

THE BOMBSHELL THAT HENRY FORD FIRED

By ALLEN L. BENSON

(This article appeared in the April 1914 issue of PEARSON'S MAGAZINE. It also forms a chapter in a new Benson book,—"Our Dishonest Constitution." B. W. Huebsch, New York City, Publisher. It is republished here for free circulation by consent of the Pearson Publishing Co., who hold copyright privilege.)

HENRY FORD has cracked the shell of hell. He who will may put his eyes to the crack and look out. Everyone in the world is putting his eyes to the crack, though not every one is looking out. The whole world is talking about Ford. Wherever men and women toil most, there is the talk most earnest. Five dollars a day for floor sweepers—think of it. Twelve millions a year given to employees—can we be dreaming? And daily hours cut from nine to eight—will not somebody kindly wake us up?

Nobody can wake us up. We are not asleep. All that we have read about Ford is true. The great automobile manufacturer is giving away money by the million—not as Rockefeller gives it, to universities and churches; not as Carnegie gives it, to found libraries in his own honor—Ford is giving the millions back to the men who hammered them out with their bones. He might have kept them all. He voluntarily chose not to. For Ford, as a human being, I am strong. He is a man.

I should like now to have you look through the crack that Ford has put into the shell of hell as I look through it—and then ask yourself whether I have pointed out anything that is not there. But to see through this crack clearly it will be necessary for you to keep Ford's millions a little away from your eyes. A silver dollar, held within half an inch of your eye, you know, will shut off the view of a valley a thousand miles long.

I said I was strong for Ford. I am. I am strong for him because he wears no bristles upon his back. I am strong for him because he is doing what no other man of his income ever did—giving back to his employees half of his profits. But I am strongest for him because he has proved many things that Socialist

writers have been telling you for years. When we wrote you yawned. You said we were dreamers. Some of you said we were fools. No matter what you said. The point is, you did not believe us. We pictured to you a world for which you did not dare to hope. You did not believe a world so much better than this could exist. But you were wrong. Ford has proved you were wrong. You were wrong because you did not dare to hope enough. The human race never dares to hope enough. So long has it been harnessed to hardship that it scarcely dares hope at all. A politician who promises next to nothing—and does not deliver that—is usually believed. We Socialists, who promise what the earth really holds, are set down as idle dreamers or malicious demagogues.

It is time now to get down to brass tacks. Money talks. Ford's money is talking. We Socialists told you that under a just system of industry even the lowliest worker need not lack a decent living. Ford has not established a just system of industry, even in his own factory. He is returning only half of his profits. But the lowliest man who works for Ford receives not less than \$5 a day. That is \$1,565 a year. Ford is paying many of his workmen more than \$2,000 a year. The average annual wage of the American workingman is less than \$500 a year.

The difference between what Ford is paying and what the others are paying indicates part of the robbery that the others are practising upon their victims. It does not represent all of the robbery, because Ford is not yet paying his employees what they earn. Ford's employees, like all other employees, earn all that is produced in excess of what is actually produced by the proprietors themselves. Most great proprietors produce nothing. Ford is an exception. He is entitled to his just reward. But his just reward is not what he is getting. His plant last year produced \$25,000,000 of profits. Ford took more than half of this sum and his six partners took the rest. No man on earth can earn \$12,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a year.

No man on earth can wisely use so much a year. Ford knows this as well as anybody. The fact that he has chosen to surrender half of his profits shows that he knows it. The fact that he has chosen to return half of this money to his employees instead of using it to found libraries and endow colleges shows that he

knows to whom it belongs. Ford has been a workingman himself. He is not entirely blind. He knows what it means to work and get only a part of what one earns.

But let us hurry along. We Socialists told you that under a just system of industry even the lowliest workingman need not lack a decent living. You hooted at us. You said we were fools. The rich men said we were crooks. What does Ford say? He says he can afford to pay and will pay floor sweepers not less than \$5 a day. What do you think of a minimum of \$5 a day? You, Mr. Average American Workingman, who receive less than \$500 a year, what do you think of \$1,565 a year? Could you live in comparative decency on that? Would your family feel a little more comfortable than it now feels on less than \$500 a year? How would you like to work for Ford? Would you accept a job in his factory if he were to telegraph you? Would you suspect his money of being counterfeit?

Then, why do you always suspect Socialist promises of being counterfeit? Can nothing but the actual sight of money convince you? All that Ford has told you in terms of money we have told you in words. We have told you even more. We have told you that you may have all your labor produces if you will but go about it in a sensible way to get it. Ford has told his employees they may have half of the additional \$25,000,000 a year that they should get. When Ford promises to return ten or twelve millions a year you take him exceedingly seriously. If you are near enough to his factory, you crowd around the gates and howl for jobs. You block the streets until the police have to come and chase you away. But when Socialists tell you that you could just as well have the whole \$25,000,000 as half of it, you yawn and declare you believe you will vote the Democratic ticket and keep the tariff down or vote some other ticket and put the tariff up.

The man who perpetually yawns is exceedingly likely to dislocate his jaw, but he is not in great danger of yawning a new suit of clothes upon his back, or a barrel of flour into the kitchen. It is time that we, as a nation of working men and women, began to give some serious thought to the problem of how we may best go about it to make life more nearly worth living. If nothing can convince us except the actual sight of money, let us thank God

that Ford has money. He has put a crack in the walls that even a donkey should be able to see through.

But we should ask too much of Mr. Ford if we were to require him to pull us through the crack. Ford has done enough for us. We should now do something for ourselves. He has shown us that half of his profits are enough to enable him to reduce daily hours from nine to eight and increase the pay of all men more than 22 years old to \$5 a day. We should be able to do the rest of the problem ourselves. It is nothing but a problem in mental arithmetic. We have only to divide the remainder of Ford's annual profits by the number of his employees to ascertain how much more Socialism would increase wages.

The remainder of Ford's profits are \$12,500,000.

The number of his employees is 25,000.

Enough profits are left to increase by \$500 a year the wages of each man, woman and child who works for Ford.

That would be a little more than \$2,000 a year for floor sweepers and still more for others.

If Ford should say to his employees that he would give each of them \$500 more a year, you would believe him. You would believe him because you know he has the money. Yet Ford cannot divide \$12,000,000 by 25,000 more accurately than I can. I know what the result is as well as he does. I know that if Ford's employees, in common with all the rest of the people in the United States, owned the Ford factory, precisely as they do the parcel post, that the employees, instead of Mr. Ford and his partners, would get the remaining \$12,500,000 a year. All this is but the simplest truth, and the sooner the working class of the United States awaken to its truth the sooner will "Ford wages"—and better—be paid to everybody in the United States.

But every industry in the United States is not a Ford automobile factory—this from our friends the grafters who want to keep things precisely as they are. Hardly anybody, they say, is making so much money as Ford and almost nobody could afford to pay so much wages as he is paying.

Nonsense! Every great industry in the United States can afford to pay as much as Ford is paying. Little business men could not afford to pay as much, because they are doing business in a wasteful, picayuneish way, but the great industries are as well able as Ford to pay what he is paying. The automobile industry is highly competitive. The great trusts, which have nearly, if not quite, destroyed competition in their respective lines—those trusts are in far better position than is Ford to pay high wages. Ford's business seems an exception to ordinary industries only because his dividends are so large. Let me tell you why his dividends are so large.

The Ford Automobile Company in 1913 made profits of \$25,000,000. The rule among big business men is to issue as much stock as the profits will pay dividends upon. That is the way business men estimate values. Earning power is the test. If a concern can produce profits of \$1,000 a year, the concern must be worth \$25,000, because \$1,000 is 4 per cent. of \$25,000. The advantage of this scheme is that it gives the insiders an opportunity to get their own profits quickly. They do not wait weary years for dividends. They simply start the presses to printing stock. The stock is sold to the public at high prices and bought back, in panic times, at low prices. The insider cannot lose. The outsider cannot win. The insider does not intend the outsider shall win.

*The Ford Automobile Company, as I have said, produced in 1913 profits of \$25,000,000. It was known far and wide as a highly prosperous concern. According to all the rules of high finance, it should have been capitalized at an enormous sum. According to all the rules of high finance, its stock should have been touted broadcast as a great investment and sold to everybody who could be induced to buy. If Henry Ford had been the ordinary big business man, he would have done these things. Upon the basis of his \$25,000,000 of profits he would have capitalized his concern at \$625,000,000 or thereabouts. Upon a capitalization of \$625,000,000 he could have paid an annual dividend of 4 per cent. As the owner of more than half of the stock he could have put more than \$300,000,000 into his own pockets and become another Carnegie. He could have reduced wages, starved his employees into strikes, shot them down if necessary, and virtuously resisted all demands for more wages by declaring that he

was already paying so much wages that he could pay only 4 per cent. dividend upon his stock.

But Henry Ford did none of these things. The Ford Automobile Company, instead of being capitalized at \$625,000,000, is capitalized at \$2,000,000. The stock of the company, instead of being scattered broadcast through the country, is owned by seven men, Mr. Ford himself owning more than half. Mr. Ford, in other words, has been and is engaged in the making and selling of automobiles rather than in the making and selling of stock.

Therein Ford differs from the conventional big business man. Because his company is honestly capitalized, his books in 1913 showed a profit of more than 1,200 per cent. It is because his books showed a profit of more than 1,200 per cent. that the Ford company is pointed out as an unusually successful enterprise. If the Ford company were capitalized for seven or eight hundred million dollars, the very men who now regard it as a gold mine would regard it as a gold brick.

And it would be a gold brick to everybody except the men who sold the brick. They would have the seven or eight hundred millions and would be so respectable that their respectability would shed censure as a duck's feathers shed rain. But the cheated stockholders would be dissatisfied with the small return upon their investment, and the workers would be dissatisfied with their wages. The wages of floor sweepers would not be increased from \$2.34 a day to \$5, nor would \$10,000,000 be handed out each year to other employees. More likely the wages of everybody would be reduced. And the reduction would be based upon the excuse that is everywhere given by big business men: "We must reduce wages in order to pay our stockholders a fair rate of interest."

We hear this cry every day. The railroad companies want to reduce wages or increase freight rates—they do not much care which. The mining companies cannot afford to pay their employees living wages. No millionaire will admit that he is making a dollar in excess of necessary household expenses. Ford is the only millionaire in the United States who is crying to his employees for help to spend his money.

Yet common sense should tell us that the Ford plant is not the only industry in the United States that is making much money.

Why should the Ford plant be so considered? The Ford plant makes nothing but automobiles. Automobiles are not necessary to life. Most people do not have them. Most people never will have them. Concerns that make and sell what everybody must have should be much more prosperous than a concern that deals in what only a few can have. A great railroad system should be much more prosperous than an automobile plant. The Beef Trust should be more prosperous than an automobile plant. The Woolen Trust should be more prosperous than an automobile plant. The Steel Trust should be more prosperous than an automobile plant. Yet not one of these trusts declare a dividend in 1913 of 1,200 per cent. Not one of these trusts has since established a minimum wage of \$5 a day and reduced daily hours from nine to eight. Not one of these trusts pays anything but the lowest wages upon which its employees will consent to exist. They are all doing business—feeding, transporting and otherwise serving the American people, but they are all paying wages that Ford's employees would not look at, and calling upon the police, if necessary, to prevent their employees from using force to get more.

The American people are being fooled—that's all. The business buccaneers of this country are concealing their profits behind watered stock. What Ford is doing all the great business interests of the United States could do if they would.

The railroads could decrease freight and passenger rates and increase wages.

The Beef Trust could increase wages and reduce the price of meat.

The Woolen Trust and the Steel Trust could sell their products for less and pay their employees more.

Ford wages can be duplicated by any trust that is willing to retire its watered stock and return to its employees half or more of the profits.

But there comes the rub. To get the desired result both of the foregoing conditions must be brought about. Capitalization must be brought down to an honest basis and capitalists must be found who will give half of their profits back to their employees. The

fulfillment of either of the conditions without the other will not be enough. It is theoretically possible, though highly improbable, that the trusts will be forced to an honest capitalization. But what if the trusts were to be forced to an honest capitalization tomorrow? What good would that do the men and women who work for the trusts? That is a question that is not answered by gentlemen who would settle everything by squeezing the water out of stock. Squeezing water out of stock, while a highly meritorious proceeding, does not necessarily amount to anything to the employees of stockholders. Squeezing the water out of stock merely prevents rich men from gold-bricking small investors. It does not compel stockholders to pay wageworkers more wages. Ford's honest capitalization did not amount to anything to his employees until he coupled with it a determination to return to his employees half of his enormous profits. Without undermining the very foundations of the capitalist system, what law can be passed to compel capitalists to return half or more of their profits to their employees? No such law can be passed. Therefore, the squeezing out of water from stock is no remedy for insufficient wages. It is a remedy only for a certain class of bad investments.

The only remedy for the miserable conditions under which labor exists is Socialism. Ford's plan, splendid as it is in comparison with the policies of other capitalists, is defective in many particulars, of which I shall mention two. It gives his employees only half of the \$25,000,000 annual profits, when they should have all of the profits except what might justly be paid to him as compensation for his services, which are of undoubted value; and, being entirely voluntary, Ford's plan may be withdrawn by him at any moment.

No man should have the right to withdraw at any time anything to which any other man is entitled. Either Ford's employees create the wealth that is produced in his plant or they do not. If they do not create this wealth, it would be interesting to discover who does create it. If they do create it they are entitled to all they create all the time. If they did not create the \$25,000,000 of profits that the plant produced in 1913, then Ford and his six partners did create them and are now doling them back to their employees in the form of charity. If the workers of this

country, in demanding higher wages, are seeking charity, I have not heard their cry aright. If Ford, in announcing his profit-sharing plan, branded it as an act of charity, I did not read his announcement aright.

“All our men,” said Henry Ford to the New York Times, on January 11, 1914, “have helped us in our business. We feel they are entitled to share in the profits.”

Not a word about charity in that. Nor in this:

“I do not believe in prolonging the conditions which, ever since the Civil War, have been developing into a curse upon the country—the conditions which have built up a few millionaires and actually pauperized millions or kept them poor. Such conditions are out of date.”

Such conditions certainly are out of date. Such conditions were never in date. They were never just. They are not just now. But to declare them “out of date” accomplishes nothing. Even if they are out of date, the conditions still exist. What we need is to put them out of existence. How can we do that? Ford’s plan will not do it. Ford’s plan is voluntary. If we wait until the great capitalists of this country voluntarily offer to relinquish half of their profits to their employees, we shall probably wait until Gabriel blows his horn. Who is willing to wait so long? If every capitalist should voluntarily follow Ford’s example tomorrow, what could prevent them from changing their minds day after tomorrow?

Don’t let your mind buckle up at this point. Here is where you should do your thinking. It is because you always stop before you get to this point that you never get anywhere. We have uncovered the loot—how are we to recover our property?

We have shown that stock watering is a device by which profits are concealed—how are we to get what we have lost?

You cannot do it by decreasing the tariff.

You cannot do it by increasing the tariff.

You cannot do it by fussing with the currency.

You cannot do it by passing more foolish laws against the trusts.

Only one law can be enacted against the trusts that will do the people any good. Pass a law compelling the trusts to sell their plants to the government, at a just price, and you will have done something. You will then be in a position to know that you will get the profits made by the trusts. Owners never have any difficulty in collecting the profits that their industries make. Outsiders are the only ones who have difficulty in collecting profits on other people's property.

The American people are outsiders. They should be insiders. The people of the United States should own the industries of the United States. They do all the work in these industries. They have need for all the products of these industries. Why should they let a few insiders own everything while all the rest of the people stand outside and pay everything? It is not because industry would cease if the insiders ceased to own. Owners are not workers. They used to be, a hundred years ago, but they are not now. Business has grown too big. Owners now merely own. Morgan makes no steel, nor helps move a railway train. Rockefeller only plays golf. Not a great captain of industry works anything but the public. With rare exceptions, such energies as they devote to business are devoted only to the business of profit-making.

Profit-making does the public no good. If the public must be buncoed out of a profit, the public has no interest in the destination of the profit. It is immaterial to the public whether the profit goes to Morgan, to Rockefeller or to the Vanderbilts. The public should not, therefore, be compelled to pay Mr. Morgan for so arranging matters that a certain profit goes to him rather than to somebody else. That kind of "work" does not constitute public service and should not be paid for by the public.

Yet it is the only kind of work these gentlemen do. To do this "work" is the only excuse they have for owning the country's industries. If they were to get out, the industries would go on. The men who are making steel would continue to make steel. The men who are digging coal would continue to dig coal. The men who are weaving wool would continue to weave wool. Noth-

ing would happen except that a few grafters would no longer be permitted to fatten at the expense of everybody else. What Ford has done for his 25,000 employees would be more than duplicated for every other working man and woman in the United States. Ford is giving only half of his profits back to the men who originally created them. Socialism would hand over the other half. Socialism would leave nothing for the mere owner—for the man who did nothing but stand at the pay window with a club.

Men like Henry Ford would be taken care of. Men like Henry Ford are as easy to take care of as they are scarce. In the New York Times interview that I have quoted he said: "I don't expect to leave much of a fortune when I die." He knows how little money can do toward the making of happiness. Yet he knows how necessary it is that everybody should be able to receive for his labor enough money to enable him to live comfortably. "I believe it is better for the nation," he said to the Times, "and far better for humanity, that between 20,000 and 30,000 men and women who work for me should be contented and well fed than that a few millionaires should be made."

The needs of all the rest of the people are as great as the needs of Ford's employees. He believes—and quite rightly—that he has helped humanity by giving half of his profits to his employees. I believe humanity would be helped still more by giving all of the profits that now go to capitalists to the working men and women who are creating them. That is what Socialism stands for. It exists for no other purpose. It has a plan for putting its program into effect. The trusts can be paid for with bonds. The bonds can run 50 years. The profits from the trusts could thus be used to pay for the trusts. The cost could be spread over more than two generations. Nobody would feel the burden. On the contrary, prices could immediately be greatly reduced without reducing wages.

That is what we need in this country. We need to widen the margin between income and necessary expenditure. It does no good to increase wages if the cost of living be also increased so much that nothing is left of the increased wages. Nor does it do any good to reduce the cost of living, if wages be so reduced that the worker can pay only for the cheaper living. The people of

this country will never be any better off until the cost of living can be tremendously reduced without reducing wages at all, or until wages can be tremendously increased without increasing the cost of living at all. Which brings us to the paltry promises that the other political parties make—and don't keep.

How miserable are the promises of the Democratic party—empty though they have proved to be—beside what Henry Ford is actually doing. The Democratic party promised to reduce the cost of living by reducing the tariff. If anyone can show that the cost of living has gone down since the Underwood tariff law became effective he will have accomplished something that Bradstreet's has been unable to do. The Democratic party promised that it would increase prosperity by "reforming" the currency. The currency has been reformed, but 325,000 men are idle in New York city alone, and millions more are idle throughout the country. The Democratic party promised to stop extortion by "strengthening" the laws against the trusts, but when Mr. Wilson outlined his anti-trust program to congress, Wall Street smiled all over and declared publicly that the President's statesmanship was superb.

Nor is that all. What if the Democratic party had actually kept its promise to reduce the cost of living? What if the Democratic party had made the average man's living cost nothing? The average man's living must cost less than \$500 a year, because his total income is less than that sum. What if the Democratic party had enabled the average man to live for nothing and save his whole income of less than \$500 a year? What would that achievement have amounted to beside the act of Ford in paying even his floor sweepers \$1,565 a year? If Ford's floor sweepers want to live on less than \$500 a year, as most American workmen are compelled to live, each of Ford's floor sweepers can save more than \$1,000 a year. Ford actually increased the wages of each of his floor sweepers \$833 a year. He more than doubled their wages, swelling them from \$732 to \$1,565. The Democratic party never promised the working people of the country more than a paltry reduction in the cost of living, with no guarantee whatever that wages would not be correspondingly reduced. As a matter of fact, the Democratic party has not reduced the cost of living at all. Yet Mr. Wilson continues to enjoy world-wide renown as a great statesman.

Nor did Mr. Roosevelt, in his most extravagant moments, ever promise anything that could be compared with what Henry Ford has done and is doing. Mr. Roosevelt, if he be read carefully, never really promised much of anything. He talked glibly about "social justice," but he never took the trouble to translate his phrases into terms of beef and potatoes. Any political phrase that cannot be translated into terms of beef and potatoes is poor politics for those who consume the political phrase but cannot consume the beef and potatoes.

What we need in this country is more food, more clothing, better shelter, more leisure and less political hot air. Mr. Roosevelt willing, as he always is, to promise at least all he believes he can deliver, really never promised anything that was definite enough to be identified by an adding machine. If he had promised to the people of the whole country even half of what Ford is actually delivering to his employees, it is a grave question whether he would have received as many votes as he did. It would have seemed too much. Nobody would have believed the country's industries could stand the drain. Yet Ford, honestly capitalized as his company is, has turned the trick and is still paying an annual dividend of 600 per cent. upon his \$2,000,000 of stock.

We who live in this country should dare to hope. We are living in both a marvelous country and a marvelous age. We have the men, the machinery and the materials with which to produce everything we need. We should no longer be content with a bare living. We should live well and live easily. We should work less and consume more. We should demand much and insist upon getting it. We should have no patience with politicians who promise us trifles and give us nothing. Any politician who promises us trifles is either crooked or lacking in realization of what are our just deserts. We who do the work of this country are entitled to everything that is produced in this country. We should have no multi-millionaires here. We should have no paupers here. We should have neither if everyone were to have the value of what he creates and no more.

We need only to go about it sanely to satisfy our needs. The industries of this country are no longer suited to private ownership. Anything that cannot be run by its owners is too large for its owners to own. Lincoln said no man was good enough to govern another man without that other man's consent. We say that

no man has a moral right to own what he cannot operate, but which other men must operate if they are to live. The small group of men who own the industries of this country cannot operate them and do not need them. The great group of men who operate the industries of this country do not own them, but must have access to them if they are to live. They cannot obtain access to them except by making terms with their owners. The terms are always the lowest wages upon which the workers will consent to exist. These must be the terms because there are always idle workers ready to take the jobs for wages that will yield a bare living.

Democrats declare these statements are false. Progressives declare these statements are false. Republicans declare these statements are false. We Socialists respectfully call attention to the fact that the capitalist who are robbing you are financing each of the parties that declare we Socialists are liars. We also call your attention to the conditions that now exist and have existed since you were born—and long before. The workingmen of this country, like workingmen the world over, have been and still are poor.

If you want to fill your pockets, you must open your eyes. Two classes are struggling for the possession of the wealth that is being produced in this country. The workers are trying to keep what they make. The capitalists are trying to get all they can. Strikes are an expression of this conflict. Politics is an expression of this conflict. Of the two politics is the more important. The gentlemen who are relieving you of so large a proportion of what you produce are, for the most part, proceeding according to law. They know, because they made the law. They are exceedingly particular as to what the law shall be. They would like the law always to be on their side. It is easier to do anything when the law is on one's side. You should know this as well as they do. You should know it so well that you would go about it intelligently to make the law as you want it.

That is precisely what you do not do. When you strike you do not choose J. Pierpont Morgan or John D. Rockefeller as your leader. You choose one of your own men. But when you go after something of much more importance—that is to say, political power—you always choose J. Pierpont Morgan or John D. Rockefeller as your leader, I mean you always vote with some party

that is controlled and financed by the rich men whom you wish to conquer.

You see Roosevelt, but you do not see George W. Perkins.

You see Wilson, but you do not see August Belmont and Thomas F. Ryan.

You are solemnly assured that Perkins, Belmont and Ryan do not count, but when your hero has finished his term in the White House they are always more enthusiastic about him than you are. You may not know why, but they do. You believed he belonged to your side. They knew he did not. Some of the men who recently built a monument in Princeton, New Jersey, to the memory of Grover Cleveland are the men whom Cleveland was elected to put out of business. It is always so. A man who is elected by the capitalist class cannot be depended upon to prevent that class from preying upon the people.

The Socialist party is trying to take possession of this country on behalf of the men and women who are doing the work of this country. It is not financed by any capitalist. Its only source of income is the 25 cents a month that each of the workers who belong to the party pays into its treasury. It has no other purpose than to promote the public welfare. It knows not how the public welfare can be promoted except by urging the people to take over the ownership of the country's industries and operate them for the public benefit. We believe we can pack meat without Mr. Armour. We believe we can do everything there is to be done without the help of anybody. We know we can do everything that is to be done, because we have always done it and are still doing it. We should only miss the activities of the gentlemen who keep us poor while we are working. We believe we could endure their absence. We also believe we could endure the absence of their agents in congress. We believe congress, without any trust agents in it, would be quite a respectable body. We should not trust it too far—we should hold it in check with the initiative, the referendum and the recall—but we believe it would do very well. Since the government has succeeded in digging the Panama Canal, we believe it could be trusted to dig coal and grind wheat, weave cloth and smoke hams.

In short, we believe so much in our country that we are exceedingly anxious to take possession of it. We should like to place everybody, not merely on a level with Mr. Ford's floor

sweepers, but up with his \$3,000 or \$4,000 a year mechanics. At present each of Mr. Ford's floor sweepers is annually in receipt of an income that is more than three times as great as that of the average American—and Mr. Ford has enough left to pay a dividend of 600 per cent. upon his stock. Mr. Ford and his floor sweepers may be proud of this fact, but how do you feel about it?

Join the Socialist Party. Vote the Socialist ticket. Get in line. It is unthinkable that present conditions can forever continue. The ownership of the earth cannot forever be kept in the hands of a few. The workers must be the owners. Do you believe otherwise? If not, vote the only ticket that will express your desires. Dare to hope—and then vote as you hope.

The price of this pamphlet is 5c; 25c per dozen; 50 cents per hundred; \$3.50 per thousand and can be had at the address below.

BENSON'S BOOKS

The National office carries in stock three books by the author of this pamphlet.

“The Truth About Socialism”
188 pages--paper binding--25 cents per copy.

“Our Dishonest Constitution”
Same size as “The Truth about Socialism”
--25 cents per copy.

“The Usurped Power of the Courts”
64 pages--paper binding--10 cents per copy.

We will send you postpaid any one of the above titles on receipt of price or the three for fifty cents.

Benson's books are clear in style and authentic in facts.

They are all as good as this pamphlet.

ADDRESS:
SOCIALIST PARTY
803 W. Madison St.,
CHICAGO, ILL.