

farm departs from him and he becomes a renter, goaded on to heroic exertions by the hope of getting the title back, which as a rule he never does.

So much for the very poor type; now for those who are able to go right ahead and break up a claim, retaining the title deeds and making a living. This type is very often pointed out as a refutation of the Socialist contention; he is referred to as an independent man. Now the writer readily grants that some farmers own their farms but would submit the following questions in all humility. Is it any benefit to a hungry man that he owns a pot in which a pudding has been boiled if someone else has stolen the duff? And is it not wisdom upon the thief's part if he is able to persuade the hungry one that the ownership of the pot and not the contents thereof is a most desirable thing, to do so? Certainly, and that is just why the farmer is so backward upon this very important point; he thinks the title deeds to a little land, which in reality are spurs to urge him to greater efforts, either to pay off a mortgage or keep it from creeping on, separate him from the rest of the workers; while the capitalist class calmly lift the produce of the farms, returning to the farm-slave enough to enable him to go on producing.

Which brings us to the second contention that the farm-slave has an interest in the grain he raises. This is certainly true and in this respect he is unlike his fellow slave of the city. The factory hand incorporates his labor-power in products and goes home on Saturday with his wages in his pocket. The farm-slave incorporates his labor-power in grain and then the game is to get it out again. Now it is certain that a rise in price of grain means a rise in that portion which comes back to the slave, and a fall means the opposite, hence the G. G. A. and similar organizations have some excuse for their existence, but they overestimate their power. As we have said, a rise in the price of grain means that the portion of