

of affairs is: simply this—a large number of people go so far as to aid and abet a certain set of men in keeping other men, who are willing, from working. Put boldly thus, this fact, common enough nowadays, has made the blood of indignation boil in many a well-meaning breast. It is not surprising that this strange attitude should astound people, especially such as are imbued with the democratic spirit. But we should like to ask the Commercial Advertiser to give its candid views as to the question, Why so many people seem willing to stand against the “freedom to work?”

In a recent article on the Waterbury issue the editor closed with these words:

Is local sentiment throughout the land, willing and intimidated, on the side of the cause of the labor union sustained by riot and violence, and against individual freedom and the right to work? If it is, and the constant necessity of calling upon the militia to uphold law and order seems to indicate that it is, something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition, to revive from one end of the land to the other the old American spirit, the old American sense of justice and right and of fair play for every man.

Why should public sentiment be against “the old American spirit”? For, with a proviso, we agree with the above writer that indications point that way. We do not think that public sentiment sustains riot and violence; but there is little doubt that public sentiment is strongly opposed to the so-called “scab,” that is, in plain terms, to the non-union man who is willing to take the union man’s job. We believe that a large majority of the American people have a “sort of feeling” that the non-union man has no right to the union man’s job, and sympathize with every effort, short of absolute violence, to prevent his doing so.

Such being the case, we agree with the Commercial Advertiser that “something needs to be done to restore public sentiment to a healthy condition.” What this something should be, certainly depends upon what is the cause of the sentiment. So, again, we ask why the sentiment exists. And we venture to assert that among all social questions there is

no more important “why” that we can ask.

It seems to us that it behooves anyone who has an earnest thought on the subject to give it utterance; and it is for this reason that we have asked the Commercial Advertiser what it thinks may be the cause. Our own belief is as follows:

In the first place, we do not believe that the public sentiment is due to any loss of the old American spirit of fair play. We believe that the belief in fair play is as strong as ever. We believe that it is due to a feeling—or perhaps we had better call it a subconscious conviction—that “free competition” among workmen to-day does not really bring fair play. People feel that the dispossessed union man has not enough chance for other employment or for self-employment to make his competition for the job in any true sense free and fair. They feel that it is a squabble for place, with lack of free space, and that if the outs get in, the ins go down. Furthermore, they feel that the advantage to those who get in over their fellows is perhaps a lowering of general conditions for all.

But in the second place, and to go farther back, we believe that these feelings, or sub-conscious reasonings, are due to actual conditions, the evils of which we have just hinted at. The free competition of laborers is no longer, to say the least, as fair as it once was in America; for the reason that there is no longer the same opportunity of self-employment. And this is due to the fact that while population has increased, natural opportunities have become more and more confined within the possession of private owners.

If our analysis of the cause of sympathy for strikers be correct, clearly the proper means to adopt for restoring public sentiment to a healthy condition is to go to the root of the matter, and attempt really to equalize opportunity. The only sane method of accomplishing this that we have ever seen advanced, is that of taxation. Lay a proper tax upon natural opportunities that have been monopolized and are yet not used. Do this in the interest “of justice and right

and fair play for every man,” and then there will be no warrant for the warping of public sentiment against any man who is willing to work.

J. H. DILLARD.

DEMOCRACY AND MONOPOLY.

I.

Man is not a creator; he is an exchanger, a converter. He originates nothing; he simply changes the form of things. He can create neither air, nor land, nor water, nor anything that is contained within them. He can, however, change the form and utility of matter by a million devices and contrivances of his hand and brain. He can convert the trees of the forest and the minerals of the earth into such forms as to make them serve uncountable uses for himself and fellows. Out of water he can draw forth steam power and out of the air electricity; quarries he can convert into stately palaces, immense bridges, great cities; the wool of the sheep he can convert into the clothing of his kind, and by the application of his labor to the soil he can supply the food of the entire community. In short, he can give value to, or put to profitable use, through conversion or exchange, almost every conceivable element of matter which he can get within his grasp.

But it is only through conversion or exchange that he can do these things. Alone and singly men can do but little. By working in unison with his fellows, man accomplishes almost superhuman tasks; alone, unaided, he accomplishes little or nothing. The best that man alone and unaided can do is to keep himself alive.

In modern civilization, however, all are aided, to a degree, directly or indirectly. It is only in the savage state that man must depend entirely upon himself. Then he must feed and clothe and house himself directly, and, unlike the more civilized being, he cannot buy his bread ready baked, nor his meat prepared for use. He can accumulate nothing and he can exchange nothing. The modern being, through a system of cooperation with his fellows, can exchange his labor (or the result of his labor) for the result of other labor; but the savage or primitive man must consume the result of

his labor, there being no system whereby he can exchange it for other labor. Neither can he store it up. And even if he could "store it up" it would be of no use to him; for the results of his labor, beyond an amount sufficient to provide for the necessities of his own existence, would, of course, be of no profit or value in a condition of society where there was no system of exchange or cooperation.

Thus, simply stated, we find that "society" itself is merely a process of conversion or exchange. Civilization is the logical outcome of collective industry; the development of the inherent power and tendency in man to gratify his desires (both small and great) through cooperation and exchange, with the least possible exertion.

II.

At the basis of man's industry is ambition or desire. He inherently has ambitions and desires which distinguish him from every other form of being in the animal world. Hence, he is a moving, progressive animal. But, constituted as he is, he could be neither moving nor progressive, in any large sense, were it not for the fact that he instinctively seeks to gratify his wishes or ambitions with the least possible labor or effort on his own part. It is this characteristic in man which makes for progress. He taxes his resources to accomplish his purposes swiftly, cheaply, simply. This is at least the tendency, and the degree in which he does it (in a free state of society) is measured by the intelligence he possesses. Early in the life of the race, he discovered that collectively he could accomplish more than singly, and thus society was formed. He became a social being because he could not progress in any other way.

But man is individual, as well as social. In but few stages of life have all his faculties been normally developed. In all history we find man more enlightened and further developed in some respects than in others. For instance, in primitive times he learned the lesson of saving and exchanging labor through cooperation with his fellows; but as social life expanded and became more complex, some men began to employ shorter and apparently simpler meth-

ods of achieving their ends. For example, many quickly lost sight of the principle of justice, and found that through the use of superior brute strength and force they could frequently accomplish their purposes more swiftly and advantageously than by the more peaceful methods of cooperation and exchange.

Thus, as the world grew, strength rather than justice, might rather than right, became one of the guiding stars of men. And hence, one of the inherent characteristics in man which normally makes for progress (self-interest) became the cause of much suffering and injustice in the world. The desire for selfish gratification grew so strong, that the other and higher attributes, justice, the true balance wheel, as it were, of progress, was largely overshadowed or forgotten. To this fact, that men have in the past lost sight of or forgotten justice, and have concentrated their energies to gain supremacy or power over their fellows, can be traced nearly all the darkness and trouble and misery that has ever appeared in this world. All the wars, unjust and despotic governments, oppressive and unequal laws, religious, social and mental superstitions, and unequal privileges of this or of other ages, are traceable to this one cause.

But man in his normal state, inherently loves justice, and even in the darkest of the world's days of injustice and oppression, the truth has never been entirely extinguished from his mind. For in every age we read of those who fought and bled in the struggle against the particular injustice or superstition of their time, and for the enlightenment or betterment of mankind. All down the pages of history we find leaders of liberty, who, in their own time, were reviled and condemned by the established order as traitors, rebels or fanatics. Such men were Savanarola, Columbus, Luther, Cromwell, Jefferson. It was in the hearts of such men as these that justice was kept alive and the seeds sown for its greater growth in modern times.

III.

Notwithstanding that the spirit of justice and equality has in our times gained great strength and power, her victory has never been complete. Co-

incident with the development of the broader civilization and more democratic spirit of the last centuries, many ancient customs have been retained and still further strengthened which have their basis in the doctrines of the darker ages. Among these are many of the old laws and customs whereby, through the protection of government, some still wrest from others that to which they have no right. In other words, although man has in many ways advanced since the days of Savanarola and of Columbus, yet he is in many other ways, in his relationship to his fellows, still far from the principle of equality and justice which is summed up in the word "democracy."

Democracy, correctly defined, is the embodiment of liberty and justice. In its greatest purity it means simply "equal rights to all; special privileges to none." A democracy is a state of society, therefore, where men actually have guaranteed to them both equality and freedom. Equality in the sense that the social and political rights are equal before the law; freedom in the sense that none are fettered or limited in their social life for the benefit of others. Unless these conditions exist, then real democracy is not present.

As I said before, man inherently seeks to gratify his desires with the least exertion, and he does this quite naturally by taking advantage of those conditions which involve the least resistance. In a free state of society, such as is found in a truly democratic realm, where every man's opportunity is primarily equal, competition serves to retain equality between the production and the consumption of wealth, and also to greatly further the general development of progress. We find, however, in our own country, and in fact in all civilized lands, that in the development of modern industry a point is quickly reached where competition itself becomes so keen that disaster follows; and then a new factor, combination, sets in, and eliminates competition.

Now why is it that competition grows so keen in modern times that it ends in disaster? Why is it that "overproduction" ensues, with poverty and depression in its train, if (as is always true) there are thousands upon thousands of men ready and waiting to ex-

change their labor for their needs or their wishes? Why is it that so many men are trying with their hands and heads to exchange their labor for its equivalent and yet are unable to do so? Surely it would seem illogical that there should be such a thing as "over-production" as long as there are men standing idle and waiting for a chance to give their wealth (that is, their labor), in exchange for the products of others. Why should consumption ever fall behind production in a condition of society where probably 80 per cent. of the community are living from hand to mouth and are never able to store up their labor or accumulate wealth in any degree; where, in fact, they all consume as fast as they produce, and where there is always the keenest competition to consume even more?

In the answer to this question will be found the kernel of the whole modern social and industrial problem.

IV.

As we come to examine modern industrial conditions closely we find that there is an outside element which enters into and affects the social being of us all. We find that some men enjoy advantages which others do not. I do not mean merely the differences or advantages of hand and brain, or even association. These are natural and will never be apart from man. Such differences are more largely inherent and a part of the man himself. It is these that give him his individuality, and, of course, without such there could be no progress. But there are certain outside, artificial advantages which some enjoy to the exclusion of others. There are many of them, but they may all be summed up under one head—that of privilege, or monopoly.

Monopoly consists in the exclusive possession by some of certain legal or other rights, privileges and advantages which are not accessible to all. In other words, it is the artificial handicapping of one portion of the race for the benefit of the other. It is not only unjust, but it is pernicious in its influence in every walk of life. Man being a social being, he produces to exchange and he exchanges only to satisfy his wants, being unable to gratify them in any other way. In an

equitable state of society he has a free field to exchange his labor for its full equivalent in the products of other labor, and the equilibrium of society is maintained through the competition of both the selling and the purchasing of labor. Under such conditions there could be neither reason nor excuse for scarcity of labor or the "over-production" of the results of labor; for production and consumption should and perforce would continuously tend to balance each other. Every producer would be able to exchange his labor for its equivalent without let or hindrance.

But as modern society is constituted this is not the case. The producer of wealth in whatever form does not find a fair and equal field for the disposal of his labor. Instead, he quickly finds himself hemmed in by monopoly. He finds that, instead of being able to exchange his product for its equivalent, he must, continuously, his whole life through, set aside a certain portion of it as a tribute to others. Like the villeins of old, he must pay royalty to his master. Every stroke of the hammer, the chisel or the pen made by the worker in our land to-day involves a contribution of some kind to this modern robber baron. In a certain degree no work is possible, no wealth can be produced, without at the same time contributing to the strength and comfort of this great non-producing, all-consuming maw of society.

V.

The honest and unbiased thinker should have little difficulty in recognizing monopoly at any time. It is only because men are constantly confused by specious or superficial arguments, hearsay, and conscious or unconscious intimidation that they do not readily distinguish monopoly when they see it. Some monopolies are so old and seem so thoroughly a part of our daily surroundings that at first thought it seems, indeed, difficult for us to realize how they can ever be separated from the involved complexity of modern society. Like the creeping vines which intertwine and wind themselves in and about a lattice work, and seemingly cannot be separated from it, so monopoly, in one form or another, intertwines itself throughout the entire strata of mod-

ern society and appears in many ways to be a vital and necessary part of it.

But, like many other things, monopoly has its earmarks whereby it can always be recognized. It is essentially a "short cut," and, as I have already stated, it had its origin among men in the discovery that there was a way for them to gratify their desires which was easier and simpler than that of mere cooperation and exchange. In abandoning the path of justice they took a short route to "success" by appropriating the property (wealth or labor) of others. When the ancient savage discovered that he possessed the strength and power to control, through threat or intimidation, the life and labor of his weaker neighbor, then monopoly was born; and it has flourished from that day to this. All through the centuries we may trace the spirit of monopoly in one form or another. We see it as the underlying motive and principle in nearly all the wars of ancient or modern times; the annals of both dead and living empires display it on every hand, and in our own time and in our own land it is as fully alive as at any other time or in any other land.

VI.

The enemy of labor is not capital. There is no conflict between capital and labor, and essentially never can be. Labor's enemy, and capital's enemy, in the last analysis, is this monopoly of which we speak. Labor, unrestricted, unhindered, leads unerringly and directly to democracy, and is itself the evidence of democracy. Wherever you find labor free, in its broadest sense, there only will you find true democracy. Where labor is not free, there you will find monopoly.

The conflict, then, is not between labor and capital, but between free labor (or democracy) and monopoly. Thus monopoly is not merely the foe to one class, but to all classes (except the class of monopolists); it is not merely the foe to the poor, as such, but also to the well-to-do. It is not only the foe to manual labor, but the foe to the producer in every form. It is the real antagonist of true business interests, of enterprise, of ambition, and the enemy of justice, liberty and equality.

JOHN MOODY.