

to farm without a binder, a plow and a seed drill, think of raising hogs without parents, imagine building a shack without lumber (unless a sod den or a hole in the ground). Just stop and look at your binder and realize what it is—an embodiment of social labor. Imagine (if you can) how the whole of society bends itself to the task of producing it. Even in its makeup are the farm products raised by some farmer elsewhere, that went to feed the workers who gave their toil to create it. Try to trace it back, and you will lose yourself in a maze of industry. Such remote things as brick-making and tailoring are involved in its construction, for you know, the binder was built in a factory made of brick, and the worker had to be clothed. The farmer becomes a cog in the great machine of industry, no more important than the rest, no less so, all bending, however, to produce a stream of wealth they do not own. That is social production and, upon this fact, the Socialists base their demand for social ownership of those machines so necessary to the life of society.

This is the first requisite for a commodity; that it be a social product. Next, that it be produced for exchange or sale as in opposition to a product for use. Of course, this commodity must have a use value, but there is no farm slave bold enough to claim that he raises wheat today for the world's use, else would all the hungry be fed, and we know under this system of production, this is far from being the case. You and I did not figure on the amount we were raising according to the number of people it would feed, but how much money we should get from our masters for raising it. We went to work to raise wheat as we would go to work in a factory, to get money to buy other things, and just in the same manner does the capitalist who gets that wheat, look upon it solely as a means of increasing his wealth. He would just as soon cause to be manufactured ladies' fans or monkeys' collars. It is all the