

SCOTT COUNTY KICKER.

VOL. 8

BENTON, MO., JUNE 5, 1909.

NO. 30

BURNING THE UNIVERSITIES

The above was the caption of the leading editorial of a St. Louis daily one day last week. To use such a head-line in a Socialist paper would start the cry of incendiaryism. But this did not appear in a Socialist paper.

For more than a week capitalism and its organs have been much worked up over the published statement of R. T. Crane, a wealthy manufacturer and top-notch in the capitalist menagerie. Mr. Crane says, in effect, that the education handed out by our higher schools is flub-dub and only tends to unfit the young for future usefulness. And he boldly asserts that the torch should be applied to colleges and universities!

When! But I'm glad Mr. Crane is not a Socialist. The papers would make as much noise about it as when a Socialist takes advantage of the capitalist institution of divorce. But what else can Mr. Crane expect? Our colleges and universities are endowed (financed) by the same interests as our newspapers and churches, and their mission is the same—to suppress the truth.

Even our state educational institutions, financed by the taxpayers, are in the same fix. The capitalists install a governor who appoints the curators (directors) and the governor selects these from among the very rich. Folk appointed Dave Francis at the head of that grafting institution known as the State University. And for a State Normal, as at the Cape, such capitalists as Leon J. Albert, Louis Houck, and so on, and books from which children are taught, even in the rural schools, are handed to us from higher up. The ruling class decides what shall be taught to the young. Hence our high schools turn out a lot of half-baked dudes who feel themselves above earning a living in the sweat of the face and inflict themselves upon the people as lawyers, politicians, doctors, lecturers, preachers, professors, bankers, insurance and other get-rich-quick promoters and scribblers on metropolitan papers.

And Mr. Crane's remedy is to apply the torch to the high schools How anarchistic! But we are not so well acquainted with Mr. Crane as with the Cape Normal. At the Normal is edited the Educational Outlook, a monthly journal edited by the faculty. It also enters a severe protest against present-day education. It says:

"Discussions continue to be rampant in current educational magazines as to the value of the education now given in American colleges and universities. Some men who stand high as thinkers in the field of education are of the opinion that American colleges are giving a training that is falling far short of what it should be. This is very likely the case. The fault lies not so much with our educational institutions as it does with the RULING SPIRIT OF OUR PEOPLE. NO PEOPLE WHO HARBOR THE POLITICAL AND ECONOMIC ROT-TENNESS THAT IS FOUND IN OUR PRESENT BODY POLITICAL CAN POSSIBLY FOSTER A SOUND SYSTEM OF EDUCATION."

That is pretty plain, isn't it? I don't see how even a supreme court judge could twist its meaning. It means that society is politically and industrially rotten, and that this rottenness prevents a sound system of education. And this from the faculty of the State Normal School!

What is "the ruling spirit of our people" if it is not money-getting, greed—"incentive," I believe, is the polite term? The Outlook continues:

The greatest weaknesses found in the education given in our colleges and universities are THOSE THAT ARE ROOTED IN THE SPIRIT OF OUR PRESENT AGE, and they NEVER CAN BE ERADICATED except by bringing about a change in our national temperament."

Somebody ought to inform the member of the faculty who wrote the above that he is a Socialist—the "curators" may attend to that. What is "the spirit of our present age" in which our educational system is "rooted"—and corrupted? Is it not commercialism? And we can't change this, for we are told by the wise ones that "you can't change human nature." So there you are.

But, fortunately, it is not necessary to change human nature. It is only necessary to eradicate the brute nature in us that has developed along with capitalism.

THE JUICY PLUMS.

I was somewhat surprised, last week, when I went to take down the county court proceedings and found that so much money had been appropriated to good and patriotic Democrats for their part in the construction of one ditch. This seems to indicate that there is something else in ditching besides letting out the water.

I have noticed that matters likely to cause unfavorable comment are often reserved for adjourned or special terms of county court—the artesian well job, the ballot jobs, and the like. Somehow, I don't like these terms of court in between the regular terms, but I am well aware that my likes or dislikes cut no ice.

The first allowance made by the court last week was \$500 to Marsh Arnold as attorney's fees. Gosh! I'll bet he sweated in "earning" that. Now, I am not blaming Mr. Arnold. I do not doubt that his claim is within the law. But who makes the law?

The people!

Yes, the people—be d—! It was made by other lawyers. Mr. Arnold was just fortunate in being selected as the recipient of this plum. Had it not been him, it would have been some other lawyer. But let's see if there is any reasonable excuse for having any lawyer at all.

We have a county court. We have a county attorney. We have the law.

Can the members of the county court and the county attorney read? If so, then why don't they go on? There's the law. All they have to do is to track it. The county attorney is paid by the people and it is the privilege of the court to call on him for advice in case it gets stalled.

Then what excuse is there for handing over \$500 per ditch of taxpayer's money to some outside lawyer in the digging of each ditch? It's the law, eh? Who makes the laws?

But, suppose it was advisable to employ a lawyer at about five dollars a minute in arranging for the formation of the first drain district what excuse is there for employing one at a similar price for each ditch? The proceedings in subsequent ditches are only duplicates of former ones—in other words, doing the same thing over according to the same rules.

But, as I have often said, our whole system of government is devised to make it easy for those in control to get a fat living, while so-called well-to-do and corn-dodger—worse—is the portion of those who produce the wealth that foots the bills.

For the erection of a sheriff's residence \$2,633.60 was appropriated. Later there will likely be appropriations for barns and other buildings that are needed on the premises I am not blaming the sheriff for wanting a comfortable home. If I had been on the bench, under the present system, in all probability I would have voted for it. Hence I am not criticizing the court. But why should SERVANTS of the people live so much better than the people themselves? Under a just system they would not.

The amount appropriated on account of Surveyor Warner was \$1,271.26. At the regular term, a few weeks ago, Mr. Warner was allowed \$375 quarterly salary as highway engineer and \$15 as member of the board of equalization.

I do not know much about surveying and can give no estimate as to Mr. Warner's profits from ditch work and the like. I know that on such occasions he employs several assistants and probably earns all he gets. But it does seem to me that \$5 a day straight time (\$1,500 a year) for a highway engineer is pretty liberal—unless he devoted his whole time to the work. The pay appears especially liberal when compared with the farmer's allowance of a dollar a day for road work. But so long as the farmers get what they vote for they should look pleased. But several hundred of them in this county have quit voting for it.

As to the income of other officials, I do not know. They get it mostly through fees and, from the way they hold on, it is safe to say they get a plenty. And yet these are only ordinary men, and such as find working around stores and offices for from \$40 to \$60 per month.

All of which may explain why they are interested in maintaining the present system. They don't want to "divide up."

Tell your neighbor why he should patronize the Kicker.

CRIME AND CRIMINALS.

From an address by Attorney Darrow to the prisoners in Chicago Jail.

Everybody makes a living along the lines of least resistance. A wise man who comes into a country early sees a great undeveloped land, and he buys it. You cannot be a landlord because somebody has got it all. You must find some other calling. In England and Ireland and Scotland less than five per cent own all the land there is, and the people are bound to stay there on any kind of terms the landlords give. They must live the best they can, so they develop all these various professions—burglary, picking pockets and the like. People find all sorts of ways of getting rich. These are diseases like everything else. You look at people getting rich, organizing trusts, and somebody gets the disease and starts out. He catches it just as a man catches the mumps or the measles; he is not to blame, it is in the air.

You will find men speculating beyond their means because the mania of money-getting has taken possession of them. It is simply a disease; nothing more, nothing less. You cannot avoid catching it, but the men who have control of the earth have the advantage of you. See what the law is; when these men get control of things they make the laws. They do not make the laws to protect anybody; courts are not instruments of justice. When your case gets into court it will make little difference whether you are guilty or innocent; but it is better if you have a smart lawyer. And you cannot have a smart lawyer unless you have money. First and last, it's a question of money.

Those men who own the earth make the laws to protect what they have. They fix up a sort of fence or pen around what they have, and they fix the law so the fellow on the outside can't get in. The laws are really organized for the protection of the men who rule the world. They were never organized or enforced to do justice. We have no system for doing justice—not the slightest in the world.

Let me illustrate: Take the poorest person in this room. If the community had provided a system of doing justice the poorest person in this room would have as good a lawyer as the richest, would he not? When you went into court you would have just as long a trial and just as fair a trial as the richest man in Chicago.

Your case would not be tried in 15 or 20 minutes, whereas it would require 15 days to get thru with a rich man's trial.

Then if you were rich and were beaten, your case would be taken to the Appellate Court. A poor man cannot take his case to the Appellate Court; he has not the price; and then to the Supreme Court, and if he were beaten there he might perhaps go to the United States Supreme Court. And he might die of old age before he got into jail.

If you are poor, it's a quick job. You are almost known to be guilty else you wouldn't be there. Why should anyone be in the criminal court if he were not guilty? He would not be there if he could be anywhere else. The officials have no time to look after all these cases. The people who are on the outside running banks and building churches and making jails have no time. If the courts were organized to promote justice, the people would elect somebody to defend all these criminals—somebody as smart as the prosecutor—and give him as many detectives and as many assistants to help, and pay as much money to defend you as to prosecute you.

Most of all our criminal code consists of offenses against property. People are sent to jail because they have committed a crime against property. It is of very little consequence whether a hundred people more or less go to jail who ought not to go—you must protect property because, in this world, property is of more importance than anything else.

How is it done? These people who have property fix it so they can protect what they have. When somebody commits a crime it does not follow that he has done something that is morally wrong. The man on the outside who has committed no crime may have done something.

For instance, to take all the coal in the United States and raise the price two or three dollars per ton when there is no need of it, and thus kill thousands of babies and send thousands of people to the poor house and tens of thousands to jail, as is done every year in the United States—this is a greater crime than all the people in our jails ever committed, but the law does not punish it. Why? Because the fellows who control the earth make the laws.

THE SPICE OF LIFE.

Ashley—Do you have much variety at your boarding house?
Jones—Well, we have three different names for meals.

APPALLING FACTS.

When, in the Appeal to Reason, a few years ago, I read a detailed account of the peonage and convict lease system that exists in the south where men women and boys are either taken by force or lured into the terpenine region and held in a slavery more galling than was the chattel slavery of fifty years ago, I did not believe it. But it so happened that among those held were some raw foreigners who had made their way to the "land of liberty" and who had been lured into the trap by a New York agency under promise of a good job at big pay. A few of these escaped and told their story to the representative of their government at Memphis.

Then there was something doing. If only the subjects of Uncle Sam had complained to Washington they would have been brushed aside as malcontents and undesirable citizens, but most foreign nations think better of their subjects, and the consul complained to Washington, the government took notice, with the result that some of the overseers (not the men higher up, mind you) were indicted, convicted and imprisoned.

When, three years ago, the Appeal told of the kidnapping of the three labor leaders—Moyer, Haywood and Pettibone—and implicated the governors of two states and other "leading citizens" of the west, I felt that such could not be in a "free" country, and that the Appeal had drifted into sensationalism. But when I learned of the powerful influences behind the persecution of these men (including the president, who denounced them as undesirable citizens) and when I read the facts as presented to the United States Supreme court, I was convinced that the Appeal had told only the unvarnished truth.

A few months ago the Chicago Daily Socialist began telling weird stories about the "white slave traffic" in this country, especially in Chicago, and that this traffic was backed by the most powerful influences of the cities. By "white slave traffic" is meant the procuring of girls, chiefly from the country, and decoying them into the vice haunts of the cities, where their street clothes are taken from them and they are held in captivity. It is what Clarence Darrow would call a "profession" developed with the times—a natural product of the profit system.

While I knew that this business was carried on to some extent, yet I thought it was only a matter of here and there, and was not ready to believe that this "industry" had been organized and trusted to such an extent as to require special legislation. Read the following press dispatch, which is taken from the Cairo Bulletin:

Chicago, May 26.—Passage of the Lederer "white slave bills" by the Illinois house of representatives was the signal for renewed efforts in their behalf by the committee which drafted them and secured their endorsement by the Illinois Federation of women's clubs, the Union League, Hamilton, Iriquois, Press, City and several other Chicago clubs, the Illinois Vigilance association and Chicago Law and Order league. This committee on legislation, appointed by the Woman's World to follow up exposures by the federation and state prosecutors, immediately sent representatives and telephone and telegraph messages to Springfield to insure passage of the bills in the senate. Word came back that the bills would pass without serious change. Governor Deneen will sign them without delay.

Writing on "Warfare Against the White Slave Trade," Clifford G. Roe, assistant state's attorney and a member of the committee declared in the Woman's World: "In Chicago alone there are more than 25,000 women leading a life of shame, and statistics show that the average life of a fallen woman is five years. Five thousand persons must, therefore, be recruited every year in Chicago alone. How many voluntarily go into this life? It is estimated that about twenty per cent. This shows us that eighty per cent are led into it by some scheme or entraped and sold and at least two-thirds of this number are from our own country, being inveigled from farms, towns and cities."

"One may inquire, 'How is it that girls are procured so easily without the public being aware of what is going on?' The answer is that love and ambition are the baits which the procurers flaunt in the faces of their proposed victims. Often it happens that promises of positions on the stage, in stores and various occupations alluring to young girls cause many to fall captive in the great net set for them. The methods employed to entice young women are quite similar, but as to the particulars each case varies to some extent. After the

girls are once within the resort, the stories are about the same. The street clothes are seized and parlor dresses varying in length are put upon them. They are threatened, never allowed to write letters, never permitted the use of the telephone, never trusted outside the house without the escort of a procurer, until two or three months have elapsed, when they are considered hardened to the life and too ashamed to face parents and friends again.

Girls are told of or perhaps have witnessed others who have tried to escape, have seen their failure and punishment, and are thereby cowed into submission. They are always held upon the pretense of being indebted to the house and this indebtedness has long been the backbone of the white slave system. From the time the girl is first sold into the house she is constantly in debt. First, for the money the owner gave to the procurer for her, next for her parlor clothes, then for the money her procurer borrows from the owner on her as his property, goods and chattels. The bonds of slavery are thus fastened upon these poor mortals by a system of vice that the people of this great country little realized existed until lately. Mr. Roe gives in detail the methods employed by which several girls, whose procurers have been prosecuted, were captured. Love and ambition are the baits most often used, he says.

BOODLE WINS.

Senator A. J. Hopkins received the Republican majority for U. S. Senator from Illinois in the primary. They tell us, you know, that "the peepul" rule, and that in the primaries "the peepul" can name their choice.

Should the people make a mistake and name a man not entirely satisfactory to Big Business, it don't count—according to what happened in Illinois.

Hopkins is a very rich man and is interested in railroads and other enterprises. From a general capitalist view-point it does not seem that there should have been any objections to Hopkins. But there is another view-point. There are plenty of railroad men in the National Senate, but it is not so well supplied with private representatives of the "deep waterways."

There is a gang of grafters and contractors in New York and Chicago who are whooping up "deep waterways," and Congressman Lorimer, of Chicago, is one of the bunch.

When the Illinois legislature met last January the Republicans split, and Hopkins, the "choice of the peepul," found himself up against the waterways crowd. The legislature dead-locked until last week, when the Democrats got their feet wet in the deep water and helped the waterways Republicans to elect Lorimer. In thanking them Lorimer said:

"I am unable to properly express my thanks. To receive this election at the hands of the two great political parties is CERTAINLY SOMETHING NEW. This could not have happened twenty years ago. In recent years the two great parties have been getting closer together until now ONLY A FINE LINE SEPARATES THEM."

With I had a magnifying glass sufficiently powerful to reveal that "fine line." I'll bet hit 'ud look purty.

WHY IT GROANED.

There is an old story, brief but instinct with a dread warning which it may not be out of place to recall for those who have never heard it: A boy had wandered into an orchard one windy day late in spring. He stopped under a gnarled old apple tree which under the pressure of the strong blast was swaying and creaking and moaning as if in greatest agony.

"What on earth are you making all that fuss about? the boy asked in some derision. Your moaning and groaning is enough to make a black cat turn pale."

"O-o-o-h," creaked the tree dismally. "I guess if you were as full of green apples as I am, you'd moan and groan, too."

BUSINESS LOCALS.

Farm for sale:—360 acres—240 acres in cultivation. As good land as can be found in Scott county. The part in cultivation never overflows. Will sell all or in such parts as suit the buyer. Price \$35 and \$40 per acre, if taken soon. Terms reasonable.

J. H. Branham, Vanduser Mo. For Sale.—Improved and unimproved farms near Oran, Chaffee, New Hamburg, Benton, Blodgett and Diahstadt at prices ranging from \$25 to \$45 per acre. Also, business and residence property in Oran, Vanduser, Commerce and Diahstadt. D. H. Harper, Oran. If you have farm or town property for sale, place it with me. D. H. Harper, Oran, Mo.

DIGGING UP DIRT.

John Y. Mardyk, former stenographer in our circuit court and for some time deputy county clerk of Mississippi county, is causing some unrest in political circles at Charleston. Several months ago he refused on behalf of the county clerk to sign what he says was a false certificate upon the request of the county court. This, he says, caused the court to ask the county clerk to "fire" him, which was done. Now Mr. Mardyk has published a rather sensational statement in the Charleston Republican, from which I take the following:

"At some time in the future a pamphlet will be issued to the taxpayers and citizens throughout the county, and the public given an opportunity to decide whether or not illegal methods have been employed in the collection of taxes, and whether or not tax collections have been properly accounted for during the past five years; and the public may also decide whether the state of affairs, as will be shown, has been connived at, consented to and approved by the county court and prosecuting attorney."

Although Mr. Mardyk was secretary of the Bryan club and big free barbecue last fall, yet his democracy is now done for. When a fellow criticizes "the party" (which means the job-holders) that cooks his goose, Nor can he get into the party organs. They'd lose legal printing. He must reach the people by pamphlet.

ABOUT REVOLUTIONS.

Some Mexican workmen are alleged to have attempted to organize a revolution against the bloodthirsty Diaz. It is claimed that they plotted to overthrow the tyranny of a brutal combination of capitalism and savagery. They are charged with the crime of having incited the slaves of Mexico to rebellion against the hideous and cruel regime that prevails south of the Rio Grande. They are accused of having risked their lives that their fellow workers might be made free.

All these acts are undoubtedly illegal. While the workers continue to turn the control of the government over the exploiting class, that class alone has the power to declare war and make revolutions. It is an accepted principle of international law that one nation cannot allow its territory to be used as a basis from which to make war upon a "friendly power."

But in old practice it makes a great difference who is organizing the revolution upon a friendly power. For years New York has been the headquarters of nearly every recent South American "revolution." When an American corporation fails to secure the favors it wishes from any government it proceeds to "organize a revolution." Guns and ammunition are shipped from American ports and the whole affair is directed from some Wall street or Broadway office.

To all of this the government of this United States is discreetly blind, it not openly favorable. Indeed, when the asphalt trust organized a revolution in Venezuela, corrupted the supreme court of that country and tried to overthrow the government, but failed, the United States government kindly took a hand, recalled such of its representatives as did not suit the trust, and has now used its diplomatic service to secure the cooperation of other nations in exiling the legal ruler of that country.

When a revolution was needed in Panama in order to secure control of the canal zone the president of the United States took a hand directly and assisted in organizing a successful revolution against a "friendly power." Of course no one suggested the imprisonment of Theodore Roosevelt for violating the laws he had sworn to enforce. But the Mexicans were just workmen. The people they were seeking to benefit were just plain peons. The object of the revolution was the welfare of men and women and children and not the increase of profits.

Therefore the Mexicans are on the road to the penitentiary while Roosevelt is shooting lions in Africa.

It makes all the difference in the world who is organizing a revolt against a "friendly power," and what are the objects of the revolution.—Daily Socialist.

VALUABLE INFORMATION. I used a word in speaking to my wife which so offended her that she hasn't spoken to me for a week. Henpeck—Would you mind telling me what it was?

5% MONEY!

I have a client who desires to loan money on well-improved farms at five and six per cent. in Southeast Missouri. Call, with perfect abstract or title, on

ORREN WILSON, Attorney-at-Law, Suite 205, Himmelfinger-Harrison Building, Cape Girardeau, Mo.

WHAT ABOUT THE LAND!

By Nicholas Klein. Some people get confused as to the word "land" which is often used by the Socialist speakers.

It does not merely mean the soil, but the rock, coal, ore, iron, clay, copper, metals, gases, the water, and every material of which the earth is composed. Of course, it also includes all kinds of natural forces. In a few words it means every "natural thing."

We Socialists contend that every human being born into this old world has an equal right with every other individual to the use and enjoyment of all "natural things." Everyone has a right to breathe air. Just so, everyone should be free to till the soil, to dig out the coal, to use the power from a waterfall, so long as he does not impair the equal freedom of others.

But it so happens that in our (?) country as in all civilized countries there are a few privileged persons who claim that they own all the "natural things."

They are sometimes known as landlords and often as "land-lords." The Miller estate in the Sacramento valley of California owns 14,000,000 acres—all owned by one man! It is twice as large as the nation of Belgium with its 8,000,000 people. Ten times as large as the state of Delaware. Four times as large as the state of Connecticut. Seventeen times as large as Rhode Island. Three times the size of New Jersey. Two and a half times the size of Massachusetts. Twice the size of New Hampshire. One half larger than Maryland. More than twice the size of Vermont.

This estate owns the surface soil, coal seams, waterfalls, and even the fish in the streams. On the other hand, more than 85 per cent of the people of this nation own no "natural things." Whether wrongly or rightly—the vast majority of the people have been deprived of their birthright—the right to use the earth.

How long did it take the Miller estate to make the soil? Land is necessary, we are land living animals. We cannot live without the land. Everything originates and has its starting point in the land. Is it right or just that one or a few should be allowed to own the things the many depend on for air and life?

History shows that cunning and force have played a greater part than merit in the building of the estates. But even putting this aside, can any land system be fair which ignores the just claims of the millions of children who are born every year?

How can we have equal rights to the land? We Socialists do not ask that it be cut up into small pieces or patches. That would be foolish. There is a better way. In your city or town there is probably a public park. Suppose it were divided up among the citizens, would it not be a sorry sight? Your park is not divided up. It belongs to all the people, does it not? You have a park commission, town council, which you elect to manage it. It is kept in order, and all the people have the right to use it.

Why can't we deal with the land of our nation in the same way? Very easy. Nothing difficult about it. Congress is the commission—the council. It could be arranged and managed for the benefit of all the people. The certain parts could be set aside for the culture of corn, fruit, trees, vegetables, etc., some for pasture, some for building purposes, and so on. Instead of the few private owners as we see it today, the people—all the people—would get the advantages.

After all, men and women own farms in order to make a living and have a home. Instead of the present system of "an old plow and an old cow," way back, away from civilization and culture, we could make the raising of foodstuffs "a thing of beauty and a joy forever."

Co-operation and science would work together to provide people with pleasant work, and pleasant surroundings, and if any man wants to go out in the woods away from mankind and go along the same old way, why of course there will be no objections.

What do you think about the land? Don't you think that beautiful cities and towns with art and culture are better than rural routes! Don't you think we could make more out of the soil and with less effort if we adopted the common principals of business and co-operation into the farming department of our new nation? After all it's the living, the home and future we are seeking, and why not get the best out of nature with the least effort? Do you favor having the few gobble up the earth, and leaving nothing for children yet unborn? Think it over, and let us know what you think about the land.

A NEEDLESS WARNING. Very often the friend who slaps you heartily on the back is getting ready to make a light touch.