it is Fair. And you ought to know it will lead to Fairness and Justice."

The Remedy

"With equal pace, impartial fate,
Knocks at the palace and the cottage gate."
—Horace.

CHAPTER THREE

Along about this time, Average might be expected to exclaim: "What do you mean? Have no more elections? What shall we do then?"

And since, by so doing, he would show more interest than the lumber-jack did, I would go on again, this wise:

Remember, Average, what the salesman told the lumber-jack to do? He told him not to let anyone lay the coins down, but to insist that they be tossed into the air, so that, no one could control them, and it would be a matter of chance, as to which side came up. That was pretty good advice, Average. The lumber-jack will tell you so. He followed it.

And now, my advice to you, Average, is that you insist that much the same thing be done in your case. Take it out of the power of everybody to say what man shall go to make the laws. Point to that Declaration of Independence, and repeat, "All men are created equal." Then, demand that that preaching be lived up to, be practiced. The men who fought in 1776 fought for that principle.

It was a promise to them. It is time it be fulfilled, be put into operation.

All men being created equal, all are entitled to an equal voice in the government, in making the laws that are to protect them; but, since that can't be had, then, all are entitled to an equal chance to have an equal voice in the government, in making those laws.

If all the people should be called together to make the laws, Average, you would go and you would have your equal voice in making those laws. You would have the absolute right to go. It's your right naturally, and no one has the right to take it from you. But, all the people, cannot be called together; there are too many. Well, in that case, since all can't go, you must have your equal chance to go. Why should you give up all your right to go just because everybody can't go? That isn't the way to solve that problem, fairly. problem is fairly solved only by each giving up his equal right to go, and each receiving in return, an equal chance to go. You gave up your equal right to go and got nothing in return. Best Mann gave up nothing. He has got everything he had before it was arranged to reduce the number. Average, you were Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Demand your equal chance with all the rest. Demand that the decision as to what man shall go to make the laws be influenced by no man, but that the lawmakers be chosen by lot; that they be drawn as you were drawn to fight.

Tell Rich Mann and Best Mann that, if it is fair to draw men to fight, it is fair to draw men to make the laws. Tell those men that, if a nation can trust men drawn by lot to preserve its life, it can trust them to preserve everything else. Tell those men that it is as fair to them as it is to you; that it is fair to everybody; that you know it is fair; that everybody must know it is fair, and that nothing else is fair.

And, Average, those men, if they mean to do fairly by you, as they profess to mean—they will agree to it.

That method is for you, Average. It will let you in. It is the only method that is for you. Election keeps you out, always. Election is for Best Mann.

Those not with you are against you, Average. Use a separator of your own. To draw or not to draw? That is the separator to use. It will separate the sheep from the goats, your friends from your pretended friends. Start the separator. Find out who's for you and who is for Best Mann.

Pretty radical plan?

Well, Average, so it is. But don't you think that the change from an unfair government to a fair government, from unfairness to fairness, from injustice to justice, is a pretty radical change of itself? Do you imagine that any such radical change can be made by any plan that isn't itself radical?

Don't be afraid of that word radical, Average. That word doesn't bite. That word comes from the Latin word meaning root. And a radical, Average, is one who believes in going to the root—going to the root of troubles and taking them out by the root.

For example: There may be weeds in your garden. The conservative would be for cutting them off at the surface of the ground, thus, making only a seeming end of the trouble, an apparent end. The radical would be for putting the hoe into the ground and cutting those weeds out by the root.

Or, a man may be troubled with boils. The conservative physician would treat the boils, which are only symptoms. The radical physician would be for going to the root of the trouble, that ulcerated tooth that is poisoning the whole system. He would remove that ulcerated tooth and thus remove the cause of all boils.

The root of all your troubles is election, Average; and you must get rid of that root or your troubles will continue to grow.

Our ancestors, Average, who picked up their little belongings, bade their friends and relations good bye, and travelled far across the seas to this land, were all radicals. They went to the root of their troubles, took a radical step, and made a radical change, all for the better.

Don't be afraid of that word radical, Average. That is a word that power that rules uses to scare you. It scares him and he wants you to be scared too.

All the progress this world has ever made it owes to the radical. The radical first proposed to get down out of the trees and form into groups for mutual protection. The radical first proposed to get out of the caves and build houses. The radical first proposed to stop the buying and selling of wives; and he first proposed that one man

should have only one wife. The radical first proposed having public schools, kept up by the public. And it was the conservative who said, "I thank God there are no free schools in these colonies, and hope there will be none these hundred years."

It was the radical who first proposed to do away with paid turn-pikes and have public roads, maintained by the public, and used by everybody free of charge; even, as it is the radical today, who proposes to have free travel on the street cars and railroads. The radical first proposed to abolish slavery, and he was hooted and sneered at by Special Privilege, just as the radical is today.

Don't be afraid of that word, Average. It is to the radical you owe everything today. The conservative has always lain back and said, "This is far enough." While the reactionary has always said, "We have already gone too far. Let's go back a little."

We might get a criminal? Or a man too young, one who hadn't had much experience? Or an ignorant man, one who couldn't read or write? And, we might get a colored man?

Well, Average, we'll give the criminal an equal chance to reform, the young and inexperienced man, an equal chance to grow old and experienced, and the ignorant man, who can neither read nor red write, an equal chance to learn. But the colorand we man: he has no chance to change his color, will either can give him none. So, with him we'll have to be fair, or else unfair.

We may treat him as you are r his share of the Average. We may let him bear

burden of government, but allow him no share in the government, or, we may deny him his share in the government, and, as a sort of compensation, relieve him of his share of the burden. And, we may be just, and live up to that Declaration of Independence, "All men are created equal."

That question will be one for the majority to decide, something to be taken up after we have decided that there shall be a drawing, instead of an election, to get a government. Let us first determine to draw; then, determine who shall be considered qualified; and let us not discuss the second matter until the first is settled.

But just the same, there is a difference between governing through the election booth, and governing through the legislature, isn't there, Average?

That colored man is helping to govern now, Average, if the people really governs, isn't he? And if he were in the drawing, the colored population in the legislature, so obtained, wouldn't have any more influence than the colored population now has in the election booth, if the people really governs through the election booth, would it, Average? By drawing, every class, every color, every condition, and every interest would be reduced proportionately for a legislature.

That great difference, Average, is because the colored man is now situated as you are. He is granted equality, just before he goes into the booth where it is taken away from him, forever, even as it is taken away from you, forever. You don't mind his voting, because it really amounts to nothing at all; but you do mind when it comes to giving him an honest-to-goodness share in the

government, a bona fide share. That is the difference between pretending to do, and really doing; between practicing, and preaching; between a real share, and a bogus share.

But, let us first insist upon some kind of a drawing. Any drawing will be better for you, Average, than an election. A drawing would bring a better governent, even if the drawing were had only from the lawyers, Average. It would bring your friend, the average lawyer.

The majority of the legislators are now lawyers, anyway, and if a drawing were had from the lawyers, only, it would leave those drawn, independent of Rich Mann, who is now so powerful with them because of election; and you would have a better chance of getting a fair deal. The average lawyer is a pretty fair fellow when he has a chance to be.

And a drawing would bring a better government, Average, if in each precinct one man should be elected by the voters of that precinct, as proposed legislator, and the drawing then had from those so elected. That would, to a very great extent, do away with the power of those who own the newspapers and other means of publicity. would bring a man very close to you, Average, but it wouldn't be quite fair as it would still exclude you. You are the man everybody is afraid of, Average. For, everybody is looking for a little better than a square deal, and everybody knows that you are, and that all your ancestors before you, the Average Mann of every age, and of every country, has always been, for nothing but a square deal.

Any kind of a drawing will be better than no drawing at all. The trouble isn't so much the kind of men we get in congress now, Average, as it is what they have to do to get there, and, being there, what they have to do to stay there. Election doesn't give a man in congress a chance to be right.

When a man must pass through a cesspool to get to congress, it can't be expected that he will be clean when he gets there. Get rid of the cesspool route, Average, so that a man can walk up to the front door, and go in like a free man, under obligation to no one, but there to attend to his own business, to look after his own interests, and thus, as a consequence, to look after and protect all interested as he is interested.

Politics is the cesspool, Average. It's rotten! It stinks to Heaven! It pollutes all who have anything to do with it, all who come near it! And your mother, your wife, and your daughter are coming!

And politics, Average—the kind of politics you and I mean—is caused by election. Do away with election, and we will be rid of that kind of politics. Politics—that kind—is the contest for political power, and politics will end when the members of the government are drawn, when the contest is done away with.

You don't like the idea of leaving it to chance as to who shall go to make our laws?

It won't be chance, Average, as to who shall go to make our laws. A body, in the nature of a sample of the people will go to make our laws. That is sure. For ages men have been using samples,

under similar circumstances, and know the results of using them. Using a sample is the next best thing to using the whole, and since all the people cannot meet to govern, there is nothing else that can be done that will be so near certainty as using a sample. It will be only a chance as to what individuals are in the government. That the government will be a sample of the people is a certainty—there is no chance about that, and there is no chance about how a sample will act. It will do what the people would do.

Average, you heard the battle-cry, "Make the world safe for Democracy," didn't you? Yes? Well, then, Democracy must be something very desirable, very good to have, don't you think? It is, Average, but there is no Democracy in this whole wide world.

Through election the people have an influence on the government, Average, but only an influence. And the people always have an influence on the government, even in an absolute monarchy. The autocrat must consider the people, to an extent, else the people will rise up and destroy him. This disaster he must always fear and try to avoid, by not going too far.

Election is only a different way of influencing the government, a safer way for the government to have the influence exerted. It's a sort of "Safety first," for the power that rules.

When the people has grown very much dissatisfied, those apparently in control of the government are removed by election, and others take their places; but the same old power is still on the

job, at all times; the same old power, only working through different instruments.

Kings employ prime ministers for much the same purpose. It used to be, when the king conducted his government directly, that the people, on growing dissatisfied, would rise up, kill the king, and set a new one up in business. That made the king business quite risky. So, prime ministers were hit upon to act as a sort of shock absorber. If the people got tired of the way things were going, the king removed the prime minister, put another in his place, and kept on going. Prime ministers made the king business easier and safer. Election serves much the same purpose for the power that really rules. An apparent change in government is made by election, but only an apparent change; no real change.

And, after election the people says: "Let's wait now, and see what these men do." And the people finds out soon enough. The people is always throwing out a poor man and putting a good man in, as it thinks: always putting that no-good party out and putting the other in. The people takes a lot of satisfaction in getting even with the party that doesn't suit it, by putting another in that suits it no better.

It is as though the people said: "Now, just for that, I won't let you steal any more of my money." It sees to be well understood that it is a punishment to be put out of power. It must be a privilege, then, to be in power.

That is what has been going on, Average, for years and years. And if the people gets, what seems to it, to be a good law, once in twenty years,

it remembers it a long, long time, and says, "See what good such a party did." And then, by and by, the joker in that good law begins to appear, and the people finally discovers that what that party really did, was the people. It has always been that way: always will be that way, so long as elections are had to get a government. Democracy! The people is always Bunkoed B' Gosh!

I will tell you what Democracy is, Average: Democracy is the preaching, "All men are created equal," put into practice. It is government of, by and for the people. You've heard the phrase, "That government of, by and for the people may not perish." It couldn't perish, Average. For, it didn't exist, and doesn't now.

Average, nuts have kernels; and Democracy, like a nut, has a kernel. The kernel in the nut of Democracy is, "For the people." "By the people," that it may be "For the people." "Of the people," that it may be "For the people."

"For the people," is the meat, Average. A government in behalf of the people, a government with an eye singly to the welfare of the whole people as a whole, just as the intellect governs the whole human body with the welfare of the whole human body as the objective,—that kind of a government is a Democracy to all intents and purposes—all that the people cares about Democracy. The form makes no difference. The substance is the whole matter. Any form will do, if it brings the substance.

To distinguish this Real Democracy, which I shall outline, this new Democracy, from this present Democracy, this hypocritical Democracy, this

misrepresentative Democracy, this Democracy of false representation, which we now endure, I shall call it, "Drawn Democracy." But Drawn Democracy is only representative Democracy, a Republic, in which the representation is true, and not false.

From the government of Drawn Democracy we will bar the criminal. He is a practical anarchist, anyway, one who shows by his conduct that he believes in no law, no government, and, since he does not live up to the laws when made, he should have no voice in making them. That is fair, and doing much better than at present, Average.

Every now and then, we hear of some congressman rising in his place to denounce a bill, and he calls it a steal. But the bill goes lightly on its way. It becomes law—that steal, by a majority vote. It is criminal to steal. Who were the thieves, Average, if that congressman spoke truly —and it is very likely that he did? A majority doesn't it seem?

Next, from the government of Drawn Democracy we will bar the young and inexperienced. It takes time to acquire experience and knowledge required in public affairs,—and we must have the best that we can get without doing any injustice. The young may safely and wisely rely upon a government conducted by their fathers and mothers—for mothers will be in it.

We will say to the young, "Wait, until you have had time to acquire sufficient information and experience. Between you, and your fathers and mothers, certainly, the fathers and mothers should be allowed to go first. Your time will come

later on." That will be fair. Anything will be fair that will not take from each his equal chance.

And, to the ignorant man, we will say, "We give you an equal chance to learn. Learn, and you may go in with us. We have learnt." And there can be no question that will be fair.

And at what age will we allow a citizen to offer

himself, or herself?

That, too, will be decided by the majority, Average, but, perhaps, at thirty, perhaps thirty-five. Certainly, the latter age should be high enough, but whatever the majority may think, should be agreeable to all of us.

And what educational qualifications? What will we demand?

At least, that those who present themselves must be able to read and write our language, and perhaps more, if it seems proper to the majority.

So then, we may have, as a minimum requirement, that only law-abiding citizens, over thirty years of age, who are able to read and write our language, may offer themselves as legislators, may seek a share in the government. The required number will then be drawn by lot from those who have offered themselves, who have volunteered.

There can be no question that all that will be perfectly fair. It will result in every class, every interest, being truly and properly represented in the government. To be sure each class, each interest, will be represented by the elders holding that interest, but that will treat each interest alike.

The unfairness in the result of election, to get a government, lies in the fact that some interests

are not represented at all, or are very poorly represented; for example, the farmers and the wage earners; while other interests have more than their fair share of representation; for example, lawyers, bankers, capitalists and professional politicians.

The method I propose, Average, will result in government by the elders, a government by the fathers and mothers of the nation. We depended upon those fathers and mothers during many years of our lives, for everything, and there can be no doubt we may depend upon them in the government, to establish justice, to the best of their knowledge and ability.

We must be sure that all the knowledge and ability in the government is working to establish justice, for everybody, and not for a part; injustice.

Those fathers and mothers will, unquestionably, enact such laws, and only such laws, as they may deem to be for the welfare of the whole nation.

Every interest, every class, fully represented, will be there to immediately inform that government of its special needs, of a point where justice may be established. None will have to organize, and prompt, and prod, that government to get it to do what it was set up to do.

Will those legislators know enough? Why, Average, we never lacked knowledge in our government. We have always had lots of it there, but, too often, it has been working for the other fellow.

A smart lawyer is a harm to you, Average, if he is on the other side, but a much greater harm to you, if he pretends to be on your side, and yet is on the other side.

What you should try to get, is as smart a lawyer as you can, who will surely be on your side. To be sure that the government will always be on the side of the people, there is nothing else that can be done except to draw the legislators.

And you mustn't forget, Average, that a congressman draws Seventy-five Hundred dollars per year, as salary, and is allowed twenty cents per mile, coming and going, to and from congress, for traveling expenses. And, also, he is allowed Twelve Hundred dollars per year for a secretary.

If a man from the country should happen to be drawn for congress, he could take his lawyer—one of those country lawyers—the best all-around lawyers—right along with him, to act as his secretary. If the salary allowed for secretaries should seem a little low to the lawyer, the congressman could make that up out of his own salary, and charge it off as "campaign expenses," since he wouldn't have any of those to pay under Drawn Democracy.

With a lawyer for secretary, if the congressman was in doubt how to vote on any bill, he might ask his lawyer, and then do as he pleased. That would be better than the present arrangement, whereby the lawyer goes down and votes as he pleases, and you have nothing to say at all, only to wait to get even.

Average, those fathers and mothers will be interested as the sons and daughters are interested. They will be always on the side of the people.

That council of elders, as we may call it, will approach in the intelligence displayed by its acts, the intelligence of the most intelligent individual on it, for, the most intelligent individual will communicate his intelligence to the rest. And the members will have nothing else to do but inform themselves, and, indeed, it may very reasonably be expected, that, long before they are drawn, they will have prepared themselves for the duties which they may one day have opportunity to fulfill.

That council of elders may call in experts to advise in intricate matters of peculiar knowledge. We need have no fear that it will not know enough. You, Average, do not know how to draw a deed or a mortgage, but you do know whether you wish to sell your land and take a mortgage back, and you have the expert prepare the papers for you according to your wishes and directions. And when they are prepared, you read them, and if they do not suit you, you require changes until they are made to conform to your agreement.

By no means do you put the expert in full charge of your whole business, because you do not know how to draw up the contracts. That is, in your private business you don't do that way. In your public business, the business of government, you do put the expert in full charge. He does it all.

And the term of office?

Well, that must not be so long that the members of the council may lose their identity of interest with the people. The council of elders must be kept always, "Of the people." I would suggest three years, as the term, choosing one third of the members each year, so that the council of elders, while continually changing, continually being refreshed from the mass of the people, still, will always have on it many who are up to date on what is doing in public affairs.

Some may be bribed?

Well, Average, so they may. But may that not happen now?

Each legislator drawn, Average, will vote as he sees fit, according to his own selfish interest. By doing that, he will be voting for, representing, all interested as he is—his constituents will be those interested as he is interested,—and if, by such a vote, a measure should carry, it will be because the majority of the council will be interested in having it carried, and, since the council will be in the nature of a sample of the people, the majority of the people will be interested in having that measure carried. That sample will want only what the people would want. It will do only what the people would do.

Since, each will vote according to his own private interests, to bribe a person, it will be necessary to bribe him to vote contrary to his own private interests, which, you must admit, is not so easy as to bribe one, who is presumed to vote, not according to his own private interests, but according to the interests of his constituents, whom he is presumed to represent, and who, thus, is often presumed to vote contrary to his own private interests.

Again, of course the objection to bribery is that it would result in the council taking action different from what it would take, if there were no bribery. That is, that it would result in action being taken contrary to the interests of a majority of the people, and contrary to what the majority wants.

That being the case, and since the council will be continually changing under Drawn Democracy, it will not be long until another body will be on hand, a body which has not been bribed, and which, since it will be a sample of the people, and the people doesn't want that law, will itself not want the law.

And, that body, not wanting the law, will repeal it, unless there is more bribery to prevent that action. So, to get a law upon the books, contrary to what the people wants, it will be, not only necessary to bribe many of the members, against their own interests, but it will also be necessary to be on hand every year, and to be continually bribing, to keep that law upon the books.

That will prove very dangerous for the briber, Average. And there is not much real bribery now, Average. It is not necessary to bribe the legislators now. The majority are owned, intimidated or controlled. Many of them are servants of Rich Mann, his private lawyers, sent there to act as his servants, to vote as he would vote if he were there.

And the law against bribery could be changed greatly for the better, too, Average. As it is now, both the giver and the receiver of a bribe are punished, if caught. So, bribery is made a sort of gentlemen's agreement, which each is equally interested in concealing. The law might be changed

so that only the giver would be punished, thus, doing away with that gentlemen's agreement.

And there is another little thing, while we are on the subject of bribery, Average. Your congressman now votes openly, in congress. That is, of course, for the assumed purpose, that you may know how he votes, so that if he doesn't vote as you would vote if you were there, you may retire him.

But that also makes it possible for Rich Mann to know how he votes, that he too may retire him. The practice of public voting lends itself to bribery very readily, since the purchaser may know whether or not the goods are delivered.

And, while those men in congress are voting openly, Average, you, in your election booth, are compelled to vote secretly, so that you may not sell your vote.

But, Average, there is one congressman for about every forty thousand voters in the election booth, and so, conceding your vote has power in the election booth, the vote of a congressman has forty thousand times as much power, in congress. And he votes openly in congress! Why not fix it so he can't sell his vote, too?

Even if he is more honest than the voter in the election booth, is he forty thousand times as honest? And if he is that, his vote is worth forty thousand times as much, so that would only leave him on a par with the voter in the election booth, as the temptation could be forty thousand times as great.

You would get a better government, Average, if those men in congress were compelled to vote

secretly at all times. The practice of voting openly does you more harm than good.

What good does it do you to retire a congressman because he didn't vote as you would have voted if you had been there, and then to send in his place another, which other, if he had been there, for anything that you may know, would have voted, just as the first one did?

And what about the other officers?

Don't say other officers, Average. Those fathers and mothers will not be officers at all. They, assembled as the council of elders, will be the government. I explained that to you already. An officer is only a servant of the government.

If the whole people should assemble to govern, it would be the government. Since the whole people cannot assemble, the council of elders will represent it, and will be the government, in its stead.

If the whole people should assemble and wanted a man to go and get some wood, it would hire a good man for that purpose; and if it wanted a good manager it would hire a good man for that purpose.

So, with the council of elders. The government will hire and fire its servants, just as you and I hire and fire our servants. Of course, Average, I might use the expression "discharge" or "ask for his resignation," but you know "fire" goes a little further, and "fire" is what I mean. If a man should be fired, I think he will be fired. His resignation will not be "asked for."

The council of elders will be the board of directors for the whole body of stockholders, the peo-

ple, and it will perform such duties as the board of directors of a private corporation usually performs. Indeed, Average, having now got so far as to have obtained a fair government, a board of directors, governing and directing for the welfare of the whole, we may reasonably expect that many of the practices followed by private corporations will be followed by the government of Drawn Democracy, and a government so efficient evolved, that it will be able to do all things that the private corporation does and with equal efficiency.

Likely, it will hire a president, as private corporations do, a public manager, and turn the administration over to him, subject to the direction of the council of elders, and that this manager will hire suitable men for the various branches he may find necessary, who, will in turn hire their subordinates, and so on.

Thus, the board will express its wishes, and it will be the duty of the public manager to do them, or to see that they are done. If there is any failure, the point where the failure occurred will be located almost immediately, and with certainty. There will be no passing the buck. Doing their duty will ensure officers of holding their jobs. Doing anything different, will ensure their prompt removal.

Comparisons

"He who will not reason, is a bigot;
He who cannot, is a fool;
He who dares not, is a slave."
—Byron.

CHAPTER FOUR

Pretty socialistic scheme?

Why, Average, no. Was it a pretty socialistic scheme for the lumber-jack to demand that the coins be tossed into the air instead of being laid? And if the coins were tossed into the air, don't you think that the change in favor of the lumber-jack was such, that it showed his wisdom in demanding that it be done? Do you think that lumber-jack, after he had tried the tossing method, could have been persuaded to go back to laying the coins again, by calling the tossing method, anarchism, socialism, bolshevism, or any other name that is used to scare you?

Drawn Democracy is only a different method of getting a government, in a Republic, a different method of getting a representative government.

Socialism is an economic system, not a method, and not a political system, though socialism does seek to have the economic system advocated put into force by the government.

The economic system under which we now operate, Average, may be called individualism, to dis-

tinguish it from socialism. The socialist calls individualism, the capitalistic system.

Under the practice of individualism, each works for his own benefit, and enjoys the product of that work, exclusively. Under the practice of socialism, all would work for the benefit of all, and all would enjoy the product of that work together.

Imagine a great body of people organized as a modern army is organized, and that army, as we may call it, supplying all the wants of each individual, and each individual doing the work assigned him by his superior.

Some would be set to work raising crops, others to gathering fuel, and still others, to cutting timber, and so on; and the product of all that work would be rationed out to each, share and share, alike. That army would be an illustration of a highly socialized state.

Or, suppose a half dozen of us should go hunting ducks. Shall we agree that each one shall keep for his own, the ducks that he may shoot? That would be individualism, or the capitalistic system. And that would be fair if all would conduct themselves fairly.

Or, shall we all shoot ducks, put the result of the hunt together, and then divide up, share and share, alike? That would be socialism. And certainly, that too, would be fair if all would conduct themselves fairly.

We are now practicing individualism. The burden of proof rests with those who would have us change to socialism. It is for them to show us that we would improve our condition by the change.

And now, why does the socialist advocate that we should make the change from this individualistic system, this capitalistic system, as he calls it, to the socialistic system? Why he says the game doesn't result fairly, that it isn't being played fairly. Well, that is true.

But is that a good reason for quitting the game? The game is fair if it is played fairly. Is there any assurance that any other game will be played fairly? Any game may be played unfairly.

Suppose you and I are engaged in a game of cards with another. And suppose that you propose to change to a different game, and urge, as your reason for making the change, that the third party is cheating, is dealing from the bottom of the deck. Isn't it for you to show me that he can't deal from the bottom of the deck in the other game? That he can't cheat? If he won't play one game fairly how can it be expected that he will play the other game fairly?

Or, suppose, again, that you and I, and a few others, should go picking berries together, but each for himself, individualistically, capitalistically, as I may say. And suppose in a little while it should develop that one of the party is running all over the patch, tramping down the bushes and destroying many berries, looking always for the best place; in other words, not playing fairly.

Then, suppose, that, to do away with that kind of action, we should arrange that what all picked should be put into one basket and divided up, share and share alike. Don't you think that it might soon happen that some one would have to complain that that party is now over under the

bushes, lying down, and not picking any berries at all, not working?

Under individualism we have to have a government, Average. The purpose in having that government is to see that the game of individualism is played fairly by all. But it isn't being played fairly now, Average. And the government doesn't take steps to see that it is played fairly. And that, Average, is because the government itself isn't fair. The government isn't fair because the method of getting it isn't fair. Election results in a capitalistic government: and it is the capitalistic governmental system that the socialist is really complaining of. He would do away with the capitalistic economic system, with capital, in order to keep capital from ruling.

So long as self-interest is in the world, Average, no one kind, in control of the government, will do justice to all kinds. The nature of man is such that it is impossible, and absurd to expect it.

Under the practice of socialism self-interest would not disappear; and there would have to be a government, a very strong government, a very centralized, efficient government; for there would be much more for the government to do. If the government, under socialism shouldn't be fair, much more injustice might result because the government would have much more power for good or evil.

But, the socialist doesn't propose a different method of getting a government. He would go on using election. He doesn't propose a fair method of getting a government. He would have Best Mann run the government just as it is now. That would let you out again, Average Mann. What have you ever done, Average, that was so bad, that no one ever proposes to let you run the government? And you do all the paying, all the work, and all the fighting.

The Best Mann has been tried, under individualism, and he cheats. If we should change the game to socialism would he change his ways? Never, Average, never. He would abuse his power again.

Under socialism some jobs would be more pleasant than others, some easier than others. With Best Mann still in control, what kind of a job do you think you would get, Average? Don't you think you might be digging ditches, while Best Mann and his supporters had charge of the rations? Don't you think you might be out in the hot sun, raising barley, while Best Mann and his supporters worked in the brewery?

Don't you think, Average, that you should insist that the government be made fair by using a fair method to get it, before you discuss any other change? Perhaps if there were a fair government to see that this game of individualism, which we are now engaged in, is played fairly, that you would like this game.

You can't better yourself, Average, by changing to another game, so long as the government which is to umpire the game, is unfair. And the government always will be unfair until the method of getting it is fair. The only method of getting it, that is fair, is to choose the members of the government by lot, to draw them.

Socialism is a sort of brotherly love game, Average, a sort of "Love-one-another" game.

And the game we are now engaged in is a sort of "Each for himself" game. Pretty selfish, I admit.

But doesn't it seem to you, that before attempting to qualify for that "Love-one-another" game

we should learn to play this game fairly?

Until every man is perfect, without a fair government no game will be played fairly. Drop all the "isms" until you have Drawn Democracy. When you have that, you will get, as a matter-of-course, whatever the majority may deem best for us all, no matter what name it may be called.

The socialist wants the capitalistic system of government done away with because it isn't fair. So, after all, what the socialist really complains of is the lack of a fair deal. Drawn Democracy is a fair deal to every man, and should be acceptable to all who want nothing more than that. If you meet Average Socialist tell him about it.

The Bolshevist is a socialist, too, Average. But socialists are of two kinds; the majority socialist, who believes in winning at the polls, waiting until he has a majority; and the Bolshevist, who believes in putting socialism into effect by a forceable overthrow of the government, direct action. He is for a "dictatorship of the proletariat." And the proletariat means, Average, the poorest class of society; strictly, the class that has no capital and lives on wages, lives by working for others for wages, the wage-earner.

The Bolshevist leader says he is for a "dictatorship of the proletariat," but since he rules the proletariat himself, it really amounts to a dictatorship of the leaders of the proletariat. A dic-

tatorship isn't a democracy. It doesn't propose to give even the wage-earners an equal share in the government. And the Bolshevist doesn't propose to do justice to any class except the proletariat. He promises them—you know—promises, too, Average.

You, Average, are not a proletariat. You are between the proletariat at the bottom and the aristocrat at the top, so you would have no share in the government, by any way of thinking, under a "dictatorship of the proletariat." You would be barred just as you are now.

All forms of government except only Drawn Democracy propose that you be barred, Average. And that, Average, is because you are known to honest, intelligent and fair. That is the record of your ancestors, the Average Mann of all the ages. And, since, you are known to be honest and fair, Average, and since every other form of government, except only Drawn Democracy, intends to be dishonest and unfair to some one, none of them want you to be in it.

You must remember, Average, Drawn Democracy is not for or against any political principle or party. It has nothing whatever to do with any political principles, except that it provides a better way of determining what principles the majority holds. It is an efficient method, the only efficient method possible to use, of getting the views of the majority on every question that may arise, just as soon as it arises.

Under our present system one party may advocate high tariff, and the other low tariff, when the tariff is the issue. The election is held. One or the other party wins upon that issue, and we may get what that party advocated, so far as the tariff is concerned. But many other matters will come up while that party is in power, upon which it will take action.

That party goes into power because it advocated, so far as the tariff is concerned, and only so far as the tariff is concerned, what the majority wanted. But, because that party advocated what the majority wanted in regard to the tariff, is no reason for presuming that such action as that party may take on other matters, while in power, will be the action that the majority wants taken. There is no surety as to that; not even a probability. And if it should happen—and it has happened—that the party should fail to put through even the tariff that it advocated, to get into power, what can be done? Why, the only thing that can be done is to wait for another election, put that party out, and put another in its place.

And there will be no more surety as to what that other party will do. There is no surety as to what any party will do. There is not even any surety that the party will keep the promises it made to get in. Parties often only pretend to

keep their promises.

Under Drawn Democracy there will be reasonable surety that such action as the lawmaking body may take, on every matter, will be agreeable to the will of the majority. For, the lawmaking body, under Drawn Democracy, will be in the nature of a sample of the people. And samples are sure to act almost exactly as the whole would act. The drawn lawmaking body will be

sure to do almost exactly what the people would do if it could meet. And the practice of drawing a part of the lawmaking body every year will make it sure that any action taken, not in exact conformity with the will of the majority, will soon be so changed as to conform.

That's all logical, Average, and may be tried out with samples of wheat, rye, oats, corn, barley, beans, chickens, sheep, and so on, before you make your decision in the matter of Drawn Democracy.

Couldn't very well have more than five or six hundred in such a lawmaking body, and you don't know whether that number would be large enough to get a fair sample of the people?

The number of units required to get a fair sample doesn't depend at all, Average, upon the number of units in the large mass of which the sample is to be taken. It depends only upon the number of different kinds of units that there are in the mass, with respect to the quality with which we are concerned.

The problem is to get a fair government. I will admit that the government should not consist of over five or six hundred individuals. To get a fair government by sample we must have fair representation of the people, not by color, height, weight, or age, but only by interests. We must have every interest fairly represented; that is all that is required.

Now, Average, there are not over seven or eight distinct interests to be found in the mass of the people. There are farmers, wage-earners, landowners, renters, capitalists, employers, and a few other interests. But many are interested in more than one way. A man may be a farmer, a landowner, and an employer. Or, he may be a farmer and a renter, or a wage-earner and a renter. So that all we have to do is to get fair representation for seven or eight basic interests and all interests will be fairly represented.

A drawing had, for five or six hundred from a mass containing only seven or eight interests, will naturally give each interest almost exactly its fair representation in the lawmaking body. Any slight variation will be averaged by succeeding drawings, so that it will be as fair for one as for the other.

That is assuming, of course, that all entitled to go, will volunteer, or, that volunteers will come from each interest, proportionately. Of course if none should volunteer from some particular interest, that interest will be without representation. But that is not a defect in the plan. That interest may have proper representation by volunteering, and if it doesn't do so, no one will be to blame except those holding that interest.

No one will be compelled to go. All will be given an equal chance to go. That's fair; that's justice; nothing else is. Fairness and justice is what we are after.

Well, there is nothing anarchistic about it?

Of course not, Average. An anarchist, Average, is one who is for no government at all, or, at best, a government of good manners. He says we will all treat each other justly without any laws. He is the worst kind of a reactionist. We came up from Anarchy. He's for going back. If we should go back some would start organizing at

once, Average, to get a cinch on the rest; and the rest would be compelled to organize in self-defense. So government would immediately start right over again.

The first government was the family, Average. The father ruled that as an autocrat. The next higher form was the clan, a collection of families related to one another. And after that, came the tribe and the state, and now we have the nation. That is as far as the world has got along.

Undoubtedly, way back in the ages, there were some who were opposed to the families uniting under one government into the clan. They were opposed to any government higher than the family. We might call them clan-anarchists, since they were opposed to the clan government.

Then, when the clans were uniting, undoubtedly there were many who were opposed to the clans going together in a tribe government. And we might call them tribe-anarchists, since they were against a tribe government.

And, again, undoubtedly there were those who were opposed to the tribes going together and forming a state government, and them we might call state-anarchists, since they were against a state government.

And, after that, there were those who were opposed to the states going together and forming a national government. Them we might call national-anarchists, since they were against a national government.

But, at all times, the anarchist was over-ruled, for, the formation of the higher government was as necessary to the preservation of peace and the establishment of justice, as was the formation of the lower, in the first instance. Sometimes the union came by agreement, but often by force. The stronger made the others join.

Thus, the world has got so far along as national governments. There are many national governments, and they live in a state of anarchy with respect to each other; just as the first families did. There is no law governing the nations. What we call international law is not law at all. There is no law unless made by a government, a higher power, a power strong enough to enforce obedience. And there is no such power for international law.

The next step in the development of government is a super-government, a world government, a government higher than the nations, to establish justice between the nations.

There are those who oppose such a government. And them we might call super-anarchists, since they are opposed to a super-government.

They say, "Shall we take orders from a body composed partly of men, not citizens of our nation?" I imagine that is just what the clanarchist, the tribe-anarchist, the state-anarchist, and the national-anarchist said in times gone by. But the government came, because it was necessary: there was nothing else that could be done. That is the only way to stop war, to preserve order, to establish justice where the nations of the world, as nations, are involved. And it will come; either by agreement or by compulsion, the stronger compelling the others to join.

But those in control of government everywhere prefer having supreme power in a nation, and a state of anarchy between the nations; to having limited power in the nation, and a state of order between the nations, to having a super-government. They seem to believe in the saying, "It is better to be the big toad in a little puddle, than to be a little toad in the big puddle," or, "It is better to reign in hell, than to serve in heaven."

Wars don't bother them. They don't fight them. You do that, Average.

How Suggested

"The rulers of the world
Unmercifully just, who punish all
To the severest rigours of the laws,
Are most unjust themselves, and violate
The laws they seem to guard; there is a justice
Due to humanity."

—Charles Johnson.

CHAPTER FIVE

How did I ever come to think of Drawn Democracy?

Well, Average, I will tell you that: Of course you heard the slogan, "Out of the trenches by Christmas?" On Christmas Eve, 1914, the greatest war the world has ever known had raged for months. On that western front hundreds of thousand of men of Germany faced other hundreds of thousands of men of France. Millions engaged! Bloody work their business! Awful death and terrible suffering their lot!

On that Christmas day there was a pause in the terrible work of killing. The men of France and the men of Germany were allowed to fraternize, for that day; and they did; but never again, during that war.

Neither the high command of Germany, nor the high command of France would consent to it again. It weakened the morale of the men. Morale? Yes, morale, spirit to fight, inclination to fight, willingness to fight.

When morale begins to disappear, Average, in its place there begins to appear, spirit of peace, desire for peace, inclination for peace, willingness for peace.

There was danger that those men might refuse to fight, might strike on the job of killing. A strike on the job. No more of that work done. No more fighting done. No more killing done. That would be peace, in fact. There was danger that those men might make a peace, in fact. The high commands did away with that danger. Those men were not permitted to fraternize again.

And there, upon that western front, Average, was the best representation, the greatest representation of the people of France, there ever had been anywhere; and there, too, was the best representation, the greatest representation of the people of Germany, there ever had been anywhere. There, was every class and every condition of the people of France; and there, was every class and every condition of the people of Germany. There was true representation for each country.

There, was France; and there, was Germany. And there was danger of peace; peace in fact; better than peace on paper.

Danger? To whom? To the people of France? No. Those men of France truly represented France. They would do nothing dangerous to their France.

Danger? To the people of Germany? No. Those men of Germany truly represented Germany. They would do nothing dangerous to their Germany.

The people of France and the people of Germany wanted peace. That would be good for the people of France and the people of Germany, not dangerous.

Danger? Then, to whom? Why, danger to the governments. Danger to the power that ruled the German people. Danger to the power that ruled

the French people.

What? Did not those governments want what was good for their people? Were they not governments of, by, and for the people? No. They were not governments of, by, and for the people. They were governments of, by, and for the power that ruled.

Those men were fighting, not for the people, but for the powers that ruled them. The powers were at war, not the people.

When those men came to talk to each other they must have learned that each army was being told by its government, that the other had started the war. For, that is what each government was telling its men; that on their side it was a defensive war, a war to preserve their country. They were Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Of course those men would make peace. It seemed that both sides were fighting under a misapprehension of the facts. There was a mistake. Why should they not quit? Each side was willing: fighting is poor pastime.

There, was the best kind of representation for each people, Average. And those men, when they came together, would have so conducted themselves that good would have resulted for the peoples that they represented. They would have

ended the war: they would have made a real peace, not a peace on paper.

I got to thinking that over, Average. And it occurred to me, that, if a body of men like the German army, and another body of men like the French army, each body small enough so that it could hold a meeting,—if that could be had, and the task of making peace should be left to those bodies, peace would soon be made between those countries.

Then the peace conference came. Best Mann came to the front, Average Mann went to the rear; stepped out; would be called again if his work were resumed.

Great hopes were entertained of what that peace conference would accomplish. All those hopes were dashed. All the promises that Best Mann had been making during the war were broken. Just such a peace as has been made hundreds of times before, in this world, was made. While making an end of one war, the conference planted seeds of many wars. But Best Mann made some nice speeches. Average Mann couldn't have made such nice speeches, though he might have made a better peace.

And so, Average, I came to think, how much more likely it would be that a permanent peace would be established if each of the nations, instead of sending their Best Mann to make the peace, would send, instead, bodies of men, like those armies, bodies obtained in the same way that those armies were obtained, men drawn.

Each representative body might meet in its own hall, and consider propositions there, make

its decisions, and, by messenger, send them in to a central body for comparison, a kind of clearing house for propositions.

Shall France have Alsace-Lorraine? Or, shall it remain a part of Germany? Well, what difference does it make? Tariffs. Economic barriers. Whichever nation has it may put up barriers against the other, economic barriers. Is that all? Yes. Well, what good are those barriers to the people as a whole? No good. They are only fertile causes of war, injuries to the people as a whole, benefits only to the ruling power.

Those bodies, truly representative of their people will agree that all economic barriers shall be removed. One cause of war gone!

Freedom of the seas? You Germans were fighting for that? Who objects? Not the people of England. Only the ruling class of England objects.

That body of men truly representative of the people of England is fair and square and it will not plant seeds of another war by insisting upon dominion of the seas. The seas should be free; that's fair, and that body of fair men will concede the point.

And, so it would go on through the Fourteen Points; open covenants openly arrived at. There is really nothing for the people of the various nations to war with each other over. The governments, misrepresentative of the people, find much to war over. The ruling power in every nation is now engaged in a never-ending contest for more power. Wars are only moves in that contest.

No people is interested in holding, or desires

to hold, another people in subjection. Only the governing class which exploits its own people, and which wishes to exploit, not for the benefit of any people, but for its own exclusive benefit, is interested in holding another people in subjection.

These thoughts all came to me, Average, with many others. And, thinking along these lines it occurred to me that Drawn Democracy would be a very good thing to have, not only for the purpose of getting a fair government for the people of the nation, but also for the purpose of making a hopeful start toward the end of all war.

If we should adopt it, other nations of the world might adopt it, too, until finally, that would be the form of government in every nation.

It would bring fair governments everywhere. With fair governments in control of the affairs of each nation, the world over, no nation would be so likely to treat another unfairly as at present; for the losses of war would have to be borne by all, not by a part of the people, while the other part prospered. Thus, there would be an increased tendency for every nation to act fairly toward every other nation.

Of course there might arise differences of opinion as to what is fair, and, perhaps certain rules of conduct might be found necessary. And drawn bodies of men from the nations of the world might meet and adopt such rules. The bodies being fairly obtained, would be fair, and the rules would be fair. Fairness might have a better chance in the world, Average. Fairness should begin at home.

That, Average, is how I came to think of Drawn

Democracy, and those are some of the thoughts that came to me regarding it.

After studying the matter for sometime, Average, I came to the conclusion that you ought to know about it. You are a pretty fair fellow, Average. I am sure you do not want anything more than what is fair. And you are praying for the end of all war. You ought to. You ought to be the man to decide about war. You are the man who fights the war: you are the man who pays for the war: you are the man who never gains by a war, but always loses. No wonder you are praying for the end of all war!

But, "God helps them who help themselves," Average. It is within your power to help yourself. Why not do a little thinking? You are the man who should run your own government, Average. And the Average Mann of every other country should run his own government. It's your business to run yours. Why should you let Best Mann run it for you? Do you need a guardian? Average, you are being Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Has Drawn Democracy ever been tried anywhere?

Yes, Average, I have found out about that, too. You have heard of Athens, no doubt, Average; Athens of the wonderful civilization, ancient Athens, of Greece? Well, Average, Drawn Democracy was the form of government that brought that Athens to the height of its greatness and glory.

In the Athenian Democracy the lawmaking body was chosen by lot from all law-abiding citizens over thirty years of age. The lawmaking body consisted of five hundred men. The term of office was one year. The method of choosing was as follows: Five hundred black beans were mixed with white ones; then the drawing took place. Those who drew black beans went to make the laws.

The executive, the manager, was elected. He had nothing to do with legislating, no more than any private citizen; no veto power.

And under that form of government Athens flourished so grandly, Average, that the time has been called by historians, "The Golden Age."

Writing of Athens under that form of government, the historian says: "It was at this time that the dominion of Greek thought—of philosophy, of oratory, of art—was established on a basis which has not been materially shaken by the revolutions of twenty-two centuries, and which seems destined to be everlasting."

And, Average, every form of government that the world has ever known, excepting only that Athenian Democracy, has, sooner or later, crumbled, and gone to pieces, because of the inherent unfairness of the system.

The pages of history are filled with stories of the downfall of monarchies, autocracies, aristocracies, plutocracies, and elective republics, such as ours is; downfalls traceable to the rottenness within the government, due to the system.

The Democracy of Athens is gone, but it endured for a period longer than our government has been in existence, and, when it did go, it was not because of any fault within the state or in the system. It was conquered by a greatly superior force.

Superior force, from without, accomplished the downfall of Athens. No historian may be found who attributes its downfall, in any manner, to anything within the state, or in the system of government.

Athens grew great and flourished under Drawn Democracy. The Average Mann of ancient Athens ruled, and he ruled well. He managed his own business. No Best Mann was guardian over him. Justice was established. From that day to this, search the whole wide world through, there has never been a government, so fair, so just, so pleasing to the people governed.

"Make the world safe for Democracy!" Average, a man, from ancient Athens, would laugh you in the face, if you should tell him your government is a Democracy. He would tell you that your government is an oligarchy, a plutocracy, a government by a few, and that few, the Rich.

And that man from Athens would know what he was talking about, Average. For Athens had tried the form that you have, Average, and had found it absolutely unfair, and to result in everincreasing unfairness.

Now, Average, there are men who will say: "We don't care anything about that ancient history stuff. We are living now: we aren't living twenty-four hundred years ago."

Such men are no wiser than the farmer would show himself to be, who, when his horses were all taken with a sickness, on being informed that Farmer Brown, over in the next township, had his horses all down with that sickness last year, and, on its being suggested to him that he go over to Farmer Brown, find out what he had done, and how his horses had come out, would reply, "I don't care anything about Farmer Brown's horses. It's my horses that are sick; not his. And, anyway, I ain't living last year: I'm living now."

Long ago, a wise man said: "The lives of other men should be regarded as a mirror, from which we may take example, and a rule of conduct for ourselves."

We may take the advice of that wise man, and go back to Athens, find our same problem there, find out how it was solved, and what the result was. And we can go to the lumber-jack and ask him what he did, and how he came out. That's better than experimenting.

And, Average, we may go back to that ancient Greece, composed of its many city-states, and find a league of nations, and discover how that league resulted, and why.

And if we should go back and investigate that ancient league of nations, Average, we would find that the king of one country, possessed of many rich gold mines, had been able to dominate the whole league, to rule it.

That ancient king, in his cups said, that he didn't find it much trouble to get any of those city-states to comply with his wishes after he had managed to get a mule-load of gold through the gates of that city. They carried gold on the backs of mules then, Average. And the politician was inside the city gates.

There are mules today, Average; and gold, too. And the politician is not absent. The politician!

"No man's condition is so base as his;
None more accursed than he; for man esteems
Him hateful, 'cause he seems not what he is:
God hates him, 'cause he is not what he seems;
What grief is absent, or what mischief can
Be added to the hate of God and man?"

How would Drawn Democracy be worked in a township or small village government?

I'll explain that to you, too, Average. But before we consider how it would be worked in the different governments, let us first suppose that the qualifications for membership in the governments have been agreed upon, made law. These might be: law-abiding citizen, over thirty years of age, able to read and write, as I stated before, or, they might be different, as might seem best to the majority. Of course, I can only guess as to what would be agreed upon, so we will only suppose that those are agreed upon.

And let us also suppose that for all governments the term of office for the members has been fixed at three years, and that it has been provided that one-third of the members shall be chosen each year. Of course that, too, is only supposition, as, after due consideration, it might be considered advisable to have the term four years and one-fourth of the members chosen each year. We can only guess at that.

Then, having the qualifications determined for membership in all governments, and the term of office fixed, we will imagine a town meeting comes round.

Perhaps for the town government it has been

provided that the board shall consist of nine members. At the town meeting all qualified who might wish to serve on the board might then offer themselves. The drawing would then take place, and the three chosen would serve for three years.

This board would be the governing body of that town, the board of directors, and have such full authority in all matters as may have been provided by law. It would employ a public manager to conduct the town business. The public manager would be the town executive. The board might have the town manager act as town clerk and town treasurer also, or it might choose others to act in those capacities, as it should see fit.

And all that I have said about the town government would apply as well to the small village government. Perhaps in the latter government it would be more probable that there would be a separation of the treasurership and clerkship.

But, as I explained to you before, Average, there is really not much need of Drawn Democracy in a township or small village government. The town board has practically no legislative power, being only an administrative board, and the town business would be very likely as well conducted by having that administrative body chosen at a meeting of the people of the town, as that would be Real Democracy, anyway.

And, while the village has some legislative power, in so far as village ordinances are legislation, the village board, or council, is also, only an administrative body, and if chosen at a meeting of the people, there would be in effect Real Democracy. While we now have several members on

both the town and the village board, it is not unusual that one man is the "whole thing." And this occurs because it is convenient and the man may be relied upon to do right.

It is when we got to the county government, and the large city government that Drawn Democracy would begin to show its real worth.

The county board, for instance, might consist of fifteen members; perhaps nine would be considered sufficient.

The county board would hire a public manager, a treasurer, and a book-keeper, or county auditor. Perhaps, too, the county superintendent of schools would be hired by the board as that is a very distinct department from ordinary municipal affairs.

There isn't much question that the county board could go down to any one of the banks that now are using the county money, generally, free of charge, and make an arrangement with that bank to have one of its officers act as county treasurer on account of that money, free of charge to the county. The county auditor might just as well perform the duties of register of deeds and clerk of court. Of course he might have to hire more clerks, but these clerks wouldn't be so expensive to the county as these other clerks, the elected register of deeds and clerk of court. The counties are paying altogether too much for the service they get. There is no reason why a county should pay a clerk two or three times as much as private corporations do for the same class of work.

Then, the public manager might act as sheriff, personally or through deputies hired for the purpose. And he could attend to all other county

business, such as looking after roads, bridges and so on.

There would be an immense saving to the county by cutting out elections, alone. And then there would be further saving in the conduct of its public business, so that, there is a probability, that a total saving to the county of at least twenty-five per cent of the amount now expended might be effected, even in the smaller counties, and a much larger percentage of savings in larger counties.

That would be business. It is not business attaching a high salary to an office and then having a free-for-all scramble for the job every couple of years. The officers, under Drawn Democracy, would be hired by the board and kept so long as they performed their duties satisfactorily, and thus, more efficient officers would be had at all times.

Some of the officers, in counties, are now being paid for doing the work, which they employ cheap clerks to do, while they acquire habits of leisure, walking round, talking politics, and looking for something better. It is not infrequently that a good farmer is spoiled by being elected to a county office. Counties probably pay five times as much for the work, actually done, as private corporations would pay for the same amount of work. Government costs too much as it is now conducted.

How would Drawn Democracy be applied in a city the size of St. Paul?

There, now, Average, it is getting better. We are beginning to get up where the need of Drawn

Democracy is still greater, where the change would be more marked, and all for the better.

Perhaps a board in a city of the size of St. Paul, should consist of forty-five, sixty, or even seventy-five, or more; whatever number might seem advisable.

That board would act as a board of directors for the city. It would hire a public manager. It would, probably, also hire the school supervisor, since a public manager could hardly be expected to qualify in educational matters as well as municipal matters; and a city treasurer and a city clerk. Just what would be done is a matter of supposition, only, Average. I just want to show you how it might be done.

The public manager would employ his subordinates, leaving to them the employment of their subordinates, and so on down, to the man who washes the windows in the city hall. And if the man washing windows didn't do his work properly, there would be his immediate superior to go to, and if no satisfaction was obtained there, his superior; and so on up, until that drawn board, fair, because fairly chosen, would have the matter to right. And it would be righted. There would be no passing the buck. No slighting of the matter because the window washer was the second cousin of the man who carries the vote of the tenth precinct of the second ward round in his vest pocket. Nobody would carry any votes around in any pocket under Drawn Democracy, Average.

That public manager might be secured from some smaller city where he had made good, might

come from another state, even; a business board. looking only to the welfare of the City of St. Paul, wouldn't care where he came from, Average, just so he was the man that could do the business properly, just so he could manage the city affairs as they ought to be managed, as a private corporation manages its affairs.

You'll have to guess how much Drawn Democracy would save the tax-payers of the City of St. Paul, Average; I have no idea, but I venture to state the sum would stagger you.

Politics would be as dead as a door-nail in your city of St. Paul, Average: that is, the mooching for political power, the maneuvering to get into position to do good—the people good—or the people well.

The City of St. Paul is now under the commission form of government. The affairs of the city are entrusted to six commissioners and a mayor, elected, that is, who won out in that contest of talking and promising, lately held. They wanted the jobs, and they had time to spare and money to spend. All who didn't have time to spare and money to spend in contesting for the office were barred.

That contest for government takes place every two years. The results of using it to get a government in the City of St. Paul are well known.

I have often been told that one man had run the city for more than twenty years. He was the political boss. People complained because there was a political boss. Why complain about a boss? Election always results in a boss. Sometimes the

boss is a gang; and we hear of the city-hall gang, and the court-house clique.

The first political boss that I have read about, Average, was a man named Pisistratus. He was called by those whom he bossed, "Pisistratus, the Tyrant." He took control of the government of Athens—that same Athens of which I told you a little while ago—and that was five hundred and sixty years before the birth of Christ. Men are slow to learn, aren't they, Average, when they don't want to? Athens then operated under a constitution which provided for election of a government.

History says of Pisistratus: "Though he, himself, held no office, by reason of his numerous friends and his great wealth, he was able to control all offices." And the people liked that so well that he received the name "Tyrant," to more fully describe him. He was in control for many years. And when he died his place was soon taken by another boss.

Continuing to use election in Athens to get a government, discontent continued to increase, until there was danger, great danger. Danger to the whole state, from the outside, on account of the dissensions within; and, danger to the aristocracy within, on account of the hatred prevailing among the masses of the people for that aristocracy which was enabled to rule by reason of election. There was a Red Peril, Average, way back in those times. Injustice is productive of Red Perils.

Facing that Red Peril, there came to the front one Clisthenes, himself an aristocrat, but pos-

sessed of more intelligence and caution than aristocrats have usually displayed through the ages; and, he proposed a constitution, which provided for choosing the government, the lawmakers, by lot. And that constitution was adopted about five hundred years before the birth of Christ. Athens lived under it; grew great and flourished. It remained the constitution so long as Athens was free.

Of course, when Athens adopted that constitution the aristocratic states, its neighbors, were not pleased, and some of the aristocrats within Athens preferred election. They wanted to change back.

At one time some of the other states made war on Athens, and succeeded, with the help of the aristocrats within, in overthrowing that form of government, for a time. The government was then placed in control of thirty aristocrats, and those thirty aristocrats became, and are known in history as, "The Thirty Tyrants." You may judge why, Average.

However, they didn't last long. They were soon chased out, and the government of Drawn Democracy was established again. From that time on, Athens went on its way, contented and happy, for all of anything that happened within.

But to get back to our subject, the City of St. Paul and its government: Those seven men, elected because they were good fellows, because they had friends, because they were good talkers, because they were willing to, and had time to spare, and money to spend in advertising themselves;—those men, without any special experience in line with the duties which they are called

upon to perform, have charge of the expenditure of more than SEVEN MILLION DOLLARS! Is it any wonder that there were many willing to spend time and money in contesting for the positions?

And all this, Average, is not spoken in disparagement of any of those men. They, probably, are as efficient as election ever will bring. I am only trying to point out to you the lack of efficiency in election as a method to get a government. Election can't result in anything better.

Do you not think, Average, that it would be very much better for the people of the City of St. Paul if Drawn Democracy were practiced by it, and a public manager who had had years of experience in the business, and who had shown his ability along the required lines, should have full charge of the city's business, under the direction of a fair board of directors, upon which board you would have just as good a chance to sit as any other man, without your spending one hour of your time or one dollar of your money?

The only way that public manager could hope to hold his position would be by doing the right thing. And by doing that he might hope to secure still better positions, either with larger city governments or the state, or, even the nation. Caught in one piece of dishonesty he would be removed, as would be done with the cashier of any bank today. And removal, for any such reason as that, would mean that it would be impossible for him to hope to secure a similar position anywhere.

His profession would be that of Public Manager. It would be his livelihood. It would be the

profession for which he had trained himself, that in which he had acquired special ability. To lose that, would mean so much to him that it is not likely he would risk it. It's the best way, Average. It's the business way. It's the efficient way. It's the cheapest way. Think of all the money you have to pay for elections, in your taxes; money paid to be Bunkoed B' Gosh!

And the state?

In the state it would be much as I have outlined for the City of St. Paul, Average. Probably the board would be more numerous, maybe consist of one hundred and fifty, or something like that. And possibly the board would keep more of the department heads directly responsible to it by hiring them itself, instead of leaving that to the state manager.

Just what would be done, I can only conjecture. But I am very positive that, if the people of the state wanted a tonnage tax or anything else, it would get it, at once, and from the first board drawn. Do you doubt?

And I think it extremely probable that, if Drawn Democracy had been in effect in the state since its admission to the Union, those iron mines up there would belong to the people now, Average. It never would have lost them. Save some taxes, wouldn't it, Average? And there wouldn't be any tonnage tax talk at all.

The Nation

"Custom is the law of fools."-Vanburgh.

CHAPTER SIX

The nation?

The nation; that is the place where Drawn Democracy would make a greater difference than you may imagine, Average. Let us look a little into national matters before examining how Drawn Democracy would be applied in the nation.

In the last three years, Average, a war debt of about Thirty Billion Dollars has been created. You are the head of a family, consisting of three children, your wife and yourself. Your share of that national debt, Average, is One Thousand Five Hundred Dollars. That is what you will have to pay to get rid of it. And every month the interest on your share will be about Six Dollars. Six Dollars a month you will pay in a manner, perhaps, somewhat roundabout, but you'll pay it.

Your government, when it issued the bonds which evidence that debt, received Thirty-cent Dollars. So, reckoned in Hundred-cent Dollars, that debt was only Nine Billion Dollars when it was created. And now, there is a movement on foot, a movement by the money power, to deflate,

which means to make prices lower, or, also, to make the Dollar a Hundred-cent Dollar. You hear, "We must get back to normal." And, very generally, people think that would be a good thing. Average, it doesn't make any difference where prices are, just so they stay steady, and everything is adjusted to them. It makes no difference whether wheat is Three Dollars per bushel, or Ten Cents per bushel, if the Ten Cents will buy you as much as the Three Dollars, and it will, when prices are adjusted to that settled scale.

To deflate, Average, means that those Thirty-cent Dollars which the government borrowed and which you will have to pay, will be made One-hundred-cent Dollars. So, for the Nine Billion One-hundred-cent Dollars the government received, it will pay Thirty Billion Hundred-cent Dollars back.

That transaction will mean a dead loss of Twenty-one Billion Hundred-cent Dollars. Your share of that loss, alone, will be a little over One Thousand Dollars. That loss could be averted, Average. The right kind of a government would long ago have taken steps to avoid that. It could be done.

Average, you read in the papers that the German Mark is down, so that, it is worth only one one-hundredth part of what it was, that the French Franc is down, that the Italian Lira is down, and that the English Pound is down. But you don't read in the papers that the American Dollar is down. No, here, it is prices, that are up. That is not true, Average. Prices didn't really go up during the war. The Dollar went down.

And that is because it is a gold Dollar, Average, and gold goes down in war time, as strawberries do in the summer time, or as ice does in the winter time.

Your government knows that. Thousands of men know it. Your government, if it does not know how to remedy that condition, could find out. But it is not interested in anything of the kind. What is your loss, Average, by reason of the fluctuation in that Dollar, is the gain of the power that controls your government. That power would never let the change be made. And any who propose such a change will be considered its enemy.

Your government could adopt a Dollar that would not go up or down, whether it were summer time or winter time, war time or peace time. All it would have to do would be to use a Dollar that meant a certain weight of some commodity that does not go up or down, or, thinking the other way, that goes up and down, as the other necessaries of life do. That never will be done until there is Drawn Democracy.

Now, Average, you will hear some man say, "That couldn't be done." He is the man who said they couldn't have ships go under the water, and that they never could fly. And he is a direct lineal descendant of the man who said they never could sail round the world, "Because when they get on the other side, they will fall off."

Way back in the ages of savagery, Average, men picked on gold to use for money because it was the lightest load, with respect to value. The intelligence employed in so picking it was no greater than that of the average boy of five years, who picks a light stone to throw, instead of a heavy one. Why, even donkeys know enough to prefer a light load! That Federal Reserve Note that you have in your pocket is a promise to pay you a certain weight of gold. It could just as well be a promise to pay you a certain weight of food. And if it were a promise to pay a certain weight of food, you can readily see that it wouldn't go down in purchasing power in war time, or any other time.

It is just the way you think of these things, Average. You think it is perfectly natural for the weather to become warm in July, and it is, if you are thinking of the northern hemisphere; but, if you are thinking of the southern hemisphere, it is perfectly natural for the weather to become cold in July.

And so it is with prices. You think it is perfectly natural for prices to go up in war time, and it is, if you are thinking of gold; but, if you are thinking of grain, for instance, it is perfectly natural, for things as necessary as grain, to stay steady, not to move either up or down, and perpectly natural for all other things not so necessary as grain to go down in price.

There is one loss to you, Average, which will be about One Thousand Dollars when the gentlemen have deflated, or "got back to normal." And that loss the government could have prevented if it looked after your interests as the farmer looks after the farm, or as the father and mother look after the interests of their children.

And, it is true, Average, that the operating

Charles and

expenses of your government for the coming year will be Six Billion Dollars, approximately. Your share of that expense, which you will have to pay without question, will be Three Hundred Dollars, since you are the head of the family. Drawn Democracy would save the disgraceful waste in governmental expenditure, Average, and that would be, without doubt, as much as twenty-five per cent. I think fifty per cent would be nearer correct. And your share of that twenty-five per cent saving, Average, would be Seventy-five Dollars.

So, you see, Average, Drawn Democracy is not only a matter of abstract justice, but is a matter of Dollars and Cents with you. When you come to consider what it would save you in the national government, the state government, the city government and the county government, you can see that you can go out and spend Seventy-five Dollars to put Drawn Democracy through-which would be, at a conservative estimate, what it would save you in the national government in one year—and then, when you get it, the first year of its operation you will have as clear profit all that it will save you in the state, the city and the county governments. And every year after that it will pay more than One Hundred per cent dividend on your investment of Seventy-five Dollars.

That Thirty Billion Hundred-cent Dollars, that is to be paid for the Nine Billion Hundred-cent Dollars actually received, is going to be paid, Average, in commodities produced by the toilers of the nation, the farmers, the men who work in the factories, in the mines, on the railroads, in the

woods, and so on, going to be paid by the toilers of today or their sons and daughters, to those who rule today, or their sons and daughters. And that extra Twenty-one Billion, for which no value was received, will enable many a man of today, and his descendants for many generations to come, to live off the fat of the land, without either toiling or spinning.

Twenty-one Billion Dollars lost! The human mind is incapable of comprehending what Twenty-one Billion Dollars means, Average.

If Two Million soldiers went across to France, and each soldier had taken forty-two pounds of pure gold, Troy weight, and thrown it into the deepest part of the sea, that would represent a loss of Twenty-one Billion Dollars.

Average, let's calculate a little: A gold dollar weighs 25.8 grains. And Twenty-one Billion Dollars would weigh Five Hundred and Forty-one Billion grains. Seven Thousand grains make one pound avoirdupois. So, Five Hundred and Forty-one Billion grains would equal Seventy-seven Million Four Hundred Thousand pounds. And there are Two Thousand pounds in a ton. So, reduced to tons, it would be Thirty-eight Thousand Seven Hundred tons.

Suppose we made up our minds to haul that amount of gold dollars with teams, loading each wagon with one ton. We would hire a man to load up the wagons. Let us say the man would load a ton every forty minutes—which would be working fast—and that he works eight hours per day. Then he would load twelve tons per day.

Let him load up the first team and drive that

team into the road and let it stand there until the other teams are loaded. Average, if that man worked three hundred days per year, that first team would have to stand in the road waiting for more than ten years.

Well, then, we would finally get the teams all loaded. Then we would start them out, allowing to each team and wagon two rods space on the road—thirty-three feet—which would be close for teaming purposes. That procession of teams and wagons would be over Two Hundred and Forty-one miles long. Traveling at the rate of Twenty-four miles per day, it would take that procession ten days to pass a given point.

And now let us find where the procession will come from and in what direction it will move. Average, your share of the national debt being Fifteen Hundred Dollars, if you have that amount of government bonds, your account balances. It will make no difference to you that the dollar goes up or down. But if you have less than Fifteen Hundred Dollars of government bonds you will be a loser; and if you have more than Fifteen Hundred Dollars of government bonds you will gain by moving the dollar back to one hundred cents.

That procession of teams, Average, will move from those men who have less than Fifteen Hundred Dollars of government bonds to those who have more than Fifteen Hundred Dollars of government bonds. It will start from Poverty Flat for Aristocratic Avenue. Down on the Flat each will contribute his full share of the loss and receive nothing back. As the procession begins to

near Aristocratic Avenue, those along the way will contribute their full share but will also receive something back, until, finally, number Fifteen Hundred is arrived at. There, as much will be thrown off as is taken on. After that, all along the Avenue, more will be thrown off than is taken on. The more bonds each has, the more will he receive from that procession of teams. In other words, the richer the man is, the more he will get from those who lose.

Average, that procession will move from the Poor to the Rich. It will make the Poor, poorer yet. And it will make the Rich, richer yet. And that will not be the only procession, Average. There will be another start, from all who contracted debts, to all who lent money. And that will be a long one. And what will be going on in this country will be going on in every other country of the world, Average, where gold is the standard of value. Poor, made poorer; Rich made richer.

Is it any wonder that a great bank in New York City sent out, in its monthly bulletin to its customers, the warning: "There must be no tampering with the gold standard, as it is the basis of our prosperity." The scales aren't right, Average, when they are the basis of anybody's prosperity.

If that procession of teams loaded with gold were moving from the Rich to the Poor, instead of from the Poor to the Rich, how long do you think it would take that congress to stop it by changing to a dollar that didn't expand and contract? That door was slammed in your face, Average, when the meeting was held, because you were going to be Bunkoed B' Gosh!

If you are a wise man you will get to work at once, with your neighbors, to arrange so that all will have an equal chance to go in that door. You may organize, and organize, forever. Nothing but the open door will do you justice. That's the truth, Average.

Average, it would be a good business proposition for you to leave off your usual work for a few days, and get round and explain Drawn Democracy to your neighbors. You'll be getting ahead financially much faster, than by staying home, working. You are like a man who is milking into a pail that is leaking. The pail would get full much sooner, if he would lay off milking a little while, and stop the leak.

Read this news item, Average, that I cut from the columns of my evening paper, the St. Paul Dispatch, last night:

GOVERNMENT PAYS \$48 FOR FIFTY CENT HINGE

New York, Nov. 27.—Testimony tending to show alleged abuse of the cost-plus form of contract in repairs to Shipping Board vessels was given here today before the congressional committee investigating Shipping Board affairs by Harold F. Hanes, an examiner of the board's auditing department.

The witness said that at Norfolk, Va., he saw a bill for \$48, which had been paid for putting a 50-cent hinge on a galley door. A machinist, he asserted, was employed to cut the hinge from a heavy piece of steel instead of going out and buying it.

He testified twenty-five men had been sent aboard a ship and remained there one week and were allowed pay for thirty-nine hours a day.

Discovery of silverware marked "U.S. Shipping Board" in a hotel at

Yokohama, and street vendors selling Shipping board linen at La Pallice also was testified to.

The witness said that on January 15 last he had heard a report that sailors on board a ship undergoing repairs at the Cramp & Co. yards had signed and sealed a statement alleging that the repair work was not being properly done. The sailors had made it a condition, he said, that their statement was not to be opened unless something happened to the ship after it had sailed.

Now, Average, tell me the truth. From the inmates of which penitentiary, do you think a government should be drawn, to get one, under which you would have to pay more for a fifty-cent hinge?

Paying that kind of prices, Average, will bring you to a point where you will have to try to get in thirty-nine hours per day, too.

That is your silverware in that hotel in Yokohama, Average. What are you doing? Moving? And that is your linen that is being peddled in La Pallice, Average. Are you selling out?

And that ship, Average, calls to mind your Ship of State. "Sail on! Oh! Ship of State!" It doesn't sail, Average. It is isn't being sailed. It isn't being navigated. It is drifting with the current of events, while the crew on board is busy looting, and throwing the cargo over board to the pirates who put them in charge. Drifting with the current of events, Average, and there are Rapids ahead, and Rocks below. That's your ship, Average, and you better do what I tell you to do, if you want to save it.

And that cost-plus business, Average, reminds me of the Federal Reserve Bank, which is run on a sort of cost-plus, basis, too. Cost-plus, Average, means cost, plus a certain per cent of profit? For instance, the government might let a contract for the building of a ship and agree to pay the cost, whatever it might be, plus ten per cent profit.

The Federal Reserve Act provides that the Federal Reserve Bank shall have power to issue money—Federal Reserve Notes. As originally passed, the law provided that, after paying the stockholders six per cent dividend, the bank might retain one half of the excess profit, and that only until it had accumulated a surplus of forty per cent of its capital stock. That law was amended in the year 1919 so that the Federal Reserve Bank may retain, after paying six per cent dividend to the stockholders, all of the excess profit over that, until such time as it shall have accumulated a surplus of one hundred per cent of its capital stock, and, thereafter, it may retain ten per cent of the excess over six per cent, which ten per cent goes into the surplus. Thus, you will see, an enormous surplus is accumulated, some of the banks having already accumulated the hundred per cent surplus.

The purpose in organizing the Federal Reserve Bank was to do away with money panics. And it will do that, Average. For, if the people should begin to draw money out of the banks, and to hide it away, the Federal Reserve Bank may issue more money, so that the banks will never get out of money, no matter how long a run may last. It is a pretty good thing to stop money panics, Average.

That Federal Reserve Bank is controlled by a

board of governors, consisting of seven members, appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate. Do you doubt that they are very likely to be politicians? That board has all that capital under its control, and all that surplus. It may determine the rate of interest that it shall charge for money, may determine that it will lend no money for any particular purpose or purposes, as, for instance, for buying automobiles or farms. Therefore, it may determine that it will lend no more money for any purpose, as a consequence. Thus, it may tighten up on money; and then, it may loosen up on money. When money is easy, prices go up; and when money is tight, prices go down. So, that board has it within its power to fix the level of prices, to determine whether prices shall be high, or low. That is quite a power to exercise, Average. You and I could afford to pay millions just for the privilege of exercising that power, only.

For instance, we could go out and sell a lot of grain and securities on the stock market, for future delivery. Then we could tighten up on the money. That would make grain and stocks fall in price on the market. When the grain and stocks got low, we could buy, and deliver to those to whom we had contracted to sell. And, by so doing, we could make a pretty penny.

And then, we could buy some more grain and stocks to hold, loosen up on the money, make money easier. And that would make prices for grain and stocks go up on the market. Then, we could sell our grain and stocks, and make another pretty penny. Average, we would have to hire

clerks to count the money that we could make in that way.

Of course, I do not know that it is being done. But I do know that such a power should not be in the hands of anybody. Money should increase and decrease in volume according to the natural law of supply and demand, as grain and other commodities do.

Suppose, for instance, we had a grain dollar, and money got tight. The farmers would bring in grain, and get grain certificates, which would be money, for it. Thus, the money market would loosen up. And then, when money became easy, men would bring grain certificates to the government and draw out grain, thus, tightening up on money a little. In that way, the volume of money would be automatically, naturally, adjusted, and it would save any board worrying over the matter, and cutting and fitting as it thought best. Any board is apt to be, at least, prejudiced and swayed according to the interests of the particular members of that board. And, the interests of the members of that board may not be the interests of the whole people.

Using a grain dollar would save the people all of the annoyances and losses due to the fluctuations in the prices of the necessaries of life, which cause the variations in the cost of living. For, it is a fact, easily found to be true, if one will only stop to think, that the average price of grain stays level with the average price of the necessaries of life, always.

Under the use of the gold dollar, Average, in war time, the dollar falls in price. Gold can't

stand up with the necessaries, because it isn't so useful, so necessary. It is so cheap now that they can't afford to mine it, and the gold miners are trying to have the government grant a bonus of ten dollars per ounce on the production of gold.

But, it takes a certain amount of money to carry on the business of exchange, of buying and selling, and it takes more Thirty-cent Dollars than it would Hundred-cent Dollars, just as it takes more one-bushel sacks to handle the grain from a grain separator than it would two-bushel sacks. So, since the dollar shrinks in war time, and more are required to do the business, substitute dollars are issued—Federal Reserve Notes—and you pay a good high rate of interest.

If the dollar were grain, instead of gold—and it could be just as well, now, since we do not carry the gold around anyway—prices would not rise in war time, remarkable as it may seem to you. And, there would be no need of Federal Reserve Notes, or any substitute dollar. The grain dollar would do the work all the time. When war time came the prices of luxuries, like gold, would fall. That would be the difference. Are you more interested in luxuries than in the necessaries, Average?

Last spring the Federal Reserve Board thought it was time to start the business of deflating a little bit, the business of making the dollar worth a little more. And why not? Nearly all the government bonds had been bought up by that time, at a good discount, and had largely got into the hands of the money power. So, why not make them worth more? Money was tightened up a little: interest rates were raised. Prices began to go

down; for, money is like any commodity, the more of it there is, the cheaper it is; and the less of it there is, the higher it is. Prices depend upon the amount of money in circulation, upon the value of the dollar in which prices are measured. And, of course, reckoned in a more valuable dollar, prices will be less. They did become less, due to that tightening up by the Federal Reserve Board.

When the farmer got ready to sell his products, he determined prices were too low, and he would hold for higher prices. That is one way to do it; but you tell the farmer for me, Average, that he would do better to get on that Federal Reserve Board, and loosen up on the money. That will do it surely and soon. Seems to me I did hear something about there going to be more farmers in the government. You tell the farmers for me, Average, that on that Federal Reserve Board is the best place, ever.

That Federal Reserve Board is moving the dollar up towards a hundred cents, getting back to "normal." Of course, the farmer, who used to get Thirty-cent Dollars for his products, can't reasonably expect to get so many Sixty-cent Dollars, even if it is true that he must take that Sixty-cent Dollar, and pay with it, a Thirty-cent Dollar debt. Of course, by paying a Thirty-cent Dollar debt with a Sixty-cent Dollar, the farmer loses—really pays twice as much—but what is that between friends? Of course the farmer, and everyone who owes any debt, will lose a lot while we move back to "normal," but, what is so lost, is all gained by those who hold liberty bonds, notes, mortgages, and so on. So, why should the farmer and those

who bought homes on time complain? It isn't so bad, as it would be, if they lost and nobody gained.

And now comes the farmers' friend, Mr. Politician. He takes the platform. He is out in the land with a sort of 'stop-thief' cry, to divert the farmer's attention from the true cause of the fall in prices. Politician says we ought to have a tariff against that Canadian wheat. He says that Canadian wheat is what made prices of wheat low. He knows that isn't true, Average. You ought to know Politician isn't in practice handling truth. He is only fixing up for another bunko game, fixing up the way for his master. Politician wants the farmer to demand a tariff on wheat, and then he'll fix a tariff for his master.

Think, Average, we export wheat, and so does Canada, and to the same markets in Europe. It doesn't make a bit of difference whether Canada routes her wheat through our country or through her own country. It eventually reaches the same market anyway, where it is sold in competition with our wheat. Putting up a tariff against the Canadian wheat raiser of the Northwest would do the American farmer no more good than it would do a farmer, whose neighbor was taking a shortcut to town with a load of wheat through that farmer's land, to make that neighbor go round the road.

If you can't believe that, Average, go to Politician and ask him how the Canadian brought down the price of cattle, hogs, sheep, wool, chickens, tobacco, corn and cotton. In what part of Canada do they raise corn, cotton and tobacco, Average?

That's Politician for you every time, Average. I'd like to tell you just what I think of him but I can't use that kind of language here.

That Canadian wheat isn't the reason at all, Average. It is because the dollar is being made more valuable, is being moved up towards one hundred cents, toward "normal." Didn't you hear them say, "We must get back to normal, gradually." Why must we? Why go back to "normal"? And what is "normal"? Why, a thousand years ago, gold was worth one hundred times as much as it is today; and in 1896 it was worth twice as much as it was in 1913. Do they mean to go back to 1913, or to 1896; or, are they going back a thousand years? They are going back just as far as they can, Average. Just as far as they can; going back until it hurts, but not until it hurts more than what it is thought you will stand. You are going to "give until it hurts."

I tell you, Average, no man, nor board should have the power to move the dollar either up or down, no more than the power to increase or decrease the weight of a pound or a ton. It is not necessary that anybody should have that power. If the right kind of a dollar, a common-sense dollar were in use, the law of supply and demand would take care of that matter. If the right kind of a dollar were in use the right to issue money would not have to be farmed out to anyone on a cost-plus basis.

Using the grain dollar, Average, the government wouldn't have to receive all the grain. All it would have to do would be stand ready to receive it. That would hold the amount of grain,

fixed as a dollar, steady. Gold and luxuries would fluctuate, not grain, and the necessaries of life. The speculator would have to speculate in luxuries, and not in what we eat, if we had a grain dollar, Average. The farmer would always know what he would get for his grain, just as the gold miner knows today just how many dollars he will get for his gold. And, when the farmer knew what he would get for his grain he would also know just about what he would get for his cattle. sheep, cotton, wool and so on. Farming would be less a gamble. And there wouldn't be any need of any co-operative selling companies. That is the way for the government to co-operate with the farmer, Average; co-operate as it co-operates with the gold miner.

Perhaps the farmer won't believe you, Average, when you tell him what I say about the tariff on wheat, and so on. In that case you tell him for me, to go to his friend Politician and say: "Now, Politician, I know you are my friend. I know you have done me a lot of good. I've read it in the papers. And I know you mean all right with this tariff on wheat and other things I raise. But, you know, Politician, I'm not very good at figures. And I'm not an expert on tariffs and things like that. And I'll confess to you, Politician, that I don't really know whether a tariff on that Canadian wheat would help me or not. Now there is a bill pending to pay a bonus to the gold miner. Seems to me that bonus bill is easier to understand. Of course a tariff for me may be better than a bonus. But, just the same, if you don't mind will you please put the tariff on gold and

give me the bonus on wheat? You see, I may be loser by asking for that change but I'll understand it better and it will be clear to me. And I'd rather get a little less, and know that I am getting it, than to get more, and be in doubt whether I am really getting it.''

If the farmer will only make that very reasonable demand upon Politician and the newspapers who are serving the Interests, he will soon find out that there is a vast difference. The gold miner knows there is a difference. He isn't asking for a tariff. He is asking for a bonus. If a tariff on wheat raises the price of wheat in this country, Average, the people will have to pay it. If a bonus is placed on gold production, the people will have to pay that, too. So, as far as the people is concerned it might just as well be paying the farmer a bonus on wheat production as paying a higher price caused by a tariff. The farmer should insist that the tariff protect the gold miner and that the bonus be reserved for that farmer's protection. So far as the farmer is concerned, there is the same difference between a bonus on his products and a tariff on his products, Average, that there is between a real share in the government, and a bogus share, that there is between real democracy, and bogus democracy, between representation and misrepresentation. A bonus would really help: a tariff, not a bit.

They have raised the freight rates and passenger rates, in dollars, Average, and they are now raising the dollar. If Mr. Farmer doesn't wake up and insist upon the game being played in a way that he knows is fair, he may soon come to the day

when, on shipping a car-load of potatoes to market he will receive, in return, a draft against him for the difference between the freight and what that car-load sold for: all, just as it once was, Average. Just as it was when thousands of tramps flooded the country and the plutocrat said: "They wouldn't work if they got a job." The jobs came, Average, and the tramps showed that false-hood up, by all going to work.

It is just as much to the interest of every other man, Average, who expects to give value received for what he gets, to have a government obtained in a way that he knows is fair, as it is to the farmer. And it is just as much to the interest of every other man, Average, who expects to contribute fairly to the welfare of his fellows, in return for what he receives, that there should be in use an honest dollar, as it is to the farmer. With a grain dollar in use, if the workingman got an increase of so much as one kernel, it would be a real increase. He would be that much better off. Using a grain dollar, he could no longer be jockeyed with bogus increases that were really not increases at all. Every workingman, every honest man, no matter what his occupation may be, should put his shoulder to the wheel and push for a government likely to give us an honest dollar to use. The wage-earner should boost for a real dollar instead of a trick dollar before he talks about wages at all. It is his business to get out and work for a method that will let him, and the farmer, and every other producer of real wealth, have his proper share in the government.

This is a great country, Average. But Politi-

cians didn't make it a great country; political parties didn't make it a great country. It was a great country before they came. God made it a great country. Men came here because it was great, and prepared it for civilized habitation. It is what it is now because of what the people have done. Everything of good in this country, everything of good in this world that has been achieved, has been achieved by the people who forced it through, often at the cost of rivers of blood. Politicians never did anything good until forced to by the people. The people should govern—that's Democracy.

That dollar, Average, is only one little thing that I would expect to be fixed up, with a willing government, a fair government, a government looking after the welfare of the whole people, in power. There are a lot more odd jobs that could be done around the place, Average, that would make life easier for you, and that you may reasonably expect to be done by a government devoted to your interests.

And that congressional investigation, Average, reminds me: Did you ever hear how that congressional investigation, for which One Hundred Thousand Dollars was appropriated to investigate the cause of the high cost of living, came out? Investigating is the best thing that congress does, Average. I wonder if this investigating committee, Average, is investigating to find out who cheated; or, only where the money is? One thing is sure: you will pay for it; but you'll have to wait and see, until which time you may remain Bunkoed B' Gosh!

The condition of affairs that I have shown you, Average, Drawn Democracy will remedy; and now, let us get to the application of Drawn Democracy to the nation.

In that government, Average, it would probably be advisable to have a board somewhere round six hundred members. That, it seems to me, would be plenty large enough, and yet, small enough so that it could meet conveniently for the purpose of transacting business. That board would be supreme.

It would be the government, and the whole government of the nation. There would be no senate, and no president with any control over legislation such as he has now, by trading appointments for votes on measures. He would have no veto power. The veto power isn't a power exercised in favor of the people, Average. It is a power exercised against it. Why should any man have the right to veto an act of the representatives of the people? Why is he any more apt to be right than any other member of congress? Why should he decry autocrats, and then, turn round and exercise the power of an autocrat himself? Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Possibly that board would have the heads of the various departments directly responsible to it, coming to it for suggestions or advice in any matters. That might be found advisable. Just how things would be worked, you see, would depend upon which way was found most satisfactory. Any change advisable would be made immediately it was wished.

The power of the supreme court to declare laws

unconstitutional would be abolished, without doubt. It should be always for those who have the power to change the constitution to declare whether the law is within or without it. And the power of the supreme court to interpret a law in such a way, that it is made to mean the opposite to what it apparently means, would probably be done away with, too. When there is any misunderstanding, as to what a man means by the language he has used, the proper place to go to settle that question is right to that man. So, the proper place to go to find out what a law passed by the congress means should be right back to that congress itself.

Time and again the law has been interpreted by the courts in such a way that the law never would have been passed if it had been thought to mean what the court finally said it meant.

And while we are on the subject of courts, Average, let me tell you what was the practice in Athens under Drawn Democracy. Those queer people actually chose the members of their supreme court by lot! They actually thought that was fair to everybody. And they were more interested in getting a court that would be fair to everybody than they were in getting a court that would be likely to decide in any particular way.

To apply their practice to our circumstances the members of all our supreme courts would be chosen by lot from reputable experienced lawyers, who had reached a certain age. Just thing of that, Average! How reckless! A trust, in before that kind of a court, would be in the position of the Irishman, who, coming tremblingly

in to be tried on a criminal charge, on being assured by his lawyer that he need have no fear, as he would get justice there; replied, "Bejabbers, that is just what I am afraid of." Justice is what the trust is afraid of, Average, not injustice.

Contrast the method of getting a supreme court, used by the Athenians, with our method. The members of our supreme court are named by the President, and the nominations approved by the Senate. And a man just spent several hundred thousand dollars to get into that Senate! While more men have just spent several million dollars to elect a President! Do you think it is any wonder there are Reds?

And, while we are on the subject of the nation under Drawn Democracy, we might say a little about how congress would conduct its business.

There would be a presiding officer, you know, and to be sure that he didn't favor one interest, to the exclusion of others, all interests would be protected by having the presiding officer for each day, chosen by lot from those who should volunteer. Turn about would be fair play there, you see.

And of course congress would have to act very often through committees. Perhaps thirty or forty men would be on each committee, and a good fair way would be to choose the members of the committees by lot from those who should volunteer for service on such committee. Looks like everything might be arranged all fairly by men fairly drawn, doesn't it?

The Plan

"If we look more closely, we shall find

Most have the seeds of judgement in their mind."

—Pope

CHAPTER SEVEN

Would the drawings be fairly conducted?

Oh! Yes, Average. It is not easy to conduct an unfair drawing, and surely not so easy as an unfair election. I will outline one way in which the drawings might be conducted:

All desiring to volunteer as legislators will go to the clerk of the voting precinct and register. Each will receive a numbered card. When the time to register has expired, each precinct clerk will send to the county auditor a statement of the number registered in that precinct.

Thus, the county auditor will learn the number registered in the whole county. And he will send to the secretary of state a statement of such number. Thus, the secretary of state will learn the number registered in the whole state. And the latter will prepare numbered cards, as many as required for the whole state. He will then send to each county auditor as many cards as there are registrants in that county, and each county auditor will then send to each precinct

clerk as many of those cards as there are registrants in that precinct.

Of course there will have to be a specified date on which registration shall close in the precinct, a specified time within which the precinct clerk shall forward his statement to the county auditor, a specified time within which the county auditor shall forward his statement to the secretary of state, and another specified time within which the latter shall send the cards to the county auditor, and still another, within which the county auditor shall send the cards to the precinct. Allowance being made for all such time, there will then be a specified day on which the drawing will take place at the capitol building.

The drawing will be conducted, perhaps, by the secretary of state in public, as many holding cards being admitted as possible, to see that it is all fairly done. And the drawing may be conducted in the following manner: A wheel bearing the ten digits, 0 to 9, inclusive, on its circumference, and a movable spindle will be provided, to be operated in full view of those assembled.

Numbers on the cards distributed by the secretary of state will be made to have as many digits as the highest numbered card given out, by prefixing ciphers to the numbers, where necessary, for that purpose.

Thus, if the highest number should be 150,000, which has six digits, all numbers will be made to have six digits by prefixing ciphers, and the number ONE would read 000,001.

Then, to draw a number the spindle will have to be spun six separate times, or, as many times as there are digits in the highest number given out. Each time the spindle stops, one digit will be indicated by it.

If it should stop, the first time, on 0, the second on 0, the third on 0, the fourth on 2, the fifth on 4, and the sixth on 6; the number 246 would be the number drawn, and the volunteer holding that number would be the one chosen for whatever body was being drawn. The drawing would then proceed in this way until the required number were drawn.

The drawing conducted by the secretary of state will be for the state Council of Elders, and for the congressmen from the state. If there are distinct legislative and congressional districts as at present, the drawing will be conducted by the secretary of state, but with a little variation. However, the practice of having distinct legislative and congressional districts will probably be done away with, for the state Council of Elders will be drawn to represent the people of the whole state, as is really the case now, anyway.

At present we say that this man represents such a legislative district in the legislature. That is not really true. The whole legislature represents the people of the state. True representation, representation in the sense that we use it in connection with the government, cannot be by one man, for true representation is by sample, and one man can't be a sample of anything—he is only a specimen.

Under Drawn Democracy we may continue to have the state divided into legislative districts as at present, or draw from the whole state as a whole. It really would make no difference. By drawing from the whole state, as a whole, it will all average, anyway. And the theory of representation by interest or class does away with any necessity for having districts to draw from. Each man drawn will be there to represent his interest, his class. The farmers in the drawn legislature will represent the farmers in the state, the working men in the drawn legislature will represent the working men in the state, the bankers in the legislature will represent the bankers in the state, and so on.

The farmers in a particular district now may be relying upon representation by a lawyer in the legislature. Under drawn democracy they will be relying upon representation by farmers. And farmers, represented by farmers in the legislature, no matter from where in the state the representatives may come, will have their interests better safe-guarded than if represented by a lawyer, a newspaper man, or a banker, even if he does come from their neighborhood.

The results of the drawing conducted by the secretary of state will be published, and those holding the numbers drawn will present their cards and receive their certificates of having been chosen. It may be provided by law that, in case of a vacancy occurring at any time, the one holding the next higher number to the number held by the one whose place is vacated, will be entitled to the place so made vacant, and for this purpose, in order that there may be a number higher than the highest number, the number ONE will be considered to be higher than the highest. Thus, there

never will have to be more than one drawing in the year, and vacancies will cause no disturbance.

Drawings for all other boards may be conducted in the same way. There will be no difficulty to have a fair drawing, and a drawing that all will be sure is fair. And the whole drawing will not cost the tax-payers of the state as much as one county election costs the tax-payers of the county. Average, it costs you a lot of money to get Bunkoed B' Gosh!

Do I think Drawn Democracy will ever come?

Yes, Average, I am sure of it, unless civilization goes to ruin. The world has been moving toward Drawn Democracy for a thousand years. All the changes that occurred in Athens while it was making progress toward Drawn Democracy have been occurring in this world, though in some nations the progress has been more rapid than in others.

Take England, for instance: A thousand years ago it was an autocracy, the king ruling alone. Then the lords gathered round and demanded a share in the government. They finally got it, and government went on that way for a time. Then the common people demanded a voice in the government. And a house of commons was set up. Only those having quite a large amount of wealth were permitted to vote for members of the commons at first. Those below, the radical, kept agitating, and the property qualification required to vote was gradually lowered, until in the year 1857, every man, regardless of what property he had, was permitted to vote.

The election system has been in use in England since that time, for the members of the House of Commons. The House of Lords isn't elected. The Lords inherit the position. And that is called a Democracy! There is agitation to abolish the House of Lords. Then, will come agitation to have a drawing for members of the House of Commons. And it will be done, unless the Bolshevist takes hold of the government. He will be for no drawing.

In the State of Minnesota we have progressed so far that members of the legislature are designated as non-partisan, meaning that they become candidates as members of no party, run on no party platform. Each runs for himself and makes any promise that he thinks will get him votes.

So, you see, Average, in Minnesota we are very close to Drawn Democracy, as, since, the candidates run on no particular platform, there really can be no other reason for holding elections for them, except it be, to give the man who has the time to spare and money to spend, the place; in other words, to give the politician the place. Of course, some may think that election brings them a better class of men than a drawing would. But if they will take time to look over the legislature that election does bring, and then consider what a drawing, had from men within the qualifications I have outlined, would bring, they will readily see that a drawing would bring a legislature composed of better posted men, on the whole, men under no obligation to The Interests, and a legislature really representative of the people.

Oh! Yes, Average, Drawn Democracy will come,

and it is going to come soon. It came in Athens when that had reached about the same stage of affairs as we have. It all depends upon the voter out in the little voting precinct. If he'll get to work it will come so quickly as to surprise everyone.

It will come first in some city, or some state. Then it will spread to other cities and other states, until, finally, every man in congress will have been drawn. Then, it will begin to spread to other countries; and it may be, that soon, the Bolshevists will be deporting from Russia radicals who are agitating for Drawn Democracy. All forms of government are intolerant of a better.

The most backward countries can use Drawn Democracy, because the educational qualification will bar the ignorant, and so it would only be for that World Government, that will come when Drawn Democracy prevails generally, to see that the ignorant in every backward nation are given an equal chance to become educated, so that they may protect their own interests by taking part in their governments. Get ready to rub your eyes, Average; there is going to be a square deal.

Won't the Constitution have to be amended to put Drawn Democracy into effect?

Yes, Average, the State Constitution will have to be amended. In Minnesota the legislature will have to propose the amendment by a majority vote, and then it will have to be submitted to the voters at the next election, where it must receive a majority of all the votes cast at that election, on any matter—a majority of all voting, whether they vote on the proposed amendment or not.

What is the first thing that will have to be done to get Drawn Democracy?

The first thing necessary to be done to get Drawn Democracy is to let all the people know about it, and to have it fully explained to them.

There will have to be a party formed? And a lot of speakers hired?

No, Average, it is not necessary to have any party formed. The word, party, Average, comes from the word, part, and a party is formed for the purpose of getting the power of government into the hands of a part of the people to be exercised for the exclusive benefit of those who belong to that part.

That is the theory of it, but the fact is, that party government results in placing the governmental power in the hands of the leaders of a part of the people. The leaders need money to carry on the never-ending contest. Rich Mann has the money. He furnishes the money. And the leaders reward him for furnishing it, at your expense, by letting Rich Mann plunder you, Average.

No party is needed to put through Drawn Democracy, for the purpose of Drawn Democracy is to place the power of government in the hands of the whole people, not in the hands of a part of the people, to the exclusion of the other parts.

After the people has learnt about Drawn Democracy and has come to understand it, there remains only to send to the legislature men who are for having a drawn legislature instead of an elected one. All the rest will come.

And as for the matter of hiring a lot of speakers, that is not necessary either. Drawn Democ-

racy can be put through for the whole state at an expense of no more than fifty or seventy-five dollars for each voting precinct, at the most.

If a book were written on the subject and copies enough circulated in each voting precinct of the state so that all would have opportunity to read it and discuss it, there is no question whatever, Average, that the great majority would be for it.

Have I talked to many about Drawn Democracy?

Yes, Average, I have talked to hundreds.

And what do they say about it?

Why, Average, nearly everyone says it would be a good thing if we could only get it, but many say they don't see how it ever could be done, since it is not likely that any rich men will furnish money necessary to spread the idea.

I am sure, Average, that among those to whom I have explained it, there are more than ninety in a hundred for it; and I have explained it to all kinds; farmers, lawyers, doctors, real estate men, travelling men, working men, and most every class.

Who will be against it?

Well, of course, Average, you will understand that the men who are now supreme in the government, the money power that really dominates every government everywhere, will be dead against it at all times.

And at that, Drawn Democracy is in their favor, Average, if they could only see it. They now have control. They can't hope to keep it forever. For, "the worm will turn." When they lose control, another class will take control, a class that will

take hold with blood in its eye, hatred in its heart, and revenge in its mind. Then, there will be no justice for Rich Mann. Election compells him to hang on to control of the government, for, in the contest of election a class must either win or lose; there is no half way. And woe to the loser!

But, generally, those in control of governments never did have sense enough to see the handwriting on the wall. They have always waited until it was too late, and they always will wait until it is too late. They will be against Drawn Democracy.

And besides that class, Average, there will be the leaders, leaders of all classes. The business of leaders is to lead; the business of all the rest, to follow. Thus, the world is divided into two camps: leaders, and followers. The leaders rule: the followers are ruled. Rulers never wish to surrender their power. The leaders will be against doing so. They, too, will be against Drawn Democracy.

But never mind the leaders, Average. They are of no real good anyway. Look at the leaders who went to Europe!

Certain real estate transactions were to take place over there, and, instead of sending men who had had experience in the real estate business, men were sent who had spent their lives in other occupations. And look at what we got! Nothing! And look at China, our friend; look at what it got! Skinned!

And then look at the contract that was drawn up for us to sign! There was nobody who could tell what it meant! If you hired a lawyer, Average, to draw up a contract, and he should draw it in such a way that the smartest of lawyers couldn't agree as to what it did mean, should draw it in such a way that there was bound to be a dispute in regard to what it did mean; you wouldn't ever go back to that lawyer again, unless it were to tell him what you thought of him. And yet that is the way the contract was drawn over in Europe, and your leaders helped draw it up. There should have been over there just a few country lawyers, men who know how to draw up real estate contracts.

And then, your leaders came back from Europe, and brought a contract all ready to be signed without any i's to be dotted, or t's to be crossed. Was it the contract that the leaders took over there to be signed? No. Those fellows over there wouldn't sign that. Well let's see the one that you took over. We want to know what it was that those fellows wouldn't sign, so we can see how it differs from this that they did sign. No, you couldn't see that. Why? Why, that would have exposed your leaders' hands—would have shown what a failure they did make.

And then the contract—partnership contract between the peoples of the world—league of nations treaty. Each people one vote, Average. Hundred and Ten Million Americans, one vote. Fifty Million Englishmen, Fifty Million Frenchmen, Fifty Million Japanese, Thirty Million Italians, all, one vote each. And so, Average, you are to count just half as much as an Englishman, a Frenchman, or a Japanese; and one-third as much as an Italian. It didn't take a very astute trader

to trade two Americans off for one Japanese, did it, Average?

That is in the executive council. In the assembly you'll count for one-thirty-third as much as a Canadian, Average. Most anyone could have made that kind of a deal, Average. Most any farmer would have known enough not to.

Most any business man, Average, any salesman, would have known that if America was to make a contract with those peoples, the way to do it was to draw up a fair contract, and one that suited us; and then when they were squealing with their "Backs to the wall," calling on us for help, to present to them the contract, show them the dotted lines for their signatures, and say, "After you have signed up, we'll be over to help you." In any fair deal, Average, we are entitled to one hundred and ten votes, as against fifty for the English, the French, and the Japanese; and as against thirty for the Italians, and three for the Canadians.

When the cattle men of the range assemble in convention, Average, each cattle man has one vote. It doesn't make any difference how many cattle he has. The cattle have nothing to do with it. The cattle man is not representing the cattle. And so, in Europe, when the powers assembled each was to have one vote. It didn't make any difference how many people were under each power. The people didn't count; it was the power. The people were not being represented. The powers were transacting business, their business, not the people's, and one power, one vote, of course.

And that's only some of the leadership for you, Average. Look at the leadership the coal miners had in Illinois. In 1917, when the war broke out, those leaders agreed with the government that the miners would continue to mine coal at the wage then set, so long as the war should last! And the cost of living went right on going up! If the war had continued long enough, it might have gone up so high, that the miner's whole day's wages wouldn't buy him breakfast. But that is what the leaders agreed to do for them. And the miners paid those leaders well.

Why, Average, if those miners had employed most any country lawyer to represent them they would have been much better taken care of.

The country lawyer would have said to the government and the mine operators, "Let's see, you agree that fifty cents per ton is the proper wage for the miner today? Yes. And coal is selling at one dollar at the mouth of the mine? Yes. Well, then is it your agreement that the miner is to get fifty per cent of what the coal sells for at the mouth of the mine? Oh! No. No. He is to get fifty cents. It won't make any difference what the coal sells for. Well, gentlemen, the cost of living goes up for the miner as coal goes up in price at the mouth of the mine. We want; those miners want, fifty per cent of what the coal sells for at the mouth of the mine. We'll settle that way. We won't settle any other way. We'll sign up for the length of the war on that basis. Not, otherwise."

Average, that lawyer would have got that for those miners, and those miners could have rested secure. They never would have had to strike. That whole coal strike, that caused so much trouble, would have been avoided.

And, Average, consider the horse that labors for man. He gets a certain amount of hay and a certain amount of grain. His wages, measured in dollars and cents, went up during the war just as the cost of living went up; and they will go down just as the cost of living goes down. Automatic adjustment.

The labor leaders, after all their years of leading, after all the strikes, and all the dues collected, haven't been able to take care of their followers, in the matter of adjustment of wages, so well as the horse is taken care of in that respect!

If those leaders, in making a settlement should say: "You agree to pay the men fifty cents per hour? Yes. Well, you know the cost of living is subject to fluctuation, and that may make it necessary to make another settlement in a month or two. Tell you what we'll do. Fifty cents buys today five pounds of wheat, five pounds of oats, five pounds of rye, five pounds of corn, and five pounds of barley. We have been looking it up, and we find that the prices of the necessaries of life, that is the average price, goes up and down as the average price of those five grains does. So the cost of living goes up and down as the average price of those five grains does. We will agree with you that you must pay your men the value of that amount of grain for each hour's work. When pay-day comes round, we'll figure up what the grain comes to on the market, and you can then pay it in cash at the market price."

Those leaders could get that, Average, if they went after it. And the working man's wages would always be adjusted to the cost of living. Strikes on that score would be avoided. But there wouldn't be so much need of leaders, Average, after that.

Such is leadership for you, Average, everywhere. Leaders are interested in leading, not in settling. When a thing is settled there is no more leading to be done. Leaders want no permanent settlements. Drawn Democracy will put leaders out of business. Of course they won't want to go out of business. They will be against Drawn Democracy.

Pay no attention to your leaders, Average. Stand up on your hind legs like a man, look your leaders in the eyes, and say to them: "I'm not going to follow you any more; and I don't ask you to follow me. I'm going this way. If you are going that way, too, we can go together."

Why don't I write a book about Drawn Democracy?

Well, Average, books are more easily written than distributed. It costs money to write books: paper and wages are high. Such a book would cost two or three times what it should cost ordinarily. And then, there is the question of distributing it.

The usual channels, through booksellers and newsdealers, is closed to such a book. For, if the bookseller or newsdealer puts the book on sale, it is not long until there comes some important gentleman, who wants to hear nothing about

changes in the government. He is doing very well as it is; so why change?

And this important gentleman, very much annoyed, blurts to the dealer, "What are you doing? Peddling Bolshevik stuff here?" And the dealer, not anxious to cause offense to any of his patrons, lays the book away where it is not seen again. He doesn't want to be classed as a radical, after the way he has heard the radical condemned. And, anyway, maybe his customers won't like the book, either.

So, it is good business for the dealer to put the book away. New ideas in regard to government are looked upon with suspicion, though none is afraid of new ideas on any other subject. So you see, Average, it would be quite a problem to get the book distributed. Newspapers will say nothing about it—they are not going to advertise it. It might hurt their business, with their advertisers.

Couldn't I get book agents to sell the book?

I hardly thing so, Average. The price of the book will be so low that a book-agent couldn't sell it fast enough to make wages in these times, even if he sold to every man to whom he talked.

There is only one way that occurs to me, Average. I could get the book printed. Then advertise it in some papers and by that way get some out around. Probably, I could not get enough out that way to be even, after paying for the book, the advertising, and postage, to say nothing of my work. But if those who had read the book would then become active, send in and get a half dozen or a dozen of them for their voting precinct, and,

either sell them or lend them—distribute them in some way—around the precinct, soon, everybody in that precinct would be for it, or at least the great majority. Most everybody is for it when it is explained to them.

One man could take one book, and call a meeting of a few of his neighbors and read it to them, if nothing else. Or, a man can study it up a little while and make a talk himself. There is no argument against it, and only an ignorant man will try to argue against it. Ridicule is the only hope of those who may be opposed to it. And ridicule is only good argument with blind followers.

If something like what I have outlined were done in each precinct, it would only be a little time until the whole state would be for it. All would know all about it: ninety per cent would be for it.

You think it would be a good thing if it could be done?

That's good, Average, I kind of thought you would, at least, see that it is perfectly fair to everyone, that it will result in injustice to no one, even if you didn't see right away how absolutely unfair election is, and the great injustice that has resulted to you from employing it to get a government.

Well now, Average, I will tell you of a plan that I have formed. Drawn Democracy doesn't put me any further ahead than it does you, or that other man out in the voting precinct. It just gives us all an equal chance. And I haven't much money that I can afford to spend. The war didn't help me any: it hurt.

I have planned to write the book, and also to volunteer to act as a sort of get-together-secretary for everybody, everywhere, who may want Drawn Democracy well enough to do just a little work for it.

I will want men in each precinct to send in their names, their post-office addresses, and the name of their voting precincts, together with a small contribution—anywhere from One to Ten Dollars enough so that I can afford to do the work as it hould be done, pay clerk hire, office expense, rent, postage, and so on. I'll file these names accord ing to precincts, counties and state. I'll act as corresponding secretary for the purpose of furthering the work of spreading the idea everywhere; and will inform men in one precinct, of men in other near precincts who are working, so that they may co-operate, and will also inform them of precincts where some work is necessary to be done in order to make a start. Of course it will require quite a bit of correspondence, and I must have funds in order to attend to all that properly.

In any voting precinct, one man may get together two or three of his fellows of the precinct, and kind of form a little organization. We may call the members, those who believe in Drawn Democracy, "Drafters," as that would seem appropriate, and it will distinguish them from those having the "G" in their names. Thus, all one will will have to do is to ask a man if he is a "Drafter," and if he doesn't know the latest news, explain to him, or better yet, get him to buy a

book, so he can have it right before him, to read and study whenever he feels like it.

One, interested in the idea, might get a dozen books, or so; leave them around with his neighbors, tell them to read the book, and, after reading it, to either pay for it, or return it.

In that way it won't be long until that precinct is pretty well informed, and information is all that the voter needs. And, what will be going on in one precinct, will be going on in all the other precincts, until all the precincts in that legislative district have organized and have written in, so that I have a record of the secretaries of each precinct.

I'll then cause notice to be sent to the secretary of each precinct, of a convention called for the whole legislative district. This convention will organize and choose a secretary, so that thereafter all my correspondence for that legislative district will be with that secretary, and he will do the rest. And the same thing will be going on in every legislative district in the state.

These legislative conventions will choose, or endorse, suitable men, who are for Drawn Democracy, to be candidates. And, believe me, Average, those men will go in with a whoop.

The success of that whole plan will depend upon the voter out in the precinct. If he works fast it will go fast. There is no question that it will go. I'll attend to getting the precincts together. After that the legislative convention will do all the rest. There will be no boss, and no leader. I'll act as an assistant to the man out in the precinct who will be gathering them in.

To get Drawn Democracy it is only needed that there be in each precinct a man who is a self starter, one who doesn't need to be cranked, one who can go without a leader, one who prefers to do his own thinking, and not to let another do it for him. With a self-starter in each precinct we shall soon, surprisingly soon, have self-determination, Drawn Democracy. And don't forget, Average Mann, Drawn Democracy means only that there shall be a drawing to get a lawmaking body. A man who is for any kind of a drawing will be a "Drafter." We will fill the legislature full of "Drafters" and then we will get Drawn Democracy. You, Average Mann, will have to get busy in your precinct. If you will do that all the rest will come. Justice will prevail throughout the land, throughout the World. Get to work for your own good."

That, Reader, is what I would say to Average Mann if I could meet him, with questions he might ask, and that is what I would say to you. But that Average Mann is a hard man to meet. He is very elusive. You may meet thousands of men but not one of them will be the average man, Average Mann.

Suppose all the people should get together, the average man would be there. Suppose you wish to get the opinion of the average man on any matter, you will have to get the opinion of the people, and that will be the opinion of the average man. Whatever answer is made by the people is also the answer of the average man. And when you say, "The people is for this," that means,

also, that the average man is for it. And if you say, "The average man is for that," that means, also, that the people is for that.

So, when the people get together, all the people, you have the average man, and also the people. You can't get the average man otherwise. And the people and the average man are always of the same opinion. That is so well known that it is only necessary to consult either one and you have the opinion of the other. The two are very close it seems, doesn't?

Close? Why, the people and the average man, is one and the same, only thought of in a different way: like man, and men. Just as the molecule of iron—the smallest possible division of iron—and iron are one and the same thing, only thought of in a different way. Whatever the molecule will do, however it will act, so will iron act, for the molecule is iron, and iron is a collection of molecules.

And now, you know, Reader, that the purpose in electing lawmakers is to get the best man, only, and thus to reject or exclude the average man, always. The average man is to be kept out. Now you can't keep the molecule of iron out of your drinking water without keeping iron out; and, you can't keep iron out of your drinking water without keeping the molecule out. If you keep one out, you keep the other out. And it is just that way with the average man, and the people. You can't keep the people out of congress without keeping the average man out; and you can't keep the average man out of congress without keeping the people out. So, you see, election, for the purpose of

keeping the average man out of the government, is also for the purpose of keeping the people out of the government.

We have been trying to get a government by the people, and we have been using a method that is for the express purpose of keeping the people out of that government. We might just as well have tried to carry water in a sieve. Election is for a purpose just the opposite to that for which we have been using it. And that is the way the people has always been Bunkoed B' Gosh! Drawn Democracy will let the people into congress, into the government, in turn. Thus, will come, government by the people, of the people, and for the people. An ideal realized!

Now, Reader, I have written the book; you have read it, and you know what the plan is. I volunteer to act as get-together-secretary for everybody, everywhere. What are you going to do? Will you take a stand for the Golden Rule, or for the Rule of Gold? "Those not with us are against us."

If you are with us, do something. If you are against us, carry the message to your MASTER to get out of the way. For, there is coming the GREATEST STEAM ROLLER the WORLD HAS EVER KNOWN. And, no POWER on EARTH can stop it! We are tired of being BUNKOED B' GOSH!

At your service, THOMAS KEEFE.

Dated December 1st, 1920.

Bunkoed B'Gosh! will be sent PREPAID on receipt of payment, as follows:

Single copies\$1.00 Half dozen copies......\$5.50

One dozen copies.....\$10.50

Send all orders and make all payments to Thomas Keefe. Address 342 Endicott Bldg., St. Paul, Minn.









