COPIES, 50c per 100.

Land Edition

THE REBEL

TOTAL SUBS
For Week Ending Jan. 6, 1912
15,802
Total edition this week—40,000

Address all communications to The Rebel, Hallettsville, Texas.

T. A. HICKEY, Editor and Owner

Entered as second-class matter July 1, 1911, at the post-office at Hallettsville, Texas, under the Act of March 3, 1879.

50c pr yr; clubs of 4 (40 wks) 25c

THIS IS NO. 27

The great appear great to us only because we are on our knees—LET US ARISE.

Successor to Farmers Journal, established June 22, 1904. HALLETTSVILLE, TEXAS, JANUARY 6, 1912. Issued Weekly.

DEBS ASKS:--"WHERE DO YOU STAND?"

Socialism is the revolutionary shibboleth of the workers and producers all around the world. We are fighting for freedom.

Where do you stand?

All the forces of capitalism are arrayed against us and we do not underestimate them in the slightest, but we are going to win out in spite of them all as certain as the earth revolves upon its axis.

Socialism means democracy, freedom, sunlight, opportunity for all, and if you are not in favor of this you are far more beast than human although you may be dressed in the latest fashion.

But to overthrow capitalism and establish the rule of the people means struggle and such a struggle as the children of men have never yet known.

This struggle appeals to every man and woman who have in their veins the warm blood of humanity. There are those, and they are many, who attempt to dodge the fight but the call to battle rings in their ears even in the silent hours of midnight.

This great fight of humanity to break its fetters and stand erect in the light of day is inevitable. We Socialists have not waited to be drafted. Long ago we plunged into the struggle and not a regret have we ever had that we burnt the bridges behind us.

The struggle has appealed to all the manly fibre of our being, and banished from our hearts all fear. It has inspired us with faith and hope and courage. Every passing day we are the better and the stronger for daring to take the place where we belong and not all the glittering prizes capitalism has to bestow could tempt us to desert our posts.

Where do you stand?

Are you still hesitating, doubting, knowing in your heart that Socialism is right and that you should avow yourself as becomes a man, and yet trying to make apologies to yourself for your weak indecision and moral cowardice?

If you do not know what Socialism is and what it stands for, it is high time you should know that you may no longer stand in your own light, forge your own fetters, and block your own way to freedom.

If only they of weak moral fibre knew what joy there is in fighting for Socialism they would plunge into the struggle without another moment of hesitation. For the little they might lose they would find themselves, and what a glorious revelation it is to a man to realize for the first time that he is a MAN!

And now again, where do you stand? or do you stand at all? for yourself, for anything, or for anybody?

Do you still blindly, stupidly follow the political bell-wethers of the capitalist parties? Have you not had enough and is it not about time you were waking up and doing something for yourself?

What you need is to read the Rebel and know what it stands for and is fighting for. Tom Hickey, its editor, who has been fighting these battles for many years, knows how to help you to help yourself, if you will only give him the chance by subscribing for the Rebel and reading the live stuff that will clear up your brain instead of absorbing the rot you get in capitalist papers, which is largely responsible for your inert and sodden condition.

The Rebel has just fairly begun its great work in the Lone Star State. It has come at the right time and the vast field spreads out all around it and is all aglow with promise.

Let all the comrades make one mighty effort to spread the Rebel with its message of emancipation among all the toilers and producers of the state!

EUGENE V. DEBS.

THE LAND QUESTION IN TEXAS

BY FRANK PUTNAM.

My friend Hickey asked me to write something on this question for the Land Edition of The Rebel.

Now, one might fill a column with solemn statistics, but would anybody read it? I doubt it. So we'll not rack our heads with a mess of figures, but deal with some general facts.

Everybody knows there are more tenant farmers than farm owners in Texas. Everybody knows that's not the right way to get good results from farming. Everybody knows that when a piece of land has to support the family that works it, and another that does not work it, but merely holds title to it, that the first family is going to get less than it earns and the second family is going to get something it doesn't earn.

O, yes, I know the argument about how the owner and his family worked and scrimped and saved and paid for the farm, and then worked and scrimped and saved a few thousand extra profit, and then moved to town to live in comfort on the interest of those extra thousands and the rent of the farm. I'm entirely familiar with that line of dope.

We Mustn't Rob Anybody.

And, mind you, I don't dispute the correctness of it, and the necessity for playing the game that way, as long as society is organized the way it now is, for producing and distributing the necessaries of life. As long as we have the competitive system, we must protect every man in the enjoyment of that which he and his family have worked for and saved as a safety fund against old age. If we don't do that we do a wrong to industrious, economical, good citizens. If we try to take from them the farm they have worked and saved to pay for, without giving them any new social guarantee against want in old age, then we are no better than highwaymen. I for one would not consider for a minute any proposition of that kind. The little I have I have worked for and scrimped and saved to hold on to it, and I don't believe any man has right to ask the state to take it from me, in order to make opportunity for some other man—unless the state proposes to give me, in exchange for this little stockade which I and mine have built with our own hands, the protection of organized society. Of course, if the state will do that—if the state will guarantee me a decent job at fair wages—something suited to my capacity—as long as I am able to work, and will guarantee me a service pension big enough to provide decent food, shelter, clothes, books and tobacco after I get too old to work—why, in that case, I'll jump at the chance to make the trade.

What Can Be and Will Be Done Some Day.

Because I am well aware that, living as we do in a jungle, where the strong man out-trades, and out-wrestles the weaker man for possession of the earth and the good things of the earth, and where the rules of the game permit it, I stand a good chance, when old age comes on, of getting jobbed out of the little property which my own labor and economy have enabled me to collect for a safety fund. Whereas, if I could get the state to step in and make us all equal partners in the business of providing humanity with food, clothing, shelter, and the other necessaries—equal partners, mind you—I wouldn't have any need to worry about the future. We'd be civilized—like a family, instead of like bears in a jungle; in place of the present rule of "dog eat dog" we'd have set up the rule of common sense and justice; we'd be providing our claim to possess a higher intelligence than the four-legged wild animals, which, as matters stand, we leave an open question.

The Land Situation in Texas.

Here in Texas only a small part of the land suited to farming is actuall farmed. Most of it has never been broken. All of it is owned, however, by either a private citizen, an incorporated group of private citizens, or by the state. The state has got rid of most of its once-big land holdings. It has mighty little land left that is worth much for farming. The good land that the people once owned collectively has been grabbed, most of it, by shrewd and unscrupulous individuals, who got it for next to nothing. If a man wants to farm in Texas today he must pay somebody—some individual—for the privilege. Either he must buy a farm or he must rent a farm.

A good many readers of The Rebel are renters. They know more about the tenant-farming proposition than I do, or ever will. No need to deal with that end of the subject here.

Some of my friends on the big Texas newspapers have been advising the renters to buy farm land in these parts of Texas "where it is still cheap." Sure, if a man can't afford bread, let him buy cake. The fact is, there are no more cheap farm lands in Texas. Gauged by what it costs to establish profitable, comfortable farming operations on the so-called cheap lands of the cut-over pine counties of East and Southeast Texas, and the mesquite pastures of Southwest Texas, the Panhandle plains, these lands are as high-priced, right this minute, as the best Iowa lands at $200 an acre.

Why the "Cheap" Lands are Not Cheap.

The "cheap Texas lands" are either as naked as a new-born baby, or they are covered with timber that has to be cut down and grubbed out before cultivation can begin. They have neither fence, house, barn, well, nor any other equipment for human occupancy. All these things have to be supplied by the buyer. On the $200-an-acre Iowa farm the buyer finds fine fences, big, solid barns and cribs, a big modern house with all city conveniences, fields all in cultivation, good near-by markets for everything the land produces, first class schools, churches and stores—all the equipment of a high-grade society. That's why the lands are worth $200 an acre. If the Texas tenant farmer wants these blessings for himself and his family—and he ought to want them, every last one of them, if he hasn't lost his American manhood—the only way he can get them, under the existing system, is by working two or three generations, like the Iowa pioneer farmers did, to build them up out of nothing but land and labor and self-denial.

Profits that Were Never Earned.

If he starts in the cut-over pine counties, or in the Panhandle prairies, or in the mesquite pastures, he'll find land speculators, coming in ahead of him, have bought up the land at its real value as raw land remote from settlements, and have added to a speculative arbitrary valuation of 1000 to 3000 per cent to its real value. He'll have to shoulder that extra, unjust burden of watered stock—we might call it that—and try to earn dividends on it. He'll be robbed of his right to own all the value he builds into the land. Before he can begin to own what he builds into it, he'll have to pay the speculator that 1000 to 3000 per cent or profit that was never earned. For instance, the big lumber companies own enormous tracts of cut-over pine land. They got it for an average of less than $2 an acre. All they have ever done to it is to strip it of its commercial timber. Now they hold it at $10 to $50 an acre—waiting for real farmers to come along and put that value into it with their hard labor and self-denial.

The Old Way and a Better One.

Mighty few of the owners of those $200-an-acre farms have done much more than earn a living from year to year; their profit has been taken in the increased value of the land—value built into it by their own labor and the labor of their neighbors, in part; in larger part by the growth of population, creating improved markets for farm products.

I liked the plan of action proposed by the Texas Renters Union at Waco, because it showed some social intelligence. It proved the men that drew it and those that voted for it were able to see a better plan than the old plan by which to get decent, debt-free, self-supporting farm homes.

Let the state tax idle farm lands their full market value—or the value at which they held by owners for sale—and you'll see so much water squeezed out of the speculative price of tens of millions of acres of this idle land that we folks in the coast country will think the Brazos river, is trying to make a new flood record. The speculators holding vast areas of idle prairie and cut-over timber lands for a raise in price will get busy. They'll not be able to pay a full-value tax very long. They'll have to let go. So we'll see them bidding for buyers that want to work the land. Competition will be reversed—instead of renters competing for a piece of land, these land-owners will be competing for buyers. Idle land values will drop down to where they ought to be, to the man whose labor must build and pay for the fences, barns, cribs, wells, houses, schools, churches, stores and other equipment of a high-grade society. The buyer under such circumstances will know that when he and his family and their neighbors have built this new value into the land, it will be their property.

Beyond the First Step.

That's the best we can hope for, under the existing organization of society—the competitive system. Not Socialism, merely the adoption of a fairer tax system under capitalism. It would help thousands and tens of thousands of tenant families, now shut out of ownership by high land prices, to become owners. But it wouldn't make them any better off than I am right now—and I'm frank to say that as long as the rules of the social game make me—or you or any other lone wolf—fair game for a stronger wolf, I'd gladly exchange my property for a social guaranty that would life all above the wold plane.

Most of the Rebel readers know what I mean. I haven't space here to explain it any further to the few who may not know what I'm driving at, except to say that, as between continuing to have competition (for bread an droof and a chance to breed), under capitalism, and going forward to co-operation under Socialism, I'm for going forward. Mankind goes forward a step at a time—but the steps get longer, as you'll notice if you'll read history with that point in mind.

So, while the full value tax on idle farm land will help a good many families to get freeholds as cheap as they ought to get them, still, it is only one step in a long march ahead that must be made before we get out of the jungle.

The Crime at the Core of Landlordism.

The earth don't belong to our generation. We have the use of it, as long as we live, but we can't take it with us when we die. We've got to leave it here for our children to live on and get grub and clothing and shelter out of. And they've got to pass on and leave it to their children, and so on.

If through greedy or stupid methods, any one generation robs the soil of some of its food-producing elements, and doesn't put them back again, that generation steals from its own children. The experts tell us this is just what we are doing today, under the stupid, unjust, greedy, wasteful landlord-tenant system. We are violating a sacred trust—leaving the soil poorer than we found it—stealing from our own children who must use th earth after us.

That fact alone compels US to find and adopt a new and better system of farming. Our generation might be willing to work for a bare, hard living and turn over the surplus wealth it produces to a bunch of landlords' but we couldn't, being human, be willing to do this and rob our children at the same time. Any system that asks us to do that asks too much. The landlord system in Texas does it, and that system will therefore have to be abolished.

If it becomes necessary—in order to prevent soil robbery and to produce plenty for all—that all private ownership of land shall be abolished, you can bet your last button it will be done, soon or late—and sooner than most folks now think.

The State That is Coming.

A little while back, when I spoke of "the state", I meant the socially organized group of people that make up the state. I didn't mean the kind of an organization, banded together politically for private profit and the spoils of office, such as we now have in all our states, I meant an organization of society in which the people through their local political organizations will hand up orders to public servants in charge of their state industries. And hand them up, moreover, with compleete power to get 'em obeyed. Today, you know, our political bosses, serving the big wolves of the social jungle hand down orders to the rest f us. In the civilized, socialized state which I contemplate, the orders will go up instead of coming down.

Renters' Union Constitution.

Through courtesy of E. O. Meitzen of Hallettsville, Tex., temporary secretary-treasurer of the Renters Union, who on the first of January vigorously entered upon his new duties, we are enabled to print most of the constitution and by-laws of the Renters Union of America, as drafted by the constitutional committee. They will shortly be submitted to a vote of the membership after which the work of organization will be pushed with power and ability.

The Rebel stands for anything that promises to arouse the toilers of the farm, so the Land Edition would be incomplete without a reprint of this historical document. It portrays what will some day be recognised as the world's most remarkable and far-reaching rebellion against landlordism and land monopoly.

Preamble and Declaration of Purposes.

As modern industry develops and the spread of commerce covers the nation, it becomes apparent that land, the source of all wealth, is going into fewer hands; speculation in the gift of God to all His children increase and thus we find that each year it is harder to secure a place to build a home. We believe that the home is the foundation of our civilization and that any causes that operate to prevent honest, industrious men from building a home should be promptly removed in a lawful manner through the organized efforts of those most affected.

We regard the bonus system, the increased crop shares, cash rent, the credit system, the holding of land for speculation, out of cultivation, and subrenting, unjust, inequitable and can have no other result than the destruction of the home. We realize that the logical working out of the above mentioned fruits of landlordism has resulted in a steady and continuous increase in tenantry, with no relief in sight. To grapple with these evils we bind ourselves to promote our common interests, in the Renters' Union of America and declare the following purposes:

To secure equity, establish justice and apply the Golden Rule we shall always struggle with all our power against unlimited ownership of land.

To destroy the bonus and cash system and refuse to rent for more than a third in grain and fourth in cotton.

To assist our members in securing places and refuse to compete for the same.

To educate ourselves in science and government; to establish reading clubs and learn the methods of our exploiters.

To maintain our organization without sectarian or partisan bias.

To promote co-operative farming as far as possible, realizing that the machinery needed to farm in the modern style, is beyond the reach of the individual renter.

CONSTITUTION AND BY-LAWS.

Article 1.—General Powers.

Sec. 1. The title of this organization is the Renters Union of America, State Division No. 1.

Sec. 2. Its powers shall be to issue charters to all unorganized territory, to appoint organizers for same, to issue necessary literature, regulate the disposition of funds in unorganized territory and take such other steps as will promote the general welfare.

Sec. 3. The officers to carry out the provisions of Section 2, shall be President, Vice-President and Secretary-Treasurer and an executive committee of five members.

Sec. 4. They shall issue local and county charters for states other than Texas, until such time as forty locals in any state perfect a state organization, whereupon the parent organization shall issue a state charter and each state organization after receiving its charter shall have absolute control over its own affairs. Under no pretext shall any member of one state organization interfere with the affairs of another state organization.

Article II—Membership.

Sec. 1. All white persons over sixteen years of age, of good moral character and who are farm renters or farm laborers, are entitled to membership. Provided that land owners who have no tenants and cultivate their own lands shall be eligible. No one who holds lands for speculative purposes or who subrents or who rents more than a reasonable amount of land or employs more than a reasonable number of laborers necessary in emergencies shall be eligible.

Sec. 2. A member entering an occupation other than set forth above must be immediately granted a withdrawal card.

Sec. 3. No person shall be disqualified on account of religious or political views.

Article III—Funds.

Sec. 1. Dues shall be15 cents quarterly, payable in advance, and shall begin with the quarter following initiation.

Sec. 2. The initiation fee shall be 50 cents per member.

Sec. 3. Female members shall not be required to pay dues or fees.

Sec. 4. Members who are sick, disabled or out of work may be exempted from payment of dues

Sec. 5. No member who is in arrears shall be allowed a vote in the Union.

Sec. 6. Members who fail to pay dues for three months shall be dropped from the roll.

Sec. 7. Quarterly dues shall be divided equally between local, county and state organizations; provided that where the county is not organized the state shall receive 10 cents.

Sec. 8. Initiation fees shall be divided as follows: 10 cents to the state, 20 cents to the local and 20 cents to the county; provided that when the county is not organized the state shall receive 30 cents. Provided, further, that regularly appointed organizers shall receive all initiation fees paid by the first twenty male members enrolled.

Article IV—State Affairs.

Sec. 1. The officers of the State Union shall be a president, vice-president, secretary-treasurer, and an executive committee of five members. They shall be elected annually and shall not hold the same office longer than two terms.

Sec. 2. The State President shall preside over meetings of the State Union, decide all questions of constitutional law, with the approval of the executive committee, and shall have general supervision over all the state officers. He shall have power at all times to examine the books of the secretary-treasurer and report on the financial condition to the executive committee. The president shall represent the State Union or be with the executive committee shall appoint someone to do in all business pertaining to the Union where representation is necessary, if not otherwise ordered by the State Union. He shall perform such other services as will in his judgment promote the best interests of the Union. His official services shall be subject to inspection, approval or disapproval of the State Union or of any committee the State Union may select for such purpose. He shall receive $3.00 per day and transportation in attending the meetings of the State Union.

Sec. 3. The vice president shall assist the President in the performance of his duties and in his absence he shall preside.

Sec. 4. It shall be the duty of the Secretary-Treasurer to keep a correct record of all proceedings of each meeting, to collect all money due the State Union and be prepared at each annual meeting to make a correct statement of all receipts and disbursements of moneys of the State Union. He shall give bond in an amount sufficient to secure the Union against all losses liable to occur and shall issue all charters. He shall furnish Local nad County Unions all necessary supplies. His salary shall be $6.00 per month, provided the receipts of his office amount to that sum, and he shall devote his entire time to the duties of his office. He shall at each annual meeting make an itemized statement of all receipts and expenditures of his office

Sec. 5. The state executive committee shall audit the books of the Secretary-Treasurer and report on their condition to the State Union at each annual meeting. Whenever the funds warrant and the good of the Union requires, they shall meet at State headquarters. Their remuneration not to exceed $3.00 per day and transportation. They shall keep a correct record of all their official meetings, giving in detail the questions voted upon, how and by whom each vote was cast and shall furnish the State Secretary-Treasurer with quarterly reports and records of their meetings so that he can furnish same to any local union or member in good standing that will send postage for same.

Sec. 6. The state executive committee shall require suitable bonds from the secretary-treasurer, the agents and all other officers required by the State Union to be bonded, and approve all bonds by their signature and the signature of the president. They shall have the power to increase, diminish or cancel said bonds with the consent of the president of the State Union and shall audit all claims against the State Union.

Sec. 7. Any officer of the State Union may be removed from office by the executive committee for incompetency, dishonesty or immoral conduct; provided, that such removal cannot take place except through the process of a fair and impartial trial, giving the accused every just and reasonable opportunity to defend himself against charges preferred. Provided that charges cannot be preferred except by a majority vote of the executive committee and their findings shall be reviewed by a state referendum vote.

Sec. 8. All state official vacancies shall be temporarily filled by the executive committee, pending state referendum vote.

Sec. 9. All state officers shall be elected by mail referendum vote. The state secretary-treasurer shall call for nominations on April 1st of each year. Nominations shall close April 20th. Fifteen days shall be allowed for acceptances. A sufficient number of ballots for each member in good standing shall be prepared by the state Secretary-treasurer and sent to all local secretaries.

Sec. 11. All election returns shall be in the hands of the chairman of the state executive committee not later than the 31st of May and the executive committee shall canvass the returns on the Monday preceding the meeting of the State Union.

Sec. 12. Pending the general election of state officers the secretary-treasurer shall be empowered to appoint state organizers. Their compensation shall be as provided for in Sec. 8, artticle III.

Article V—Local Organization.

Sec. 27. Any member found guilty of renting or trying to rent land from under a member of this Union without the consent of said member, shall be expelled from the Union.

Sec. 28. No member of this Union shall be allowed to pay more than one-fourth of cotton for rent and one-third of grain.

Sec. 31. It shall be the duty of the Union to send a committee of three members to the persons promising said money rent or attempting to rent from under any member.

Article VI—County Organizations.

Sec. 1. A county Union may be formed in any county having not less than five locals.

RENTERS UNION NOTES.

(By E. O. Meitzen, Temporary State Secretary-Treasurer).

Until the first week in January I have been kept very busy making arrangements so as to devote all the time necessary to pushing the work of organization.

Beginning this week, I shall be ready to issue charters, commission temporary organnizers and do other work that has been held up pending the transfer of the secretary's office from Lorena to Hallettsville. I trust that the brethren have not become unduly impatient.

Already there are nearly thirty applications for local charters on file which I consider a fine record considering that no organizer has yet been put on the road.

There will be many able organizers, judging from letters received at this office.

J. C. Rhodes, a veteran farmers' organizer, prominent in the Alliance, Farmers Union and like movements has agreed to look after the Third congressional district, and has been given power to appoint sub-organizers therein.

Taylor McRae, another Farmers Union and Alliance warhorse, is eager for the fray, having offered his services. He has severed his connection with the Co-Operator.

Tom Taylor, formerly the most active and aggressive Farmers Union organizer in the state, has answered my request that he take the field for the Renters Union in a favorable strain. Says that he used to be a renter and his heart is with the renters; wants to see a constitution first and if it suits him (of which there is little doubt) he will aid in the work to the extent of his powers.

T. P. Crawford, of Corley, Ark., another Alliance-Union veteran has agreed to take the road organizing in Oklahoma.

A. J. Rasco, of Eustace, Henderson county, Lee Rhodes of Grand Saline, and others will take the field shortly.

From the most unexpected quarters—from wealthy philanthropists such as the millionaire, Fels, of Philadelphia—from men of all parties, from rich and poor—come many and strong letters of sympathy and promise of support. However the Socialists, who are always the first to take up for the "under dog" have shown the greatest interest. Among the latter may be especially mentioned The Rebel, though such old party newspapers as the Houston Chronicle, The Co-Operator, Waco Times-Herald and others have treated us fairly. Even the Farm & Ranch has let up its "knocking" campaign, perhaps because it realized it was not doing the Renters Union any harm nor Col. Holland any good.

Contributors to Land Edition.

The Rebel is proud to present this remarkable array of talent to its readers. No such a gathering of genius has ever appeared in a Socialist paper in one issue in the South. We present: E. V. Debs, Frank Putnam, Nat L. Hardy, Judge Harris, J. L. Hicks, T. A. Hickey, Ed. Green, J. C. Rhodes, G. G. Hamilton, Dan Gandy, Judge Meitzen and E. R. Meitzen to our 50,000 friends.

BUNDLE ORDERS.

In anticipation of the orders that will pour in after the boys see the Land Edition, we are printing 25,000 extra copies over and above our regular orders. Order at once, 50c per hundred.

LEVITICUS 25-23.

The Reverend S. M. Rich, of Romney, Eastland county, desires to say that he is willing to preach from Leviticus 25-23. May his tribe increase and multiply until they cover the earth.

The Renters.

This is the last article written for this great Land Edition. I am proud to know that at least 50,000 copies will be distributed principally in the South and the figures may run higher. I start this article with this statement because it is the best evidence of the immense interest that has been awakened by the launching of the Renters Union.

The 110 delegates from 24 counties that met in Waco on the 4th of November were direct from the soil, and thoroughly knew their conditions, the wrongs that they groaned under and the way that they can get out of their bondage.

They splendidly stated in the resolutions that were adopted unanimously with a rising vote, that they stood for an organization

White tenants have increased from 165,000 in 1900 to 209,000 in 1910, and the negro and Mexican tenants and farm laborers have greatly increased.

The cost of machinery necessary to obtain the best results in farming has greatly increased.

Many landlords demand contracts that interfere with the political and personal liberty of the tenant as well as the manner in which he cultivates his crops.

The present tenant system, through lack of proper improvements, overcropping and single cropping, is causing the soil to lose its fertility and yield unsatisfactory returns.

The increase in land values has made it impossible for the tenant under ordinary conditions, to buy and pay for land.

These conditions are forcing the landless farmer to live in miserable shacks and keeping the women and children in the fields to such an extent as to be exceedingly detrimental to the mental and physical well-being of our people that was non-political and nonsectarian and that they would, while holding to the non-political position, make every man looking for office, go on record for or against them in the 1912 campaign.

Although I have been a Socialist for 20 years, back in the days when I was a beardless boy, back in the time when to declare yourself a Socialist meant ostracism and physical danger, I here and now, as editor of The Rebel, declare that I will support that party that unswervingly accepts the demands of the Renters Union regardless of what that party may be.

Let us see what has caused the formation of this great Union. In a nut-shell it is this:

The acreage of cultivated farming in Texas has decreased from 125,000 in 1900 to 109,000 in 1910.

ple and a menace to the homes and social institutions of our state.

To secure relief from these conditions, we have proposed that use and occupancy shall be the title to land. We have proposed that a tax shall be placed upon land values "up to the limit." We realize that in Canada if a man has 160 acres of land for speculative purposes, the state taxes the idle land eight times that which is taxed the tilled land. If the sons of Canada have the patriotism and all around good sense to put through such a law in their parliament, surely the sons of the great Lone Star state, that has lived under six flags and has all the traditions of the Alamo in their history, can do at least as well. Personally, I believe they can do better. For this reason I am going to do all in my power to make every man in every party from dog-catcher to governor, toe the line in this 1912 campaign and see whether he stands for use and occupancy and taxation on idle land, or not.

I know that because of our present constitution there will be objections to this movement of the Renters Union. As editor of The Rebel, I have anticipated them. Our readers will notice on another page, the article from Judge Harris of Austin, the author of Harris' Annotated Constitution; you will read there the difficulties that he presents towards putting this program through. You will also notice that he says: "When a new political idea prevails, with a majority of the people, even the courts of the country are not slow to give it a strained construction to meet the demands of a recognized majority." This makes the issue clear with this new political idea that the Renters Union has launched. It is up to us to make this new idea "prevail with the majority of the people," and when it has prevailed, then every white man in Texas can live under his own vine and fig tree. Every child can be educated. It will be a grand day for Mollie and the babies. To accomplish this work is the divine mission of the Renters Union. Get into the fight and the future will be bright for the vast majority of men and women in the old Lone Star State.

THE LAND QUESTION FROM A BIBLE STANDPOINT.

(Briefly Stated).

Wrong.	Right.
"Let a few men have dominion over all the earth."	"Let them (mankind) have dominion over all the earth." —Gen. 1:26.
"The Lord has disposed of the earth long since."	"All the earth is mine."—E. 19:5; 1 Cor. 10:26.
"The few shall eat their bread in the sweat of the faces of the many."	"In the sweat of thy face shalt thou (mankind) eat bread."—Gen. 3:19.
"The land shall be sold forever."	"The land shall not be sold forever."—Lev. 25:23.
(Above statement founded on the acts of the present capitalistic system.)	(Above quotations from the Bible).

"The Socialist Party strives to prevent land from being used for the purpose of exploitation and speculation. It demands the collective possession, or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end." (From S. Party platform.)

Mr. Bible Believer, which side of this question is right? Are Socialism and the Bible on thesame side?

Are you a Socialist?

Fraternally, John A. Currie.

Thurman-Hamilton Debate.

Several hundred copies of the noted Thurman-Hamilton debate for sale at the reduced price of 15 cents each, postpaid. These books are especially valuable in view of Rev. Hamilton's subsequent conversion. Send orders to The Rebel, Hallettsville, Tex.

Write the following question down on a piece of paper, hand it to the preacher nearest you who opposes Socialism, and ask him to preach a sermon in answer to it: "Should there be less cotton raised while millions are shivering and suffering for clothing and bed covering?"

STATE MOVEMENT.

ELECTION REPORT.

Hallettsville, Tex., Dec. -, 1911.

The undersigned members of the State Auditing Election Committee met at the State Office December 25th, one member, Nat B. Hunt, being unable to attend. On tabulating the votes cast for State Secretary and National Committeemen, found that preferentially computed candidates received the following votes:

For State Secretary:

Ed. A. Green of Rockdale, 2079 points; he having received the lowest number of points is accordingly declared elected State secretary.

B. H. Lauderdale of Abilene, 3046 points.

J. C. Thompson of Texarkana, 2896 points.

W. H. Wilson of Groesbeck, 3211 points.

For 2 National Committeemen:

E. Bellinger of San Antonio, 3630 points.

T. A. Hickey of Hallettsville, 2288 points (elected).

W. S. Noble of Ranger, 2436 points (elected).

M. A. Smith, of Commerce 2902 points.

As far as our limited time would allow investigation, we found the books of the State office in a satisfactory condition.

Fraternally submitted,
Nat. L. Hardy,
J. C. Rhodes.

P. S. With reference to the above, we would add that all communications pertaining to State Party matters, be hereafter directed to Ed. A. Green, State Secretary, Rockdale, Texas.

Notes.

D. S. Hollowell, Secretary Milam county, writes: "I desire to call attention of all local secretaries to the clause in the state constitution that requires each local to render to the county secretary, by the 7th of each month, a financial report of the preceding month, remitting therewith the county and State dues, and giving the names of all members in good standing admitted or withdrawn since last meeting. We are sorry to say that we have local secretaries here who have either not read this clause or care nothing about it. Some, however, make neat reports regularly and we hope that all of them will do the same. I have decided to follow the constitution in this matter from now on. We will keep you furnished with blank reports and any local secretary sending for due stamps must properly report or his money will be returned to him."

Dr. J. H. French, a traveling optician and Socialist agitator, has started on a tour through South Texas. The following dates have been fixed: December 31, January 1 and 2, Willis; January 4, Conroe; 5, Spring; 8 and 9, Rosenberg; 10, Wharton (at Nation Hotel); 11 and 12, El Campo; 13 Ganado (South Side Hotel); 14 and 15, Edna; 17, Victoria; 19 and 20, Goliad. All he charges for speaking is that the comrades buy $5.00 or $6.00 worth of 10c books and circulate them in their section. He carries only the best literature.

At a mass meeting of the Socialists of Eastland county, W. T. Webb of Carbon, was elected county secretary and S. M. Rich of Romney, chairman. Comrade Webb announces that W. S. Noble will begin a 30-day campaign in Eastland county on January 29, 1912.

Joe F. Hudspeth of O'Brien has been elected secretary of Haskell county; he announces the following dates for W. S. Noble: January 4, Cottonwood; 5, Jim Hogg; 6, Cobb, 8, Rockdale S. H.; 9, Howard; 10, Post S. H.; 11, McConnell; 12, Ward; 13, Plainview; 15, Bunker Hill; 16, Joe Bailey; 17, Willow Point; 18, Sagerton, All meetings at 7:30 p. m.

County Secretary Hudspeth writes: "Rev. G. G. Hamilton spoke at O'Brien the 20th to a fine crowd. The people at O'Brien have a better feeling for Mr. Hamilton than they had when he met Sandy Clark at this place. Hamilton is surely a power, and wish that every man in Texas could hear him."

B. D. Sebring, secretary Runnels county, writes: "Please announce that I want suitable names from every precinct in Runnels county to be presented to the commissioners' court, with the recommendation that they be placed on the election boards. By the way, I am sending you an application for Scout service, and we will try to take care of the whole of Ballinger precinct. We also want to make an effort to completely sow this county down with literature, and make arrangements for the best speakers in the spring, so as to keep the voters out of the old party primaries. We have a good chance to elect a county ticket."

The mass meeting of Hunt county Socialists will occur on January 6th, instead of the 15th, at W. O. W. Hall at 10 a. m. and two p. m. Every Socialist, whether a party member or not, is earnestly requested to attend and help lay plans for a great campaign in 1912. Our county campaign will begin December 30th at 2 p. m. with Rev. G. G. Hamilton as speaker, at Commerce.

W. W. Gilbert,
County Sec.

Nat. B. Hunt, by request of local Tyler, sends us a most timely resolution to the affect that all Socialist organizations should be very careful about engaging speakers that are not regularly routed by the county or state organizations Many of the free lances do good work, it is true, but there are some who do more harm than good. By writing to the state office before engaging a speaker, you will perhaps save yourself much trouble in this respect. We refer especially to such speakers as make a practice of attacking religious ideas or organizations.

John A. Currie will be routed through South Texas beginning in January. Comrades desiring dates will write this office at once.

THE OLD WAR HORSE TALKS

In behalf of the promoters of the Renters Union in their noble work I wish to congratulate you in your wisdom and precautionary safeguards.

The unborn will come to this world to honor and bless you for your grand and glorious service. Your diadem will be decreed with glory for what you will have done for humanity. I have seen the need of such an organization for 20 years. The renters are mud sills of society; the source of all wealth, the life of all nations. Upon their great strong arms all humanity leans and yet they have been looked upon by the landlords and all other lords as being beneath their dignity and deserve no consideration at their hands. The pirates have controlled all these branches recognizing they secure their trust of honor from that class, hence the renters have never been considered, but with small farmers and renters organized, demanding their dues as an organized force, they will get them as soon as they find that their only means to secure office is to cater to the renters and workers. The office seekers will then do the bidding of the renters and laborers. You have my best wishes and undivided support.

J. C. Rhodes.

From the free state of Van Zandt.

To Our Rebels.

A HEART TO HEART TALK ON OUR GREAT PROGRAM FOR 1912.

In the face of obstacles galore The Rebel has done some remarkable things in its short life, but it has mapped out a program for the coming terrific campaign that if carried out, will beat anything it has ever tried to do. It will shake the South like an earthquake and frighten politicians, great and small, within an inch of their worthless lives.

THAT PROGRAM IN A NUTSHELL, IS TO MAKE THE LAND QUESTION THE ONE GREAT ISSUE OF THE 1912 CAMPAIGN.

In order to carry that program into effect many preliminaries are necessary.

Details Settled.

Here are some of the preliminaries that have been arranged:

Beginning next week The Rebel will have on its staff the ablest political writer in the South, one whose powerful style and wide grasp of men and events will be apparent from the first. Although a busy man he has kindly consented to fill one page each week, under the nom de plume of "Pendragon," as his name cannot be made public as yet.

Including the editor-in-chief other effective writers will contribute each week.

In the business and executive offices things are rapidly taking shape with E. R. Meitzen, former state secretary, as business manager, and Dan Gandy in charge of the circulation departments.

In the mechanical end we now have day and night shifts, have installed quite a lot of new machinery and otherwise systematized matters.

Details Unsettled.

However many details remain to be arranged:

We must increase the size of The Rebel from six to seven column, four pages.

We must be able to print the ever increasing editions in time to get them to the subscribers in time. This is a heart-breaking task with the present equipment.

We must be able to print, mail and fold The Rebel in one day, where it now takes three days and sometimes longer.

Everyone of these problems can be settled with a new printing press of the web perfecting type.

But a machine of this kind costs money—lots of it.

As matters now stand we must struggle along as best we can, fumbling at the great task that has been set for us to perform, until such time when funds enough are accumulated to buy a faster press but by then the campaign will be about over.

Now, ye Rebels, you know this will not do. WE WANT THAT PRESS NOW, before the campaign opens up. We must get our great message on the land question to the Southern people before the old party politicians get them stampeded with the tariff, prohibition and other fake issues.

You can help put that press into The Rebel office within the next six weeks without lending or giving a cent, for The Rebel shall never beg or borrow from its subscribers.

Rebel Press Fund.

All you need do, is to sit down and write a letter about as follows:

"Dear Rebel:—Enclosed find a ____ for which renew my subscription for ____ years, and credit this amount to the Rebel Press Fund."

Get others to do the same. Incidentally pick up as many clubs as you can and send them along for good measure. We shall need $2000 to make the first payment on the press, and an accurate account of all Press Fund receipts will be printed each week until that amount is accumulated.

Press Fund Sub Rates.

For single subscriptions, renewals:

Forty Weeks	25c
Three years	$1.00
Five years	$1.50
For life	$5.00

We have hundreds of letters to the effect that The Rebel ought to have two hundred thousand instead of twenty thousand readers. Well here is your chance to help us get in a position to reach for that figure and beyond that figure. We have before us the great fallow fields of agitation of the Sunny South. It is peculiarly The Rebel's task to cultivate them.

TEXAS GREAT CONSTITUTIONAL LAWYER

Gives Opinion on Land Legislation.

(Written for The Rebel.)

[W. M. Harris of Austin, Texas, author of Harris' Annotated Texas Constitution, makes replies as follows to the questions as stated:]

Questions.

1. Can a confiscatory tax be constitutionally applied to lands held for speculative purposes, and not used by those who hold titles thereto?

2. Can land ownership be constitutionally limited to an arbitrarily fixed number of acres?

3. It has been suggested that under the law of eminent domain, lands that are not in use and that are needed by homeless and landless citizens and farmers, can be constitutionally condemned and the owners compensated for same as in the case of lands needed for right-of-way of railroads, and other public works. May the principle named be constitutionally thus applied? The suggestion is, that the State having thus acquired such lands, they may be sold at cost to the said homeless and landless citizens.

Replies.

1. No.
2. No.
3. No.

Remarks: These answers are based on certain provisions of our State Constitution, together with constitutional construction.

Without discussing their probable effect upon an Act of the Legislature, the purpose of which would be to levy a confiscatory tax upon any property in the first instance, or, in the second instance, to limit such confiscatory tax to lands held for speculative purposes only, I recall now the following constitutional provisions:

1. Art. 1, Sec. 17. "No person's property shall be taken, damaged, or destroyed for or applied to public use without adequate compensation being made." etc. * * *

2. Art. 1, Sec. 19. "No citizen of this state shall be deprived of * * * * property, privileges or immunities, * * *, except by due course of the law of the land."

3. Art. 8, Sec. 1. "Taxation shall be equal and uniform. All property in this state, whether owned by individual persons or corporations, other than municipal, shall be taxed in proportion to its value, which shall be ascertained as may be provided by law.

4. Art. 8, Sec. 9. "The State tax on property, exclusive of the tax necessary to pay the public debt of the taxes provided for the benefit of public free schools, shall never exceed thirty-five cents on the one hundred dollars valuation. * * * *"

5. Art. 8, Sec. 18. "The Legislature shall provide for the equalization, as near as may be, of the valuation of all property subject to or rendered for taxation * * * * *; and may also provide for the classification of all lands with reference to their value in the several counties."

Such an Act of the Legislature would seem to come clearly within the inhibition of Article 8, Sections 1 and 9. As to license and occupation taxes, it has been frequently held by the courts of the country that there is no limit, but as to property taxes, the provisions of Section 1 and 9 of Article 8 are mandatory. Further, neither the Constitution nor the statutes of this State make any distinction for the purposes of taxation, as between land owned for speculative purposes, and otherwise. Under our present system, lands when acquired from the government, become the absolute private property of the party acquiring them, and his heirs and devisees, the only qualification to such absolute ownership being the law of eminent domain, and this power is restricted to the acquisition of public works and institutions, roads, etc., and to certain corporations, quasi-public, such as railroads, etc.

The provisions of our Constitution and the court decisions thereunder, are inimical to the idea of taking from the title holding land owner any part of the value of his holdings, regardless whether that value be speculative or otherwise, and regardless of the extent to which monopoly conditions contribute to such value. No provision of our constitution or of our statutes has ever sought to limit the amount of land one may own. It is true, in the case of purchasers of school lands from the State. The State has heretofore enacted a land low limiting the amount of land one may purchase from the state, but this statute has for its purpose the encouragement of settlement, and in no way restricts the amount of land one may own.

Our country, until comparatively recent times had abundance of cheap lands, and the land question has never appealed to the body politic, the real lawmaking power, in the same way that it may possibly be considered at some future time, when a monopoly condition possibly has had time to produce conceivable conditions that would be onerous to society. Should such condition ever exist, the changed spirit of the people will undoubtedly be reflected by a change in our Constitution, followed by suitable laws. There is no political power higher than the people. The people change their constitutions when they choose. True, the process prescribed for a change in our organic law renders such change slow and tedious and exceedingly difficult to bring about under the method prescribed in our Constitution. It is well that it is so; for it is the bulwark of private rights that are sacred to the individual—"a pillar of cloud by day, by night a pillar of fire"; but the Constitution belongs to the people, and when a new political idea prevails with a majority of the people, even the courts of the country are not slow to give it a strained construction to meet the demands of a recognized majority.

Much could be said on the subject, and what I have said above is not the result of much study of the question as your readers will readily determine.

JOB WORK.

This office is prepared to do all kinds of job printing, including letter heads, envelopes, bill heads, statements, pahphlets, circulars. Work done in the three languages, English, German and Bohemian. Write for terms.

WANTED—Addresses of my brothers, J. E., W. H. and G. N Perkins and sister, Myrtle, and Mrs Chas. E. Lancaster. Last heard from in 1898. Any information appreciated by Mrs. Martha Perkins Ficken, 675 Willow Ave., San Francisco, Cal.

A SHORT SERMON ON THE LAND QUESTION.

(By Rev. G. G. Hamilton.)

Text: "The land shall not be sold forever for the land is mine; for ye are strangers and sojourners with me"—Lev. 25:23.

From a reading of the scriptures, both of the Old Testament and the New, nothing is clearer than this—God is and has ever been opposed to speculation and exploitation. Because of this this law was given, as well as others. I am sometimes asked if Socialists purpose the same land law as was known to Moses and the prophets. My answer is always this: Truth is eternal, principles are everlastingly the same, but the application varies with changing conditions.

We Socialists do not propose the ancient land law of the Jews. We know that we are living in a later age—thousands of years after that law was given. We do not propose to believe that this law is binding upon the society of the present but we do contend that the principle upon which that law is founded is eternally and everlastingly the same. That principle is: **No man and no set of men shall monopolize the means of life upon which the people collectively depend.** I have $50 and expenses for the man who will deny this proposition. Trot him out.

Through all the history of God's ancient people we can trace the working out of this principle. The prophets of Israel, John the Baptist, Jesus Christ and His apostles, so far as the system of their day would allow them, were Socialists. In other words they were class-conscious working men with a full knowledge of conditions, as they then existed and then knowing also that no way of escape and deliverance for their class could be found except through co-operation action.

Trace this thought throughout the Old and New Testaments, and it is ever the same. Come to that day when Nehemiah saw and was moved with the sufferings of his people, when the people complained because of the mortgages they have given in order to live. "Yet now our flesh is as the flesh of our brethren, the Jews, our children as their children, and lo we bring into bondage our sons and our daughters to be servants, and some of our daughters are brought into bondage already; neither is it in our power to redeem them, for other men have our lands and vineyards." In other words, "The other fellow holds the means of life upon which we collectively depend, therefore we are fouled and unable to help ourselves."

Is not this a true portrayal of conditions as they exist in Texas and the Southwest? The great majority of our people are fouled. Their chance and their opportunity is gone. The other man holds the means of life upon which many depend. They do not have to die in order to go to hell, they are already in hell. Hell to them, is a present reality. Dam such a system!

I have gone over this great state and over the great young and growing state of Oklahoma, but conditions are the same everywhere. The land is monopolized. **The few hold the means of life upon which the many depend.** Where is there a chance and an opportunity for the toiling, suffering, landless millions of this county and the world!

Comrade Editor, this is enough of a sermon for New Year's day. inform the plutocratic preachers of every church in Texas and the Southwest that Hamilton has $50 and expenses for any one who will deny the facts set forth herein. Dam such a land system and dam the preachers who stand for it

The Renters' Resolutions.

(By Nat L. Hardy.

The much discussed subject as to whether the resolutions adopted by the renters convention at Waco are single tax or Socialism is not relative to the main question. The resolutions were written to express the demands and program of the Renters Union regardless of political parties, cults or theories.

The renters passed these resolutions because they propose to abolish landlordism. They propose to abolish landlords and make use and occupancy the title to land.

The monopoly of land values being responsible for their present miserable condition it was only natural and logical that they make their principal attack on land values. Texas land was acquired at a very low figure in the early days, much of it as low as fifty cents or one dollar per acre. Surplus farmers came into the country and the third and fourth system was inaugurated to give them access to the soil. Since this the price of the best lands in Texas has advanced until today it is selling at from $80 to $200 per acre. This increased value of land is not the product of the owners, but due to the general development of the country by society at large.

The third and fourth share rent will not pay more than from two to five per cent interest per year on the present land values. Thus in the last two or three years the landlords, to increase their dividends have made demands for a cash bonus of from $1 to $3 per acre or one-third or one-half of all crops and as cotton is more profitable to the landlord a great many demand high cash rent for grain land. To accede to these demands the tenants must reduce their standard of living to the level of the Mexican peon. This they will not do.

The tenants were unorganized and competing with one another and aiding in makig their conditions worse. Their protests were partaking the nature of violence. This necessitated organization.

The organizers saw that as long as land was privately owned for exploitation that this struggle would continue. To end exploitation and the struggle it is necessary to make use and occupancy—the only just title—the only legal title to land.

As a legal and practicable program to accomplish this end the confiscatory tax on land held for speculation was decided upon and the declaration was made for a "tax on land values to the limit." This may be Single Taxic or Socialistic, but in this particular case it is the definite demand of the organized renters of Texas.

Not only were these resolutions clear in their demands but also how they were going to put these demands through. They realized the value of political action and promulgated a fair and definite line of action in this respect. First they are to present their demands to the platform committees of the various parties and to all political candidates, and boycott all parties and candidates that do not promise to help secure their demands. But the masterpiece of strategy of this convention was the move to present to the people of Texas a blank petition demanding the next legislature to submit a constitutional amendment incorporating the land value tax. This will put the people on record as to whether they favor land monopoly with its misery and stagnation or the tillers of the soil have free access to the land which nature has so bounteously provided.

There is no doubt but what the people of this state prefer a land of happy and prosperous homes to the present state of waste and miserable shacks. No doubt you want to help in the work of getting such conditions. Sign the Renters petition! Get others to sign it.

AS TO LIMITED LAND OWNERSHIP.

(The following has been forwarded to Home and State, of Dallas, for publication.)

I was much interested in the article in your issue of December 16 by John A. Brown of Graham, Tex., on the subject, "Texas Land Renting System." The cry of the land renter is entering into the ears of the Lord ofSaboth, and it were as sinful to smother that cry as to keep back that which of right belongs to the laborers. By admitting such articles to the columns of Home and State you display a genuine human interest in human beings, whether their woes and hardships result from rum or from rent.

I cannot refrain from asking a little space to correct what seems to be a misconception on the part of Brother Brown, in his article referred to, with reference to "the more radical socialistic system of 'no ownership' of land," which, he says, is sure tocome unless forestalled by "limited ownership." That the socialistic proposition with reference to individual land holdings differs from the present system only in the limit it would impose upon such holding, is perfectly clear from the text of the land plank adopted two years ago by a referendum vote of all who are identified with the socialistic movement in the United States. I kindly ask you to print that plank, which is as follows:

"There can be no absolute private title to land. All private titles, whether called fee simple or otherwise, are and must be subordinate to the public title. The Socialist party strives to prevent land from being used for the purpose of exploiting and speculation. It demands the collective posession, control or management of land to whatever extent may be necessary to attain that end. It is not opposed to the occupation and posession of land by those using it in a useful and bona fide manner without exploitation."

So we see there is no foundation for the prevalent notion that the socialistic idea of land ownership is equivalent to "no ownership." The doctrine set forth in the above plank is that individuals and families may, under the proposed socialistic system, possess and hold land, with the same security of title as at present, to whatever amount they can use and make productive by their own efforts. But there the line is drawn on individual ownership. No holding of land for speculation, or for rent, or to force tribute in any form from another.

This is the socialistic idea. And it amounts, after all, to a limiting of private ownership of land, without surrendering the present public right of eminent domain.

J. L. HICKS.

Abilene, Texas.

Congressman Underwood of Alabama made a speech in New York recently in which he bitterly attacked the rascal. In the course of his remarks he said: "The remedy is plain and the way is clear. The people should drive from the places of power and responsibility the unfaithful servants and elect those who will be fait hful and true to the trust imposed upon them." Why, sure! That's exactly what we want with the recall.

Give me the man who looks with no more consideration upon a wrong that is six thousand years old than if it had sprung up during Roosevelt's administration.

LAND AND LAW.

To The Rebel:

I make no attempt to discuss all phases of the rent system nor suggest any visionary theory of government, but beg leave to direct your attention to one branch of the subject and to one cause of the present condition.

The demand for homes on the farm is greater than the supply; many thousand men unskilled in any line of labor excepting agriculture, are forced to seek shelter with their families in towns and cities. Withholding from the plow many million acres of excellent agricultural land in Texas, by both resident and non-residents, owners should be discouraged and the public free school and the unnecessary land should be in the hands of the laboring class and settlers.

Rich in resources and possibilities this state is not what it should be in agricultural development.

This isthe penalty for an unwise land policy:

House Bill No. 236.—Provided for the sale of all school land in any quantity and authorized an agent to sign the applications and obligations of a purchaser. In other words authorized syndicates to the extent avoid complications in bidding. This proposition extended to the speculator a plan for combination and exclude a laboring man from bidding.

It is not ancient history that a radical change in the school land law cost the school fund not less than fifteen million dollars. There has been underhand tampering with the land laws all along and we may expect a continuation and with the actual settlers clause in the land law repealed we may expect the agent of the northern land speculator to be as numerous as vultures around a slaughter pen.

The capitalist class admits we need a change in our present system of land ownership, but the plan they propose, to my mind amounts to no change at all because they say each person should have the right to say how much land he really needs. We have that plan now and the result is you can hardly find a man but who will claim he needs every acre he has and would like to have a little more so to my mind, Mr. Capitalist's plan falls flat to the ground and is worthless to be any use to the laboring class.

I am willing to admit that my plan and views on the land question are extreme, but I would suggest to Mr. Capitalist and landlord that we are dealing with an extreme case and I have heard it said if you go to fight the devil you had better fight with fire

This accounts for my extreme views on the land question and I want to insist on the necessity of a law fixing the maximum limit at 160 acres for if a man can't make an ample living on 160 acres he can't make it at all by farming and had better quit the farm and go to something that suits him better.

Let me insist on another point and that is the limitation of ownership of land as the key to the whole situation. Give us limited ownership for which I contend and all of our rental troubles will cease. Not that I am necessarily a renter, for I have my choice to rent land or job work and do as the boss says and I have a great many other renter brothers in the same condition and some of them are already in a tight place and prospects are that their chance will only grow darker as the years roll by unless this monster evil land monopoly can be checked and forever abolished in our ccuntry

Let me urge every land renter and small land owner throughout the state of Texas to talk and agitate this limited ownership question till the people wake up and fully realize the fearful condition that awaits them in the near future. For the sake of the toiling masses and the toil-worn mothers and innocent children who are robbed of their birth right, let us work like men and pledge ourselves to destroy the claims of capitalism and slavery and politicians of the Southland where hands are red with the blood of children and laboring classes.

A. G. MAXEY,

Secretary Falls Co. Renters Union No. 1.

A REPLY TO "STATE PRESS" REPLY TO THE REBEL.

As to the question of landlordism, land monopoly or free land lacks one thing needful to make it a real answer to a mighty big question.

Herbert Spencer the greatest of all writers on Social Science says paper titles giving unlimited ownership to land are indefensible and Blackstone, the greatest authority on law adds his verdict in the same vein.

Before the tenth century there were no titles to land in the form which is now common, the Romans being the first people to make merchadnise of the soil, and the fruitage of the system was that the rulers and the titled class finally grasped everything in sight, Rome's downfall was complete.

England inherited the Roman land system before handing it to us via Jamestown and Ply- and very slowly, it is true, tried to retrace her steps in order to save herself the fate of Rome.

Within the memory of most of us the work of the Irish Land League is an evidence of the spirit that if strong enough, no power on earth can withstand, that spirit forced England to command non-resident English landlords, and they were the whole thing, to sell their lands to the tenants and on such terms as they, the tenants could meet. And now England herself having tasted the bitter cup of injustice to her own people is today facing the most notable crisis of its history. Again the struggle is on to right that law which can not be contravened with impunity, that he who gets something for nothing is a robber whether it is by legal enactment or at the point of a gun.

All men are created equal as to rights, but through fear or superstition they fail to assert these rights. And the right to an equal footing to the soil is self evident.

As population presses, slums and tenantry multiply, the great injustice of fencing the earth by enactment becomes more and more unbearable and civilizaton mends or breaks at this point, no matter how much we may try to veneer the evils with free hospitals for the poor, sweet charity in a thousand forms, free soup houses and free shows.

Communal administration of land where rights are equally conserved to the overthrow of monopoly, which means all the earth contains, would not kill incentive, but it would undoubtedly strengthen the bands of true Christianity. The same demand for the production of wealth would prevail, with the vast difference that none could take that which was not produced by his own effort.

State Press says he is not going to hades, but to heaven, where perchance socialism may have some show for existance. Let him not be too sure; on his arrival at the pearly gatets and lifting his hat to the mighty Peter who beholds the splendid dome (brain) of State Press turns to the editors' book of fame and finds therein nothing doing for State Press.

A Rebel Dallas, Texas.

There is this difference between the black chattel slaves of other days and the white wage slaves of today: the white slaves have power to free themselves.

LAW AND LAND.

In Social Statics Herbert Spencer denies that there is any such thing as an equitable title to land. He proposes ownership of the land by all the people. He suggests that bona fide tillers of the soil bid for land that they would use and occupy. In support of this position he says:

"A state of things so ordered would be in perfect harmony with the moral law. Under it all men would be equally landlords; all men would be alike free to become tenants. A, B, C, and the rest might compete for a vacant farm as now, and one of them might take that farm without in any way violating the principles of pure equity. All would be equally free to bid; and all would be equally free to refrain. And when the farm had been let to A, B, or C, all parties would have done that which they willed—the one in choosing to pay a given sum to his fellow-men for the use of certain lands—the other in refusing to pay that sum. Clearly, therefore, on such a system, the earth might be enclosed, occupied and cultivated, in entire subordination to the law of equal freedom.

"No doubt great difficulties must attend the resumption by mankind at large of their right to the soil. The question of compensatin to existing proprietors is a complicated one—one that perhaps can not be settled in a strictly equitable manner. Had we to deal with the parties who originally robbed the human race of its heritage, we might make short work of the matter. But, unfortunately, most of our present land owners are men who have, either mediately or immediately—either by their own acts, or by the acts of their ancestors—given for their estates equivalents of honestly earned wealth, believing that they were investing their savings in a legitimate manner. To justly estimate and liquidate the claims of such is one of the most intricate problems society will one day have to solve.

"But with this perplexity and our extrication from it, abstract morality has no concern. Men, having got themselves into the dilemma by disobedience to the law, must get out of it as well as they can, and with as little injury to the landed class as may be."

Who will question the justice of this proposition?

THE SOCIALIST AND THE RENTER.

By E. A Green, State Secretary of the Socialist Party.

What I have to say on the question of the Renters Union is brief and to the point:

I was born in the mountains of Tennessee, the son of a renter. All my life, my lot has been cast with the hardy sons of the soil, except for a brief period when I embarked in business. I realize that the Renters Union is nonsectarian and non-political and I would not raise my little finger to change their positions on these lines, if I could. However, I want to say that while I am state secretary of the Socialist party, I shall do everything that is in my power to boost and push the Renters Union until their lawful and just demands are placed on the statue books of our state.

To every organizer of the Renters.Union who may come to Rockdale, I wish to say that they will find the latch string on the outside of my door.

Up with the Renters Union. Up with the Bible teachings on land. "Land is mine and shall not be sold forever" saith the Lord.

To those who ask in what way land ownership should be limited to use and occupancy, I would answer that the worst way should be infinitely better than the way it is now.

N. E. C. ELECTION.

In the Nation.

Chicago, Jan. 1.—The New Year was opened by the National Office of the Socialist Party with the anouncement by Acting National Secretary Work that the referendum vote of the party for new Executive Committee had been completed and that the committee elected was made up as follows:

Victor L Berger, Job Harriman, William D. Haywood, Morris Hillquit, Alexander Irvine, Kate O'Hare and John Spargo.

The acting National Secretary John M. Work was elected to the permanent national secretaryship by a big majority over J. Bentall his only opponent.

There is considerable new blood in the National Executive Committee just chosen, only Berger, Hillquit and Spargo having been members of the preceding committee.

In Texas.

In Texas the vote for ten leading candidates for N. E. C. was as follows:

E. R. Meitzen	854
Kate O'Hare	687
Wm. A. Ward	640
Stanley J. Clark	597
Wm. D. Haywood	596
Alex Irvine	569
Dan Hogan	537
Victor L. Berger	495
Job Harriman	430
W. J. Bell	334

Among the old N. E. C. members Carey received only 19 and Hilquit 87, Barnes got 55 votes. For National secretary Work received 759 and Bentall 288.

THE LAND QUESTION.

The land question has been the gravest problem that governments, past and present, have had to deal with and will remain thus as long as land is considered private property. Properly speaking property is but a product of man's labor; and society must guarantee "property right" to the producer. Things which exist separately from man's labor is said to have been created for society—a gift from God.

Land being one of these the title rests in society. Taking land for property governments have commercialized it by law, without thought for posterity. Hence we have the lord and serf and the inevitable revolution which only lifts the yoke of bondage for a short space when it falls as heavily again upon her citizenship.

The question of taxation can as equitably and surely be met in a levy more directly placed on labor; for labor pays all tax and is the sole support of society, collectively and individually.

A correctly organized government will recognize the citizen's inalienable right to a free home upon the earth and guarantee protection to his property right—the product of his labor.

I take this to be an axiom: Whereas no effort of man can create land, everyone should have a home free.

Socialism offers this plan and for Socialism I stand.

Damn anything else.

DAN GANDY.

The United States census for 1910 shows 106 males for every 100 females. That means over two and a half millions of the wild sex for whom there are no mates among the mild sex—that many to whom the command, "Be fruitful and multiply," locks horns with the injunction, "Thou shalt not!" The question, "What are you going to do about it?" is a question that does not concern this writer personally. If it did he wouldn't stop to argue over it—he'd get into the game of "Every Adam and Eve as long as the Eves hold out."