The Dying Tramp.

I am a tramp, a dying tramp,
I've lost all self-control;
When clad in rags, with hunger weak,
What else can you expect?
I've dragged my blist'ring feet along
The hard and frozen ground;
I've shivered thro' the winter nights
And tramp'd in hopeless round.
You look at me, a whole wreck,
With lips that show your sorry
And wonder why I'm in this plight:
A tramp was ever born.

You step aside lest I should minch
Your rich and stylish dress;
But yet I know I have a sorry
Which you might never guess.
Stand thou and hear thy victim's tale,
Twas pattern'd by thy hand;
You read it shaped as its glove,
That rules this stricken land.
In days gone by I work'd for you,
In days when all was red;
And when I was a journeyman
I counted and I weal.

The days pass'd by in faithful toil,
The ev'rything brought their cheer.
As time roll'd on, around our board
Were served a feast for free.
But then a change came over the scene,
You felt the thirst of greed;
You cut my wages to the nect
That little was soon spent.
Protest and strike unheeded fell,
I arroght for home and wife;
But as the wages lower drop'd,
All joy forsook my life.
The baby's face was pinched and wan,
The children cried for bread;
Then sickness took a favor'd one,
And laid her with the dead.

You paid too much to let us starve
And not enough to live:
While those without a job were feed'd
To beg what others give.
When times grew hard and work shut down,
Our wages slowly sank;
In spite of living bare
That little was soon spent.
The keepers (taught with memories,
Associations sweet,
Were pledg'd where show the triple balls
Upon a hungry street.
Our little home was sacrifie'd
For just a nickel song.
The horses built with earnings small,
For which we tol'd so long.
Through all the land I could not work
At all my honest trade;
And in a seeming content.
Our rent was left unpaid.
I look'd for jobs, our landlord came
And pitt'd us in the street;
I begg'd to save my family,
You took me for a "beast".
And sent me up for ninety days,
The victim of your wrong;
You burnt on me the brand of shame
Because I was a tramp.
At last the prison doors unclou'd,
But all my love were lost;
My wife was dead, my children gone.
See what your wealth has cost!
My boy became a genuine tough,
I saw his corpse one day;
My girl, the young and chaste and starve,
You led their steps astray.
In my despair I took to drink,
For nothing else remain'd;
Yet lay the blame on me,
Because I did not rise above
This struggling human sea.

It's easy from the quarter-deck
To taunt and bring them grief,
And ask me why I have no yacht
To come to my relief.
You pass me by, a "filthy tramp,"
A "blothet" upon the land;
But hearken to my dying words
Nor stir from where you stand.

The victims of your avance
Are but the planted seed;
Whose fruit will be a whirling doom
Upon your heartless greed.

A. Thurston Hayden.

Centralization.

Money is being said and written at the present time about centralization of capital and the evils incident thereto. The funny papers that champion the party out of power never weary of cartooning and caricaturing the trusts and their promoters, picturing their rapacity and heartlessness quite hideously. Warning is sounded by the press of the deposed party and despairful calumny predicted if the tendency to centralization continues. "Economists" write and talk about centralization, its dangers and its remedy, but all of them stop short of a thorough investigation of the cause of this tendency and the logical necessity for its prevention.

Some men who seem to be well meaning and try to point out how best to control the trusts, and a few like Francis Amasa Walker advocate one centralization and the evils of trusts by further centralizing all capital: by putting all trusts into one great trust—the government. The object of these "economists" is either to solve the vexed question or to allay discontent. If they are honestly seeking a solution of the question, are intent on bringing about an equitable state of affairs, then they must fearlessly and without prejudice grapple with the facts, regardless of where the logic of these facts may lead them. This, however, is not to be expected. These men have social standing. They have more to lose by telling the truth than they hope to gain from a social and financial standpoint. Usually their minds are so filled with formalities and red tape, legal and social, that they cannot conceive of any adjustment freed from such things. To them all social and political arrangement implies simply a modification—either simplification or complication—of the existing arrangement. In view of these facts it is evidently useless to go to this class of men for a solution of this question.

Centralization of capital tends to reduce the number of employers, to remove the employer further from the employe, to create a class of immensely wealthy people who form a social strata quite distinct from the remaining members of society in general. Its evil effects are too well known to require elaboration. How to prevent these evil effects is the question uppermost at present. To prevent the evil effects it is only necessary to do away with the cause, i.e., centralization.

There is a school of social economists who call themselves scientific socialists, who claim to know the why and wherfore of all social phenomena and to give a material interpretation of history and thus to predict the condition of the future. The reason for mentioning them is that the most of those who are attracting public attention at the present time on account of their attempts to solve the question of centralization are more or less tainted with the terrors of this school. They claim that competition drives the competitors to combine and thus leads to centralization. The government is a sublime power in their eyes, one that they hope some day to enlist in their favor. They want to centralize capital to a greater extent than now by placing it in the hands of the government. They seem incapable of distinguishing between society and the government. In speaking of competition they argue as though it could only be prevented by government control of all industries; in fact they so assert. Competition seems to them as much a self-existent something as capital seems to the bourgeois economist. They would reduce competition among workers by withdrawing large numbers from the ordinary fields of production and placing them in government jobs, thus taking them out of competition with their fellow workers who are looking for a job. They fail to see, or at least to properly appreciate, the fact that every man withdrawn from production must be supported by those engaged in production. They seem to think that the government can create value. They attribute centralization to the inevitable working of natural force and seek to completely centralize all industry and all capital by extending government control over them, by governmentalizing—socializing, they will call it.

Centralization of capital has grown up quite quickly, but so quietly that its growth was not perceived by many until it had assumed proportions that made its presence painfully apparent. At first only a few knew that it was centralization that was happening, and they were laughed at by many who now call centralization most hastily. Gradually the fact that this process was working havoc with the hopes of a very large percentage of the people became recognised, and now we save
anti-department store, anti-trust and other move-ments that are arrowed out after the scalp of central-ization. They know not what they do.

Centralization is a logical result of accumulation. Accumulation has been inculcated in the public schools, at home, by preachers and pulpit, and extolled as a virtue. Accumulations of wealth have been proverbial. The very law of the land and the machinery of the law. Two accumulators put their accumu-
lations together and organize a corporation; two or more corporations form a trust, and those who advocate accumulation denounce the trust and demand its abolition.

Land monopoly—that is to say, legal title to land—is one of the fundamental causes of centraliza-
tion. Money monopoly, legal tender, is another cause. The two are the primary causes and su-
cient to bring about all the centralization that now exists, but they are supplemented and the process is regulated by patents, copyrights, license fees, etc.

When men are denied the use of the land they must seek other means of providing themselves and their dependents with the necessities of life. They might go into busi-
ness. Having none, they must find work or travel to make money. This is the market value of
labor. If he is selling goods he must charge these items into the price of the goods. He is helping to centralize capital by so doing.

Most men look for a job—try to get an opportu-
tunity to work for another. The other knows that hundreds are looking for a job, so they must when access to the land is denied them, or they are com-
pelled to pay rent for it, so he reduces the wages of his employees, thereby increasing his profit, and decentralizing the capital in his hands. The man who is looking for a job can feel himself working for himself. In that event he undertakes to drive an express wagon, peddle truck or run a hack or cab. He went many blocks along the street until he collides with a policeman who asks him for his license. Failing to produce one he is taken to police headquarters, where, if the Chief of police happens to be cranky from lack of sack, he may be fined a fair price. He is arraigned before the magistrate and after a great deal of evidence will have to contribute a part of his earnings to the political machine. Maybe the license will
force him out of business and he may then hire out to the big company that owns a number of express wagons, a market truck or a lot of hacks and cabs. The license law has driven him out of business and helped to centralize capital.

A mechanic may see what appears to be a good opportunity to manufacture something that he
fully understands making. He starts in business but soon finds that improved machinery must be
introduced by him in order that he may compete with other manufacturers. He discovers that
while he may be able to make the machine required he is restrained from doing so by patent laws. Each effort on his part will charge him such a price for the machine, or such a royalty on it that he will be forced out of business and the trade he would have done will go to the patent owner. Thus the patent laws help on the centralization of capital.

Every avenue of human activity is thus closed against all who are not already possessed of con-
siderable capital. Even if possessed of much capi-
tal as would have insured success some years ago—other conditions being favorable—a man finds himself at a disadvantage, and unless he can pool his capital with others, can form a trust—centralize—the chances for success are against him. If he does pool with others he hastens cen-
tralization.

In every instance where centralization is the

logical and inevitable tendency it will be found that a law is at work favoring it. Laws restrict competition, subvert the rights of the individual to liberty, and give advantage to some which it denies to others.

We can thus see that centralization of capital is the inevitable result of a system that those who how against it have fostered and who now defend it. It is true that centralization, like the growth of a forest or development of a wild animal, is the result of law: of conscious interference with human association by the men who constitute the government. When our pres-
tent system of private property title to land was established it was for the purpose of forcing some persons to work for others. When money was
made a legal tender, and its issue monopolized by the government it was for the purpose of exercising a controlling influence over labor.

All these things have been done by those who sought advantage over their fellowmen; who despised the poor and cared for them only as they could use them to make profit, and they have been

notified on the grounds that it was all for the pub-
lic good. The superstition of government has, and does cause people to acquiesce in all these nefarious schemes, even though they may curse them and howl with rage at their effects. They never
blame the fact of government, but lay the scolding upon the fate of a blooming rose, and say that the legislators proved recreant to the trust reposed in them. They go to the polls at election time "to
turn the rascals out," and only succeed in turning some other rascals in. All the time they are try-
ing to get some one to work for them, centralization is going on as rapidly as ever, and the

controllers of this centralized capital are wield-
ing more influence than ever over their lives and happiness. Are subjugating them more completely than before.

Decentralization is a necessity. Instead of cur-
ing the evils of centralization by nationalization, or other forms of monopolization, they can be
removed, without introducing greater evils on the

other hand, by decentralization; by abolishing the laws that have made it possible, or at least encouraged it. When those injured by centralization cease to support and defend government; when men quit putting their trust in politicians; in legislation and power of government to improve their con-
ditions and assure them security, to involve the

state at will in any and all transactions without paying tribute for the privilege, there will then be hope of removing the evils of centralization.

Centralization being the legitimate child of gov-
ernment, how can you look to the government to kill it? -Henry Adams.

Morning.

I.

THE FAMILY A BAR TO LIBERTY.

SINCE I wrote the article under this head in No. 129 I have been able to further develop my thought on the subject and thereby better the subject. While our present status of affairs is in the former article, I expect now to present facts which I hope will cause the reader to consider whether the narrow-minded exclusiveness of the family law institution as it exists today is worthy of perpetuation. I must call attention to the fact that for all prac-
tical purposes there is no difference between a legal and an illegal marriage, as only recognized by the courts as binding covenants, but do also carry the same term of exclusive relationship and narrow-
gaged action. The two are in fact, in the eyes of the law, the same, in the eyes of the other they beam. In every other particular the two cases are alike.

Those families tilling the soil for their own maintain-
ance, those in which large numbers of energy are the proper ones by which to compare and value the others. To produce food, clothing, shelter and such luxuries as have become necessary to us as cult-
ured animals, alone satisfies one to the right of exist-
ence, from a moral point of view.

This being the case, it follows of course that where-
ever the people become interdependent by improved methods in the production of this necessary wealth the family as a form congenial group of convenient size for the purpose of resisting hunger and cold and pro-
moting sociability. But what do we find? A scraw-
lum for existence among the sons of wealth, but in robbing and exploiting the producers of wealth, thereby increasing the stumbling blocks in the way to a happy existence to all the families.

And here I deem it proper to put the question: What is our object in life, real or apparent? Un-
doubtedly to enjoy it to the fullest extent. But do we? I have in mind just now a family worth perhaps $50,000, more or less. The father retired a few years ago from business. Is the family happy? Do they know it? Here are some of the apparent reasons: the father is not an Atonis and the mother lacks some features of being a Venus. Neither had any ambition other than to be well off. So they are. But that is all. The prosperity is now that the husband and father mistook the hired girl for his legal spouse and the
legal spouse objected by instituting divorce pro-
ceedings. Where they loved each other in the begin-
ning of their family relationship, they now worry each other all they can. Poor people—well off! They followed custom and usage, and strike in their old days into a real heartache.

Here is another picture of the sacred family. Some years ago two young people, he a stout, ambitious merchant, she a blooming, bright and healthy girl, fell in love with each other and—married. Every-
thing went lovely the first two years. They got to be father and mother twice. They got to dislike each other for various reasons. The husband found and saved company more congenial than his spouse, came home drunk occasionally and the mother renounced, but to no purpose. He began to treat her bad and they would have separated if they had not considered it their duty to stick together on account of the children. Do they enjoy life?

Another picture: Here is a family of six, Father, mother, four sons, and a daughter. The father, which comes especially handy when father has no nose for whom to work, which is the greatest part of the time, for mother has taught him to bend his back and think that he does not care what he does. He is a model workman. Do they love each other? They abuse each other for ever having married. He is disgruntled with the overstrict

law to maintain. He works from early morning till late at night seven days in the week, ordering the children about, threaten-
ing to punish them for—well, they know not what outlet to this energy. The children are partly fed, partly clothed, and partly cared for. Father and mother are afraid the children will turn out bad, so they insist upon obedience regardless of right or wrong. The whole lot are too ignorant to know the meaning of intelligent action. But is it bad? Yes, after they have gone to bed at 9 o'clock too sleepy to worry about the past, present or future. But here comes a contrast in sex relations which I had occasion to observe. A woman, an inmate of a "house of ill fame," was approached by a drunken man using very bad language. She was quite intel-
ligent and somewhat refined—she put him out. At another time this same woman was approached by a diseased man. She refused his company. Both of these men were married and, being of a troublesome disposition, their wives did not dare to refuse them. Their only ambition other than to make sure that any reader of this article can multiply such instances many fold.

After realizing the foregoing consider the beautiful estate of the woman in each and every family of from fifty to five hundred grown persons of both sexes with their offspring, not one of them maintaining private property in sex partners, but, on the con-
trary, having them equally used intellectually and sexually, while all of them are intelligent enough at least to act so as to command the respect of the others. No one has any occasion to strive for the pos-
session of anything which is not equally as pos-
sive. Each man and woman stands upon his or her own feet, asking no favors of any one except what cannot be done alone. On the contrary each member of this family is continually striving to please every other member as occasion arises. Are they narrow minded? Are they jealous of one another? Is there any grounds for strife among them? No; their envi-
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The above is from an Anarchist Communist paper, but here it makes a serious error. It asks how anyone can judge which is right or wrong in one paragraph, and in the next paragraph it states that Anarchism believes in the freedom to do "right" and "wrong." Now I wish to ask you: Is the New Era who is going to get the power to judge what is right or wrong, the church, and the state, and society, and how? And Anarchism is a condition of freedom to act as you please, and not according to some established creed of "right" and "wrong." —A LITTLE ANARCHIST.

STRAIGHTFORWARD writing is so rare an accomplishment, says the London Times, that we have no hesitation in extending the hand of welcome to it wherever it is found. The most recent shining specimen of literary dexterity which has come light upon us is a letter addressed to an Austrian politician by an Austrian anarchist who assisted to emancipate him, who being, on reaching his high estate, forgot the man who had risen. The Ausstralis wrote as follows:

"Dear Sir: You're a dam fraud, and you know it. I don't care a rap for the crooked politician: the man in the street, I know how you got it: you're not an honest man. You took a man's money, more to me than 200 shilling's is to you, but I object to being man'd an liter in your pocket, and I've tied ties of the law after you want me to tie me hard working, a feller here want's a man. That is what, you think I'm in the House moor a week before you muck a cell of yourself. I bet him a man on that as fith was worth it you were worth. After I got Your Nere sayin' you de declined to act the matter I drove over to the Feller's place and take him he had got 19. That's jest I could by now tell I'm tell for you on pole day, 2 months before. You not a thief, but you're a Thrift's Pleas but I am kind in business, I believe you think you're all, O, no, O. I don't care. You don't think nor is near consequence then you will be. I believe you take a pleasure in being a feller you'll be tied by the clouds roll on 'nly'll cut you, you'll stick to them, Ears, where you'll cut the pig, Yere man. An' I don't think much of a deman. You tell me, me and a few. Where are my tickets to a skunk, even though I mend him a member. And the Globe adds:—Thus, it seems to us, what is Matthew Arnold called a "serviceable prose style."