

The Social Unrest

Earl C. Davis

Pittsfield, MA

1908¹

There always has been, and undoubtedly there always will be, a social unrest. Sometimes it goes on quietly and almost imperceptibly. At other times it develops slowly but with constantly increasing intensity until it marks an epoch in history and registers in the life of man a new milestone on the road of progress and destiny. At times in the past the social unrest has developed into a veritable fever with its attendant ravings and wild and unrestrained actions. We must assume there will be a constant process of change in life. New hopes and new principles and new applications of old principles are constantly appearing and will be tested and if valuable to human life will establish themselves. If they do not prove valuable and effective they will be discarded. In this unceasing seething change, those forms and those institutions which have already done their work must be left behind, and give room for the new. This is a simple and elementary fact of history, and yet there are many that do not see it. To state it in other terms, social unrest is an inevitable condition of historical progress, grounded in the nature of things. This fact must be recognized as the ultimate force of the unrest of our own times. Just because it is his nature to do so, man instinctively feels that the golden age of noble life and noble effort is in the unrealized worlds of tomorrow, and not hidden away in the archives of history. Let him who objects to the fact of a social unrest today or at any time, take his complaints before the gods who have made us, and ask that we be made over again to suit his fancy ignorance.

Measured in a large way, the conditions of today are better than they ever have [been] in the history of the world. It may be that many individuals feel the pinch of hardship very keenly, and I know that there is no consolation in the statement that they are better off than some men were during any period of the

¹ While there is no explicit date on this manuscript, it can be dated from the reference in the second paragraph to "the year of our Lord, 1908."

past. I know that there are many who will say that conditions today are not what they were at some time or in some place prior to the year of our Lord 1908. Yet if one reads his history carefully, and goes below the surface, he cannot fail to see that things as they are, are better than they have been at any time in the past. I know that you will point out the marked contrast in this country today, suffering from the evils of depression, and contrast it with the conditions of a little more than a year ago, and ask me what I can say about that. I shall say just this. We were affected with the same trouble then that we are now, only we did not know it. Now we know it, and the very fact that we do know it is making the unrest of our times the much more potent in affecting the changes that are necessary. The point of it all is this, that the social unrest of all times, and the social unrest of today, does not have its origin in the idea that things today are not so good as they were yesterday, but in the idea that things today are not what they ought to be, and that they are not what they will be tomorrow. Our unrest is due, not to the memories of a dead golden age of memory, but to a living idealism written into every fiber of our being, and bound by the very laws of the universe to establish itself in the life of man.

We are accustomed to say that the unrest of our time has its origin in the economic conditions under which we are living. This is given as the cause of the changes and movements that are going on in our social life about us. It is very true that this condition is one of the immediate causes of the seething changes in our modern life. The unequal distribution of wealth, the pressing poverty, on the one hand, and the enervating life of pleasure and ease, on the other—these are pointed to as the causes of the unrest. Child labor, the impoverished conditions of the home, the vast army of the unemployed, the cruel desperation of the uncertainty of life among such a vast proportion of our people, the fact that so many are living in poverty and dependence, the fact that so many more are just balancing themselves on the precipice of poverty, and the slightest push being sufficient to hurl them headlong down into the terrible abyss of starvation of body and soul; the fact that to most of us there is no future but the future of desperate toil, unrelieved by hope, and darkened by the ever-threatening cloud of fear—all these things are spoken of as the cause of the unrest of our time. In a sense they are. In all this I hear the cry of the lost and despairing soul, deprived by the conditions

under which he is living, of giving expression to the nobility of human life which is in him and which is hungering for a chance to show itself in the simple natural relations of human life.

But this is not the cause in the sense that all these people, who are bearing the burdens of our prosperity and the hardships of our depression, are just giving expression to the whining wail of defeat in the struggle for existence. They are not asking for bread for the sake of eating, they are not asking for quarters, they are not asking that they shall be cared for, and protected, they are not asking for immunity from work, they are not asking for ease and luxury, either for themselves or theirs. They are asking for justice and a chance to live. They are asking for a chance to give expression to the best that is in human life, for the chance to learn through experience the things that make for the rich life, as all men must. If I am not mistaken, this cry of the desolate soul, of the man and the woman and the child, who feel the hunger for the natural satisfying life of the human being, is much more desperate among the rich than among the poor, among the idle and the worthless at the upper end of the social order, than it is at the lower end. Our economic conditions are the occasion for our unrest, but the cause is much deeper.

There is another force in our modern life which is often referred to as the cause of our unrest. That is the fact of education. Education has always been recognized as a dangerous enemy to established institutions. Great institutions have been maintained in the past on the foundation of ignorance among the mass of the people. People must not know, must not inquire, must not ask questions, must not think, and above all else, they must not give expression to their thoughts, for that would cause discontent, and make them dissatisfied with their surroundings, and their lot in life. Lord Berkeley, of the Colony of Virginia, saw the danger of education to established institutions, and gave a very clear expression of the foundation upon which human society was conducted for centuries. The people and the ministers of Virginia made demands of Berkeley for schools and greater freedom in the pulpit. To them he replied

[The] ministers should pray oftener and preach less. But, I thank God, there are no free schools, nor printing; and I hope we shall not have these hundred years, for learning has brought disobedience, and

heresy and sects into the world, and printing has divulged them, and libels against best government. God keep us from both.²

It is hardly necessary to say that Lord Berkeley enjoyed what we call a monopoly. It is true that education leads to unrest now, as it always has, but it is hardly the cause. It is rather a means of understanding and expressing the natural and the inherent unrest of man. In spite of the inefficiency of our systems of education, they are a powerful factor in stimulating unrest, and putting in the hands of people the knowledge and the information without which no sensible judgement can be formed, and no remedy applied.

But deeper still than anything that I have mentioned, as connected with the unrest of our times, is the entirely different attitude towards life in the modern world as compared with ancient times. I hardly know how I can illustrate this difference any more clearly than to refer to the different point of view in regard to the nature of government. In Europe, during the palmy days of feudalism, there obtained the notion that men were entirely incapable of self-government. God knew this and to meet the deficiency that existed in human life, he instituted the fact as well as the doctrine of the divine right to rule. The will of the king or the Emperor was the will of God and that was final. All the people had to do was to submit to the will of God as it was manifested in the commands of the king. It made no difference how silly, or foolish or brutal this command might be, the subject had no other course open to him than that of keeping his mouth shut and obeying. That doctrine, once accepted as final, has not become obsolete in most countries in the Western world. It still obtains in Russia under conditions that indicate very clearly the respect in which it is held. In Germany the form still exists but the vitality has gone. In England, the king is nothing more than an expensive luxury, who pays for his keep by making himself...³

² Earl Davis gives no source for this quotation. It can be found in John Graham Brooks' *The Social Unrest: Studies in Labor and Socialist Movements*, New York: Macmillan Co., 1903, p. 73. Sir William Berkeley (1605-1677) was the longest serving governor of Colony of Virginia (1641-1652 and 1660-1677).

³ Clearly some text is missing here. But the text as transcribed here is what is found at the end of manuscript page 5 and the beginning of manuscript page 6.

The English landlords, entrenched behind the privilege of land monopoly, called John Ball "mad" because he sounded the note of the modern world which has sent many of the ancient customs and institutions tumbling to the ground, and will not stop until it has finished the task begun by the brave and stolid yeomen of European feudalism. They called him mad because he thus addressed the suffering people of the fourteenth century, about six hundred years ago, in these words,

Good people, things will never be right in England so long as ... there be villeins and gentle folk. By what right are they, whom we call lords, greater folk than we? On what grounds have they deserved it? Why do they hold us in serfage? If we all came of one father and one mother, of Adam and Eve, how can they say or prove that they are better than we, if it be not that they make us gain for them by our toil, what they spend in their pride? They are clothed in velvet, and warm in their furs and ermines, while we are covered with rags. They have wine and spices, and fine bread; we have only oat cake and straw, and water to drink. They have leisure and fine horses; we have pain and labor, the rain and the wind in the fields. And yet it is of us and our toil that these men hold their estate.⁴

That was said about six hundred years ago. It sounds like the product of our own times. It is one of the first clear statements of the practical bearing of the principles of modern life on the social conditions of the old world which we are first leaving behind. The doctrine of the divine right of a privileged class met its deathblow in the revolution that freed the serfs. Those wild and terrible days paved the way for our modern ideal of government. We have yet to do much to make our ideal effective, but it is a tremendous gain to think that we have traveled so far as to have for our ideal of government that noble statement of Lincoln, "the government of the people, by the people, and for the people." With this let us contrast the old ideal of the government of the people, by the king and for

⁴ Earl Davis gives no source for this quotation from John Ball. It can be found in *The Standard History of the World by Great Historians*, Vol. IV, Medieval History (Concluded), John Herbert Clifford, Managing Editor, New York: the University Society, Inc., 1907, p. 2305.

the king. Truly we have advanced a long way, and we still have some distance to go.

This brings us a little nearer to our modern conditions, and shows the necessity and the bearing of that powerful doctrine of individualism in breaking up the system of the old world. I want to make clear if I can the value and the necessity, and the tremendous work accomplished by the doctrine of individualism. The old system of society was based upon the legally and socially recognized class system. A man was born into a class. He could not rise above it or sink below it. It was a complete caste system. It had its merits and had served its purpose in the economy of history. But the time came when it was necessary to break the strength of the caste system. This was done by insisting on the idea of the right of the individual. Man is not born to rule, but must prove his right to rule by his ability. Man is not born to anything, but must show his right and his ability. If a man who is born a peasant can demonstrate his fitness to rule, he must rule. It was necessary to break up that system of closely centralized classes, and the only way to do it was by declaring that the field was free, and the race was to him who had the power. Under the faith in this strong individualism, we have traversed the way from feudal Europe to the present.

But in these latter days it has become apparent that the old doctrine of individualism, which has done such valiant service, has come to be abused. You will notice that in its older form, and under the older conditions, it meant a free field for him who was most zealous in breaking up the feudalism. If a man had ability, that ability should be recognized, regardless of the class from which it came. The cry then was, as it is now, "Everyman [has] a chance." But in our modern times it has come to receive a different meaning. This new turn that has been given to it has been very closely associated with some [of] our modern scientific ideas, accepted in an undigested form, and applied in a dogmatic manner. It is surprising what service that scientific phrase, "the struggle for existence and the survival of the fit" has been put to in the defense of existing social customs, and how, under its patronage, the idea of individualism has been warped. I have read recently a book written by Prof. William G. Sumner, and published in 1883, under the title of

*What Social Classes Owe To Each Other.*⁵ In this book, he attempts to give a final and conclusive answer to those complainers and sentimentalists and reformers who are heralding the coming of better times. He says,

The notion of civil liberty which we have inherited is that of a *status created for the individual by laws and institutions, the effect of which is that each man is guaranteed the use of his own powers exclusively for his own welfare.*" (Page 34.) ...

A free man in a free democracy has no duty whatever toward other men of the same rank and standing, except respect, courtesy, and good-will. (39.) ...

In a free state every man is held and expected to take care of himself and his family, to make no trouble for his neighbor, and to contribute his full share to public interests and common necessities. If he fails in this he throws burdens on others. He does not thereby acquire rights against the others. (40.)⁶

Now that is alright if he means by that no man shall be such a hog as to derive his own comfort and luxury at the expense of the poor. But what he means is just the opposite. He is using this statement to show that the men who have been squeezed have no right to ask for aid, nor anyone else any right to speak in their behalf in a free state. Then follows a strong and vigorous re-assertion of the doctrine of *laissez faire*, which he says means, in everyday language, mind your own business. This he holds to be fundamental economic philosophy in the struggle for existence. The book ends with this statement,

The yearning after equality is the offspring of envy and covetousness, and there is no possible plan for satisfying that yearning which can do aught else than rob A to give to B; consequently all such plans nourish some of the meanest vices of human nature, waste capital, and overthrow civilization. But if we can expand the chances we can count on a steady general growth of civilization and advancement of society by and through its best members. In the prosecution of these chances we all owe to each other

⁵ William Graham Sumner (1840-1910), *What Social Classes owe To Each Other*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883.

⁶ William Graham Sumner, *What Social Classes owe To Each Other*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883, pp. 34-40, emphasis in the original.

good-will, mutual respect, and mutual guarantees of liberty and security. Beyond this nothing can be affirmed as a duty of one group to another in a free state. (Page 168-9.)⁷

Such is the word of that type of an individualist, which views life in the light of a struggle for existence, and the battle to the strong, with no quarters and no mercy to the weak. Fortunately, this man belongs to a former generation, and the kindness of the undertaker is meeting their arguments.

There is one other book along this line that I have come across. It has no merit as a book treating of economic subjects, although there are some rather keen remarks in it. It is interesting on account of its title, *Natural Law in the Business World*.⁸ Evidently the title for the book was suggested by Drummonds's famous book, *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*.⁹ Indeed the author refers to that book. In this book, he points out the old *laissez faire* arguments, and holds to the view that the evil conditions that result from them must be accepted as necessities. Yet in this book, which was written some twenty years ago, there is a note that is forward looking, and paves the way for a transition into the next topic of which I wish to speak. In the conclusion of the book, there appears some ideas which show the eternal human in man, and will break out through the best devised systems of thought. One of these statements is of interest.

Employers have serious responsibilities devolving upon them. They should treat their employees like, men, and not like machines. A kindly interest in their physical and moral welfare is a positive duty, and tends to advance the interests of both, and of society. A system of profit sharing is worthy of trial, to harmonize interests that men have been taught to believe were antagonistic. Labor and capital can only prosper to their best and fullest extent, when the fallacy of antagonism is exploded.

⁷ William Graham Sumner, *What Social Classes owe To Each Other*, New York: Harper & Brothers, 1883, pp. 168-169.

⁸ Henry Wood (1834-1909), *Natural Law in the Business World*, Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1887.

⁹ Henry Drummond (1851-1897), *Natural Law in the Spiritual World*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1883.

It is plain that extra legislation is no cure of the ills of society. It cannot take the place of conformity to Natural Law. ...

...

Our theory is, that society is a unit, like the human body, composed of different members, whose functions are unlike, but which together form a complete whole. *When one member suffers, all suffer: And when one rejoices all rejoice.* (Page 220 and 221.)¹⁰

So much for the theory of an unrestrained individualism, and a free competition of the wealth of life. Under the operation of this theory, which was indeed powerful as an influence in breaking up the feudal system of the old world, there have arisen abuses, and there have resulted conditions that are inherent in this theory of the social order, especially as the theory has been applied in its true logical method in the orthodox school of economics. It has resulted in those conditions of which I spoke, extreme wealth over against extreme poverty, and the gradual differentiation of society into two groups, the dependent, and the controlling. The privilege of the controlling group rests upon a practical monopoly of the necessities of life, and the means of producing and distributing those necessities. While it is true that many of the chains that bind the dependent group to the controlling group, are covered with silk, and do not chafe or irritate, yet they are chains nevertheless.

As [a] result of this relationship, there has arisen an ever-increasing tendency on the part of those in control to accumulate great fortunes, and on the part of those who are dependent, to tend towards extreme poverty. This poverty has become, not only that kind of poverty that touches the body, but it touches the whole being of man. It undermines his mental and moral powers, destroys his confidence in himself, and in destroying a man's faith in himself and in his use to society, you have struck a death blow at his self-respect. When you have struck a man's self-respect, you have wounded the heart of his moral and spiritual life. Society as a whole has not been slow to see and to feel the prick of these conditions of poverty and the attending immoralities. The heart of human nature, which is

¹⁰ Henry Wood (1834-1909), *Natural Law in the Business World*, Boston: Lee and Shepard, 1887, 220-221, emphasis in the original.

essentially one of good will, broke through this system of "mind your own business" and declared its faith in the belief that it is a duty as well as a privilege to go to the rescue of a man in trouble. I have heard this generation spoken of as a generation characterized by pity. There is some truth in that statement. Men have looked on the misery and the suffering of those who were bearing the real burdens of society and their heart has been touched by that deepest and best of human feelings. Lacking knowledge, which can only come by experience, they sought to relieve this cruel and oppressive situation. They began with the idea that most of the poverty was due to immorality, and that its cause was to be found in the individual. They thought that by taking the individual by the hand, and taking men one-by-one from either terrible conditions, they could at length remove the large proportions of these distressed individuals. With a motive as clean and self-sacrificing as one could ask for, men have given themselves to the work of clearing up these distressed portions of our society. Large charitable organizations, social and college settlements, libraries, schools, clubs, and almost an infinite variety of methods have been tried. Heroic work and consecrated work has been done. These institutions have accomplished much good in the way [of] relieving suffering, helping those who were hard-pressed for the necessities of life. They have helped many onto their feet. But in spite of their tremendous work, they have made no impression on the conditions. In fact, the conditions have been rather growing on them. But I think that the most valuable thing that they have done is to learn something. They have learned that you cannot grow a plant on the arid regions of poverty. They have learned that the surroundings and conditions, both physical and moral, have a lot to do with promoting the very victims whom they would rescue. One great and lasting lesson has been learned from this charity work. It stands out strong and clear above all else. The most effective workers have learned that any effective work must go back of the individual and get at the conditions. The poverty and misery of the individual are not so much the cause of vicious centers as they are the result. Hence we have seen the appeal of these workers to the government for the enactment of measures that shall get back at the relief of conditions. You know of many who have learned this lesson. Jane Addams of the

Hull House in Chicago,¹¹ Prof. Rauschenbusch of Rochester,¹² and Robert Hunter of New York¹³ are among the best known of these. This is just where the great philanthropic work of today stands. They are doing their best to relieve cases of pressing need and necessity, but they are hoping, and the best of them are working, for some force that shall get back and do something towards cleaning up the conditions that produce the cases.

One other method has been more or less widely tried as a means of bringing operatives and operators into closer harmony, and also as a means of relieving the apparent burden which rests upon the shoulders of the workers. In many cases, this method has been tried in good faith, while in many other cases, it has been but a concealed method of more complete exploitation. I refer to the so-called welfare work in which factories have taken more-or-less of a paternal interest in the people who were working for them. Almost everyone is familiar with this sort of thing. It covers a large range of effort. In its simplest forms it means nothing more-or-less than that of the provision of decent place of work. But in some of its more extended attempts it has been made to cover the providing of houses, stores, entertainments, places of amusement and recreation for employees and their families. It has also provided all sorts of devices within the factory such as bathrooms, lunch rooms, reading rooms, and has even gone so far as to decorate shops with plants and forms of art so that the workmen may not be discontented. I have not heard as yet that any of these patronizing welfare enthusiasts have ever gone so far as to designate the kind of tooth powder that their employees shall use, but in many cases

¹¹ Jane Addams (1860-1935) American settlement activist, reformer and author. She was the second woman to receive the Nobel Peace Prize in 1931. In 1889, along with Ellen Gates Starr, she establish Hull House in Chicago, the first settlement house in the United States

¹² Walter Rauschenbusch (1861-1918) American theologian and Baptist minister, taught at the Rochester Theological Seminary. He was a key figure in the social gospel and single tax movements of the late 19th and early 20th centuries.

¹³ Wiles Robert Hunter (1874-1942) American sociologist and progressive author. In the late 1890s he became organizing secretary of the Chicago Bureau of Charities and became involved with the Settlement Movement, connecting with Jane Addams, among others, when we was a resident of Chicago's Hull House. In 1902 he was the Manager of the University Settlement in New York.

they have carried their principles to an absurd extreme. We cannot deny the good intention of many who have done this work, nor can we deny the good results that have appeared where the work has been done in good faith. But the fact remains that the results of this kind of work have been disappointing and surprising to many who had hoped to see great good come from it. In most cases, it has proved a failure. The Dayton Cash Register Company and the Pullman Car Company are clear illustrations of the failure of this method. They carried the welfare work to the limit, and almost became nurses for their employees. The result was that the employees resented it and there came a time when they would no longer stand this kind of patronizing paternalism. They began to feel like people who had been shut into a field around which there had been built a beautiful hedge. In time they began to see that the hedge concealed a strong iron fence, and that they were virtually in prison. This is the logical outcome of paternalism. The fact that men have preferred freedom in poverty to comfort in constraint is a strong confirmation of the assertion that I made above to the effect that the present unrest is based not so much on economic greed as upon the desire for justice and a chance to live. For the most part men have no desire to revert to a system of economic feudalism.

I have referred to the two attempts that have been made to relieve the conditions of poverty and oppression among the workmen of the country. The attempt of charity and philanthropy may be said to have emanated from what we call the third party or the public. In perfect justice, I think that it may be said to have been prompted by large generous motives. If it has failed, or been inadequate, the failure has been due to a failure to appreciate the nature of the situation. The second attempt has emanated from the controllers, and this also has proved a failure. Again the failure has been due to the misapprehension of the true nature of the situation.

I now pass to the point of view of those who have felt the most keenly the pressure of these conditions. Failing to get any permanent relief from the organization of labor and the attempt to control the labor market and dictate the conditions of labor, they have searched more deeply and have tried to get back at the ultimate causes of the conditions which they find to exist. I wish now to present their diagnosis of the situation, and the remedy which they propose to apply.

The first point to be noted is this, that in the long process of evolution man has learned through experience to make many devices which enable him to provide the necessities of life much more easily than in former days, and to a large extent frees him from the overlordship of natural forces. He has become master of natural forces and can divert their strength to his support and his well-being, instead of being a complete victim of their caprice.

This accumulated experience appears in modern life under two forms. One of these forms is knowledge, and the other is capital. Our labor, together with the accumulated wisdom of the ages in the form of knowledge, and the accumulated devices of the ages which appears in various forms of machinery, and which are, and of right should be, regarded as common heritages from the past, are the means by which we today are to maintain our control over the forces of nature, and assure to ourselves life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

Now says the proletariat, we find that we have very little of these common heritages. All this accumulated wealth, which is the product of labor, and represents the surplus of labor which has not been properly distributed, is being withheld from us. More than that, it is being used, not to lift us out of the condition of dependence into which we have been forced in the struggle for existence, but it is being used for the purpose of exploitation. Men armed with this great weapon and source of power which is the product of human experience, are taking advantage of our dependence and crushing us even more mercilessly than we have been crushed, that they may increase their power over us, and add to the already stupendous amount of accumulated capital. The result is that they, having the advantage, can successfully exploit us, and gradually they come into that condition in which it is no longer necessary for them to labor at all. They simply live on the interests of their accumulated capital, draw their dividends, and devote themselves either to culture or vicious idleness. In the meantime, we are becoming the more dependent, and have to work the harder, and live the less decently, and are unable to meet the heavy conditions of life which are imposed upon us. To state the conditions bluntly, there exists two classes, one class who has within its control practically all this accumulated surplus of labor, and the other class that is dependent on the controlling

class for the necessities of life. One is the exploiting class and the other the exploited class.

More than that, by virtue of the fact that we are laboring under such a great handicap, by virtue of the fact that we have such a hard struggle for existence, we are deprived of a just and fair opportunity of availing ourselves of the vast knowledge and wisdom of the ages. We have no opportunity of improving our lot, and lifting ourselves above the plain of a continual and unrelieved struggle for the absolute necessities of life. Every time we make an attempt to lift ourselves, we no sooner get upon our knees, than we are knocked down again by the exploiting class. If by chance we are able to increase our average wages, then we are met by an even greater increase in the cost of the necessities to the consumer. No sooner do we get a little advantage in the times of commercial prosperity, then we are floored by a financial depression.

Our condition is hopeless because we have been deprived of the two great weapons that give men freedom from the prison house of poverty and want and the accompanying conditions of ignorance and crime.

This is the diagnosis of the case. Now what is the remedy?

The remedy proposed is this. In as much as capital, which is the undivided increment of mental and manual labor working upon the natural resources of the work, is the product of society as a whole, and represents a common heritage from the past, let society as a whole own and use it for the freedom and the betterment of society as a whole. This capital appears in two forms. That which is concentrated in the systems distribution, and that which is concentrated in the plants of production. During the past 50 years we have seen a constant tendency on the part of these corporations of distribution and production to combine into large plants and thus acquire a virtual monopoly of the products in which they deal. While this has worked to a general advantage in some respects, it has developed a virtual plutocracy. Now it is a peculiarity of these great combinations that they have developed an impersonal system of ownership. Their stock is widely scattered, and they are managed by boards of directors and various officials who have no direct interest in the men or the plants. Now the socialist says that, in as much as this accumulated capital belongs to society as a whole,

and should be used for society as a whole, let us take these great systems that own the means of production and distribution into our possession and operate them for the benefit of the public to whom they belong. In so doing we would eliminate the tremendous expense of interest, rent and profit, which we are now [paying] to those who have possession of that which we, as a whole, should own. We could then retain the men of great executive ability to manage these great concerns, pay them well for their services, and utilize this great force which we call capital for the purpose of making and distributing the necessities and the comforts of life in the most effective manner possible. Labor, whether mental, executive, or manual, should receive its proper reward, based upon a minimum of a liberal living wage. The goods would be distributed at a figure as near to the actual cost of production as possible. In short, that which belongs to the public should be used for the benefit of the public, and the great purpose of life should be changed from that of economic exploitation at the expense of honest work, clean pleasure, and a fair share of life's best possibilities, to the cooperative endeavor of developing the greatest number of individual lives along the line of the highest possibilities of human life.

I realize that I have stated this diagnosis and remedy of the socialist very imperfectly and very inadequately. In connection with this, one must say that it is the only proposition that has yet been offered that goes to the bottom of the problem which the social unrest of our times brings before us for consideration. In general, its premises are sound, and in keeping with the great principles along which modern society is developing. It involves a loftier conception of human nature and the function of human life than we have yet put into practice. Like the ideals of Jesus, to which it is very closely akin, it has never had a trial as a total proposition. It's essential principle has been applied to various problems in particular, but never to the extent of a complete trial. More-and-more we are coming face-to-face with the concrete question as to whether we shall give this system a trial. It is a grand and magnificent ideal. Only the fact of experience will be able to determine whether it will prove effective as a practical basis of the social order. As citizens it is our duty to face this problem squarely and with an open mind. We must examine this theory of the social order as minutely as possible, question it, put it to every test that we are able to make upon it. Someday we shall

have to decide between the principle of industrial and social cooperation on the one hand, and competition on the other. It involves a tremendous option. It is our duty to prepare ourselves to make a rational and enlightened decision.