

Some Thoughts on the Science of Government

Written for the Bulletin by
C. L. WILLIAMS.

(Continued from yesterday.)

It is on account of diverse interests, mostly greedy, held by the members of different parties, that diverse political parties exist. I might give many examples, but one will suffice—the protective tariff. It has always been supported by the northern manufacturers and opposed by the southern planters. It has been a battle field for the greedy members of different parties since the adoption of the constitution. We may thus see that the immense majority of all political parties cares but little about the rights of others, but only that its own greedy interests shall prosper. And we may further say that under present environments at the present stage of human evolution, any kind of democratic government must be instead of a highly idealistic system of government, only a warfare between different selfish parties whose members possess diverse greedy interests.

As an example of the operation of the divine right of the majority, let us suppose that two honest seamen are shipwrecked upon an uninhabited island, which is not shown on any sea-chart and belongs to no nation. Then the government of the island will be in the hands of those two. There can be neither majority nor minority. But afterwards a pirate crew casts three of its number, unworthy for the same island. Now there are two political parties, one honest and industrious, the other dishonest and destructive; both a minority and a majority. It is now the divine right of the three pirates, the majority, to compel the two honest sailors to work ceaselessly for the pirates and with only a bare existence for themselves. If one of the pirates were about to die, then it would be their divine right, and probably their honest sailors, to kill the one who would not remain the majority. Of course, it would be necessary to allow all the five citizens to vote on the proposed execution of the honest sailor; but if they should conduct their political affairs in such a straightforward and legal manner, then it would be sedition if one of the sailors should speak against the already decided execution, and it would be high treason if he should forcibly oppose it. What a sublime and holy ideal!

But there is a small school of thinkers which entirely denies the idea that one person, or 1,500,000, or 100 persons, have even the least shadow of right to govern one person that does not consent to that government.

The God of the Hebrews commanded the Israelites not to do any work whatever on the Sabbath day. But the commandment was too strict. It suited their taste, so they interpreted it thus: "It is lawful for one person to carry a loaf of bread on the Sabbath, but it is entirely lawful for two to carry it together." And we say: "No lone king has any right to govern a people; but when the kings are the majority of the people, of course they have the right to rule." The logic is as good in one case as it is in the other—and as bad.

One person has no right whatever to govern another; two persons have just twice as much right as one person. If a million men are to be ruled, a million men must be rulers; and a million persons have a million rights, and a million persons have a million no-rights. When one can add a column of naughts or cyphers and get one for the sum, then, and not till then, can the absolute right of the majority to govern the minority be proved. So says mathematics.

When Voltaire and his contemporaries had driven the Gods out of the thoughts of educated Frenchmen, and when even the uneducated and lower classes began to look upon religion and its ceremonies as mere matters of form and fiction, of course there could be no divine right of kings in France. Some other basis had to be found upon which to shift the top-heavy and tottering structure of French misgovernment. It was then that Jean Baptiste Rousseau, John the Baptist Rousseau, came to the rescue. He elaborated a scheme so wonderful that all Frenchmen accepted it almost at once. Yes, and although I shall have to get ahead of my story to say so, it is accepted by all those that were assumed to have consented to it. Neither had they orally agreed to abide by the contract. It was not a real contract at all. It was only what is called in law terms, a "quasi contract"; an "as if" contract. It means that when a person does a certain thing, the law assumes that he agrees to do certain other things without his having actually agreed to do so. As an example of what it really means in law, let us suppose that A takes and sells B's horse without B's permission. The horse is reasonably worth \$100, but A sells it to C for \$150. Now the law assumes that A agrees to pay B all that C gave him for the horse; and B can sue A on the assumed contract for \$150 and gets it, although that \$50 more than the horse is worth. But you will see that this assumed con-

tract was not a real contract at all. It was only what is called in law terms, a "quasi contract"; an "as if" contract. It means that when a person does a certain thing, the law assumes that he agrees to do certain other things without his having actually agreed to do so.

But how does John the Baptist Rousseau's quasi contract come into force? Whenever anyone so far forgets his duty and obligation to the state as to be in it on account of that wrongful act, the law assumes that he agrees to obey all the laws now in force or ever to be enacted. It is wrong to attempt to enter into a real contract before he were 21 years old, the law would allow him to repudiate it on account of his infancy. He is too young to do a lawful act, and too old to escape the consequences of such a wrongful act as to be a born citizen.

Every law upon the statute book may be directly opposed to his every interest and to all kinds of justice and equity; it makes no difference. The laws, and even the kind of government itself, may be changed; he may have fought against such change with voice and sword; it makes no difference, he is assumed to consent.

But some will say that when an immigrant enters the state, he should not swear to abide by the laws, and having sworn, there is a real contract. But why does he swear? Suppose that he knows that the laws of the country that he enters are bad; perhaps the laws of the country that he left are much worse. Perhaps he would starve if he remained away. No, my friends, don't be too hasty in your judgment. According to the laws of England and the United States, force, duress, fear, misunderstanding of a vital fact, all invalidate a contract. To enter into a binding contract there must be an absolutely free will. Where that is lacking the contract is void.

But the contract of an infant (minor) is not absolutely void, but only voidable on his part. That means that he may fulfill his part and require the other fellow to fulfill his part, or he may repudiate it. As against the government, I hold all human beings as infants. We all are continually changing our opinions. Today we might swear fealty to a king, and 10 years hence believe in democracy. We were infants and our contracts are voidable. We have a moral right to repudiate them. Truly, the social contract as a foundation for human government, is a fiction of law; and like the divine rights of kings and the divine right of the majority, is entirely untrue and unjust. But can we not find another foundation for human government?

Yes, there are very many human beings that say that might makes right, that the power of the king that has the majority of soldiers, or of the majority itself, to overcome the minority, gives it the right to govern it.

The divine right to reign always belongs to a king as long as he can maintain it by force; but when another king can take it away from him, it immediately belongs to the latter. The king de facto becomes the king de jure.

And whenever any party cannot win by votes, but thinks it can win by force, that party immediately throws the nation, or even the entire world, into a war of blood and fire. The American civil war and the great world war originated in this way.

Ordinary human government can overcome the minority by force. Therefore, some people think that the majority has the divine right to rule the minority. Such is the "law of the jungle"; but it seems to me that the law of the jungle is a contemptible basis for the foundation of Christian ethics and divine rights.

However, I propose to slant hypocrisy and call things by their right names. Under the divine right of kings, under the divine right of the majority, and under the social contract, we have had the law of the jungle; and it is no more than right to admit it. So let us study the law of the jungle.

Society, the nation, the world, must long remain in a ceaseless warfare between different parties with diverse selfish interests. And the majority can overcome the minority and the minority must remain physically, but not mentally, the slaves of the majority. But who are the majority?

A lone man goes among the mountains, into the dense forests, and kills hundreds of savage beasts, wolves, black and grizzly bears, even lions and tigers, without a wound to himself. Let us count the noses; the beasts are the majority. Let us measure the physical strength; they are the majority. But let us measure the gray matter and count the convolutions of the brain; and he is the overwhelming majority in every battle.

A little while before the close of the war, thousands of laborers struck in the city of Berlin. A captain with a company of soldiers and with machine guns dispersed them and drove them to their homes. The captain was the majority.

The physically weak but mentally strong human being easily vanquishes all physically strong and savage beasts of the forest, and he can likewise conquer the crowds of foolish men that dare to come against him. If laborers of Berlin had possessed the majority of intelligence, they would have provided the machine-guns for themselves instead of providing them for the Kaiser. But until then the Kaiser was the majority in Germany.

But there is yet another thought that ought to be discussed in regard to the law of the jungle. We have seen that the counting of noses is not the correct basis for the calculation of majorities. But that brains count for more than either numbers or muscle. But it is not all kinds of intelligence that really counts; it seems to be a particular kind of intelligence. It was not Darwin, Huxley nor Spencer, it was not Buddha nor the Christ, it was not scientists, philosophers, poets, nor

ROBERT SLAY



Robert Slay of New York City has the distinction of being one of the most wounded and decorated men of the Seventy-ninth division. He has been awarded the Distinguished Service Cross and Croix de Guerre and cited in army orders, besides being highly complimented personally by the king of England. He was wounded six times.

millions toil and slave to produce wealth and pleasure for them. These of whom I am now speaking used their intelligence for the benefit of mankind; but those that have exploited humanity for their own selfish gain, have used a different kind of intelligence. It is the cunning of the fox, the selfishness of the swine, the treachery of the wolf and the ingratitude of the serpent, boiled down and intensified a million fold; that has counted for more than all the science, philosophy and altruism, in the control of the present toiling masses of mankind.

If we follow the law of the jungle under the present leaders of the majority, the world is rapidly approaching a social cataclysm so terrible that in comparison Dante's Inferno would be a paradise. Can we escape it?

It is said that in the early days of Israel, before Saul was made king, that God himself was king. Such a government is called a theocracy. There are those that want to put this nation on record as one in which we were governed by an all-wise, all-loving, father-and-mother in one? Every person would be sure to get the full product of his labor; and besides this, he would be taught how to labor most effectively. Think of the crowds that would go to hear him speak when he made a tour of the country. Think of the wisdom that would flow as water with every word he uttered. If we did not get justice from the courts, we could appeal to our King. But perhaps we ought to consider one or two points before we elect him and get rid of President Wilson.

In Israel he was not seen by the people generally, but only ruled through prophets and judges. Some of these were so bad representatives of what they thought God was, that they were called "false prophets." A real human king instead, if he should happen to choose some of the Napoleons of finance or captains of industry, such as a great coal baron that claimed to represent him, we might follow in the footsteps of the Israelites, and ask him to resign. But if he would only rule personally!

Now let us try to imagine God creating everything earthly and heavenly in the supposed six days of creation. We would see him extremely busy. But let us imagine him producing everything of the rights of everyone, not only in this little world, but all the worlds in the great stellar universe that we see, against the injurious acts of foolish, ignorant and selfish persons, and his latter activity would compare with his former as the lightning with the snail.

We said at first that if God created the universe out of materials that belonged entirely to himself, he has the right to rule it; and it isn't very foolish to think it is his duty. Mark Twain said: "Only God can choose the best ruler for every people, and so it seems his duty to choose rulers; but the rulers are seldom good, and so we must suppose that God is neglecting his duty." But we have already said that he probably will not delegate his right to rule to a being less wise than himself; and to find a being equally wise is impossible.

And it is not at all wise to expect God to rule in detail the every-day affairs of all humanity. If he rules humanity in any manner, he probably rules only according to such broad and general laws that we entirely fail to notice their operation. In fact, the human being does not rule many parts of his body in detail. The heart, lungs, blood, stomach, liver, kidneys, etc., act in most part without any conscious effort of the man himself. Why should God rule his body any more in detail than we do ours? He has no wish to rule according to our ideas, and no one else has the right.

So we may now assert that neither one nor many has a right, either divine or otherwise, to rule another human being. There exists only the right to protect oneself against all kinds of injurious acts committed by others. And, side by side with the right to protect oneself, there exists the right to protect one's children, wife, husband, brothers, sisters and parents; for as the children grow older and stronger, the parents grow older and weaker, and then require the protecting care for themselves that they formerly bestowed upon their children.

And, as we analyze this law of the right to protect, we see that it does not depend upon the nearness of relationship, as one might at first suppose, but merely the need of protection.

And, as humanity consists of an almost infinite variety of degrees of strength and weakness, power and helplessness, physical, mental and strength or power to protect them that may be endowed with less of any kind of strength than he.

And, as each one has the right to protect himself and his weaker brethren and neighbors, so the individuals of villages, communities, tribes, states, nations and empires have the right to ally themselves together, so that in their collective capacity they may protect each of their number against the injurious acts of all persons within or without their domain.

But I fear that some will accuse me of building again what I have destroyed, of denying to one or many the right to govern, and then granting them that right under a fiction by using the word "protection" instead. But let us try to distinguish the difference between the protection of the rights of citizens against the injurious acts of other citizens and the right to govern all citizens, as the term "govern" is often understood today.

If we consider the old motto of the divine right of kings, "The king can do no wrong," the motto of the divine right of the majority, "The minority has no rights that the majority is bound to respect," or the motto of the law of the jungle, "The one or the many has the right to do whatsoever he has the power to do," we see that the right claimed by each is an absolute right to rule, a right paramount to any right of the subject of the king, to any right of an individual of the minority, or to any right of any member of the weaker party. The idea of protection has no part in any of the theories of government, except in the protection of the strong against the ineffectual attacks of the weak. I say "ineffectual attacks," for if the attacks be effective, the weak have become the strong and the rights of the strong belong to them.

Another important difference is this: Under the theory of an absolute right to rule, either the consent of the governed is entirely unnecessary or it is assumed by quasi-fiction of law that has no existence in fact, while under the theory of protection all the rights of the alliance that takes the place of an absolute government, are derived directly from the actual consent of the individuals composing it; and when any alliance for the protection of individual rights fails to perform its functions, it is the right of each individual, either by himself or with the help of others, to overthrow the alliance and to install such other alliance as may seem best.

I do not contend that every citizen and statesman everywhere has no higher ideal than the absolute right to rule. All through the ages there have been those that taught that the ones that assumed the right to rule had no other right than that of protecting their fellow citizens. There are many such in the world today. But I do assert that every modern government has as its fundamental theory the absolute right to rule, the Declaration of Independence to the contrary notwithstanding; and it often, if not always, exercises that assumed right.

There was a time in the ancient autocracies when it was not necessary for the king to enact a law and then have soldiers and a great army to have sentence of death pronounced upon him. Before Magna Charta, the English kings assumed such rights; and even long since that time, though the king was the maker of all laws, there was none that the king need obey. And it is this assumed right of the strong, whether king, aristocracy of majority, to rule the weak by oppression and exploitation, that has led to the social revolution and revolution, in the different nations of the present time, as well as being the cause of the fall of the governments and civilizations of the past.

Now, as I said before, the right of absolute rule cannot exist among human beings; and the form of government which that false right may for the time assume, is entirely immaterial. And I wish to add that under an alliance for the protection of individual rights, or of social rights which are the aggregate of individual rights, provided that those rights be protected, that alliance is exercising only its natural rights, and the form of the so-called government under which it functions is absolutely immaterial.

The manner in which individual rights can best be protected, must now be given our consideration. As we have seen, the right to protect them, belongs to the individual, the primitive man, whether among primitive men or more evolved men, endeavors to protect his rights, as best he may, without the help of other human beings. And there is a school of political theorists today that, seeing how inadequately and unequally individual rights are protected by all systems of government, declares that the only and only adequate method of protecting individual rights is for each to protect his own. We call the members of that school anarchists, and they accept the name.

But that each should protect his own rights without infringing upon the rights of others, requires that each should know just how far his rights extend. Just where the boundary lies between his rights and his neighbor's, and that very boundary lies between his rights and those of the other fellow, even then it would be impossible for one lone individual to protect his rights, unless all but ONE of the rest of mankind should be willing to respect them.

And long before written history began, mankind learned that very few knew where the line between their own rights and those of their neighbors lay; and that very many that knew some of their neighbors' rights, were unwilling to respect those rights. Even at the present stage of human evolution and civilization, the great majority of humanity esteem such things as they very, very much desire, their natural rights, for their minds are in a great measure controlled by their desires. So primitive man established primitive government; and with all their theories of divine and social rights, and with all their inequality, selfishness, exploitation and oppression, they were better than none.

Conflicting Thoughts



powerful in the olden times, he protected the weak though few, against the strong, though many. For a wise and unselfish king, it required but one man; for a wise and unselfish democracy, it requires a majority. But while a king may be more wise and unselfish than a majority, he may also be more ignorant and selfish. The majority is never quite as bad as the worst member of it, and it is never near as good as the best. It is only a compromise between the best and the worst kings. Under a king there may be either rapid advancement in civilization and justice, or there may be exactly the opposite; while under a democracy advancement will be less rapid, or retrogression will be more slow.

But, as there are limited monarchies, i. e., monarchies in which the power of the monarch is limited, so there are limited democracies. In fact, as I see it, no unlimited democracy has ever appeared on the earth, at least since written history began; but there are degrees of limitation. Let us consider a limited democracy as we find it in the United States.

Firstly, there is the age of limitation; one has to reach a certain age before he can take part in political affairs. This limitation is purely arbitrary; intelligence, education and ability to think and act along political lines, have nothing to do with it. Secondly, there is the sex limitation; but that is fast being obliterated. Thirdly, there is the residence limitation. This is partly based on reason, and is partly arbitrary. The part that requires residence in the district for which officers are to be elected, seems rational; but the requirement that one shall have resided there a certain number of years, is arbitrary and has a tendency to disfranchise wage-workers that are often compelled to move about the country in search of employment. All these limitations are statutory.

But I wish to speak of another limitation, one that limits when all the rest have failed to produce the results desired by certain employers. It is the limitation of industrial coercion or duress. It is a hint, or often more than a hint, that to vote a certain way, to sign a non-unioning petition for a candidate of a certain party, or to fail to vote at all, will cost the employee his job. This limitation is not legalized by the statutes; but, on the contrary, is made a crime. However, to prosecute the guilty party is to lose one's chance of employment during life wherever that employer and his associates hold economic power. So this limitation succeeds, although illegal and even criminal.

While our boys were fighting in France to make the world safe for democracy, such employers were striving to make democracy safe, if not for the world, at least for their selfish interests. There can never be an unlimited democracy while there is an individual, corporation, trust or combination of wealth, that owns or controls the industries at which the voters must earn their bread.

And the tendency of the age is toward democracy, toward more democracy, toward unlimited democracy. And all the reactionary tactics of political and industrial autocrats and aristocrats can no more stop it than King Canute could stop the incoming tide. It will come gently and peaceably as the river that flowed down the valley above Johnston, Pa., if it be not resisted; but they dammed the stream, and the great Johnston flood was the result. Thousands lost their lives in a single night. So, if there be too much resistance to the oncoming democracy, it will be a world revolution that will sweep the world as the French revolution swept France. Then we to them that stand in the way of the flood!

I cannot picture democracy to you in all the beauty that others see to it. Democracy in Rome led to the empire; in Thebes, Nero and Caligula; Democracy in Greece led to Philip and Alexander. And a comparatively free democracy in the United States has led to a pseudo-democracy, an unconscious slave to a plutocracy that openly violates and defies the laws that it cannot amend or repeal, that usurps the functions of organized government and defies its chief magistrate. But democracy will not only regain its former freedom in America; it will become entirely free. And as the sunshine, the light, begins in the east and moves westward, so will unlimited democracy sweep round the world in the path of the sun. It must come

before anything better can take its place. Its work is destructive rather than constructive, but when things are evil destructive forces are needed.

But I see a brighter future "when the mists have cleared away. I see a new standard of society, not the old fiction, an equality that does not exist in nature, but the standard of brotherhood. And there is no equality in brotherhood, unless the brothers are twins; and even then not one pair of twins in 10,000 are equal in all respects. Brotherhood means that there are older and younger brothers, teachers and pupils, master-workmen, journeymen and apprentices. It means a co-operative commonwealth in which there is diversity of labor, but unity of purpose and equality in the enjoyment of its results.

The kings, aristocracies and plutocrats have each had their inning; they have each been weighed in the balances and found wanting; and the "Mene, mene, tekel, upharsin," that appeared on the walls of Belsazzar's palace in Babylon, has been written opposite them all. So now it is the time for democracy, real democracy, unlimited democracy, to take its turn at the bat. At the very worst, democracy can be no greater failure than the other systems of government have been; and besides this, it is our dharma, our duty, the next step in the evolution of that self-control that is necessary to each individual of mankind.

Of course this world is one continual chain of changes in evolutionary changes that has to do with forms or bodies. In the form side of the universe, there is nothing but changeless change. So we must recognize the fact that democracy is not to be the end of all forms of government, but only one of the intermediate forms. Something else must take its place, as it must entirely take the place of everything that has gone before it. But just what shall be the form of the protective alliance of the future, is a question that concerns posterity rather than us of today. Let us solve our own problems, and remember that, as humanity evolves as a whole, it will be at least as competent to solve its problems of a better government than democracy to a more intelligent generation than we are today.

Where Do You Stand?

As a result of the great world war (Tibatic forces have been released and are now engaged in a death struggle for mastery).

INDIVIDUALISM AND COLLECTIVISM.

Individualism, representing everything selfish in the human heart.

Collectivism, representing all that is best and noblest in man; the spirit of altruism.

Individualism is anarchic; it is the most vicious and brutal form of anarchy.

Checked in a garb of pretended "law and order," it is essentially anarchistic.

It is wholly self-seeking.

It is self-centered and egoistic. It functions solely through the "claw and talon."

Its motto, "Let him take who hath the power and let him keep who can," it stops at nothing in order to conquer.

Nothing is too brutal or inhuman if it leads to success.

It shields its misdeeds with the cursh cry of Cain, "Am I my brother's keeper?" It is always crying, "Wolf, Wolf."

Like Cain, it roams the earth with a brand upon its forehead, that he who runs may read.

It is the yellow brand of greed, avarice, lust for gold.

Its modern name is CAPITALISM; it knows no law save the "law of profits."

INDIVIDUALISM, CAPITALISM ANARCHISM, the triune CURSE OF MAN, the blight of HEAVEN and the crimson shame of HELL.

Every one must take part in the struggle; there is no neutral ground; you cannot serve God and Mammon; Where do you stand? WHERE? He who is not for is against.

A ROUNDABOUT METHOD.

"Pa, why do you always insist on my singing when Mr. Bimble comes here?"

"Well, I don't like to come right out and tell him to go."—Boston Transcript.

DENVER'S GARBAGE

(Continued From Page One.)

to hours with success so marked that when the war swung the tide of public opinion in favor of the pig, as against the reduction plant, it was found that Denver had gone ahead of all other municipalities in the matter of utilizing waste to produce food.

Garbage Utilization a Duty.

The United States food administration issued a bulletin in April, 1918, urging all cities to dispose of their garbage in this manner, concluding with these words:

"This material, when freshly collected, produces pork of good quality, against which there is no market discrimination. Garbage utilization is more than a method of disposal—it is a patriotic duty."

Several large cities, notably Minneapolis, which once installed and operated reduction plants, have abandoned the use of their plants and are now feeding garbage to hogs.

The garbage in the city of Denver is collected by a garbage association consisting of a number of hog raisers of the vicinity. The wagons collect daily in the business section throughout the year, twice a week in the residential districts in the winter time and almost every day in the summer time. A city ordinance provides that a certain kind of a garbage can may be used and that only "garbage, and not tin cans, glass, etc.," be placed in the can.

More than 8,000 hogs are being steadily fed on Denver garbage, although this is not the sole ration. The Denver hog ranch, the largest in the association, feeds 5,000 pigs on its place, five miles from the city limits. Every pig is immunized for life from Cholera by the double treatment with serum and virus. The equipment of this ranch consists of farrowing and weaning sheds, fattening pens, 35 steel tank wagons of 500-gallon capacity each, barns and headquarters. In addition, the company has a small auto truck, which it uses for the collection of garbage in emergencies.

Restaurants Barred.

The city ordinance does not permit hotel and restaurant keepers to sell their garbage, this being the hub on which the success of the plan turns, since the collector loses money in the sparsely settled districts and must make it up downtown. The garbage could not otherwise be removed without cost to the city.

Denver's plan for the disposal of garbage has proved to be a great success for the last 15 years," said Dr. William H. Sharpley, manager of the department of health and charity, and in charge of the garbage collection for the city.

"Given the size of Denver as paying from \$150,000 to \$180,000 a year for the collection of the kitchen waste. Incinerating plants have not proven successful, being too costly to operate. We have contracted with hog raisers to collect all the garbage in the city from the residential sections as well as the business sections, and it does not cost the city one cent. The collectors get their pay for this work by feeding it to thousands of hogs. We receive fewer complaints about poor service than any other city of the same size in the United States and many of them pay hundreds of thousands of dollars to have the refuse taken away."

"The garbage collectors have more territory to cover than in the average city of Denver's population. There are 1,200 miles of streets in Denver and the teams have to traverse all of them from twice a week to six times a week. The war hit the garbage collectors extremely hard, as the appeals of the food administration for the conservation of all food products resulted in a decrease of one-third in the amount of garbage thrown into the cans."

STILL CHEERFUL.

The following is part of the diary of a U. S. A. soldier who had promised to give daily accounts of his experience on board ship:

Tuesday, 17th, 8 a. m.—Feeling fine. Full of good cheer and portage.