

the farm-slave adding his quota of labor-power to the mass of production (and nothing else) gets any more than its value? We think not, but it is also objected that the farmer holds property and has an interest in the wheat he raises, and both these statements are true, as we shall see, although some Socialist propagandists are inclined to deny this.

First, then, let us look into the question of the farmer's property in this country. A few years ago when this West was opened up for settlement, the government loudly proclaimed that they were giving away free land upon which the overcrowded people of Europe might settle and live happy, contented lives. This looked like benevolence, but was simply business; for land has no value, despite the real estate boosters, and in order to get wealth out of this golden West one thing must be applied—human labor. The free homestead idea, then, was a ruse to coax this very necessary factor away from the older lands out upon the new. That it succeeded well the reader can see for himself. The government then gave, after three years' residence and work upon this land, a title to the homesteader in fee simple to 160 acres of land, and he became in theory an independent man. We have already seen that no person is independent, the farmer less than any, and we shall find that the title deed business is a rank bluff.

Who were these people who came in to settle the West? For the most part they were very poor men of the artisan class and the poorer peasantry of Europe. To start homesteading, money is needed, and this is obtained by selling one's labor-power for six months of the year and retiring to one's homestead for the remaining portion. At the end of three years this type of homesteader is ready to start farming, for he is then in possession of his deeds upon which he can raise the money to buy horses and machinery by handing them over to a mortgage company. Thus his