

**MILLIONISM VS.
SOCIALISM;
OR, TIMOCRACY
VS DEMOCRACY**

Published @ 2017 Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd

ISBN 9780649134755

Millionism vs. socialism; or, Timocracy vs democracy by H. Slack Worthington

Except for use in any review, the reproduction or utilisation of this work in whole or in part in any form by any electronic, mechanical or other means, now known or hereafter invented, including xerography, photocopying and recording, or in any information storage or retrieval system, is forbidden without the permission of the publisher, Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd, PO Box 1576 Collingwood, Victoria 3066 Australia.

All rights reserved.

Edited by Trieste Publishing Pty Ltd.
Cover @ 2017

This book is sold subject to the condition that it shall not, by way of trade or otherwise, be lent, re-sold, hired out, or otherwise circulated without the publisher's prior consent in any form or binding or cover other than that in which it is published and without a similar condition including this condition being imposed on the subsequent purchaser.

www.triestepublishing.com

H. SLACK WORTHINGTON

**MILLIONISM VS.
SOCIALISM;
OR, TIMOCRACY
VS DEMOCRACY**

Millionism *vs.* Socialism

OR

Timocracy *vs.* Democracy

BY

H. SLACK WORTHINGTON



UNIV. OF
CALIFORNIA

THE SHAKESPEARE PRESS

114-116 EAST 28TH STREET

NEW YORK

1912

HB 171

-7

W73

COPYRIGHT, 1912,

By

H. SLACK WORTHINGTON.

Gift EBloss

NO. 1110
LIBRARY

PREFACE

The time is rapidly approaching, if, indeed, it has not already arrived, when there should be a political party in the United States of America that aggressively and courageously espouses and promulgates principles in favor of A QUALIFIED BALLOT or EQUITABLE RELATIVITY in the exercise of suffrage, and which defends property rights and individual ownership and management, as against the SOCIALISTIC and GOVERNMENTAL tendencies of both the existing great organizations.

SELF preservation is the FIRST law of nature; the preservation of the offspring is the second, and the preservation of the race or society is the third. Socialism implies that the preservation of *Society* is the *first law, which reverses Nature*. It follows therefore that individual ownership should not only be permitted but encouraged, till both self and offspring are adequately protected, plus a sufficient accumulation for the preservation of society. But private ownership does not signify PRIVATE MONOPOLY—MILLIONISM IS NOT BILLIONISM. Unless private monopoly is prevented SOCIALISM which is PUBLIC MONOPOLY, will likely be adopted. Timocracy suggests a plan by which private monopoly can be prevented, and yet private ownership can be encouraged and protected to the fullest extent necessary for individual excellence and civilized progress. That plan is, The "Mil-

lionth per cent. Anti-Monopoly Tax." See chapter first hereof.

Private ownership is right in principle or it is wrong in principle. A compromise position is untenable. If it is right, the owners of property should assert and defend that right, and the attitude of government or society toward millions (but not toward monopoly) should be the same as its attitude toward any subdivision of those magnitudes. If it is wrong it should be abolished.

If private ownership is right, then private controllership and management is also right, because no thing or system can exist without carrying with it the necessary corollaries and concomitants of that existence. Private ownership with socialistic control (which all governmental control is) constitutes a condition as unreasonable as would exist under socialistic ownership with private control. Control in either case renders nugatory and void the underlying principles of ownership, because controllership is a necessary concomitant of possession or ownership.

Regulation is but a form of control and its tendency is toward industrial strangulation rather than toward industrial stimulation, because of the uncertainties that would beset the operation and management of enterprises in which private capital is invested.

Politics and business do not work well together, and SOCIALISM is but the natural result of existing tendencies toward PUBLIC REGULATION AND CONTROL, AND of existing tendencies toward PRIVATE MONOPOLY. The former should be called GOVERNMENTAL FETICHISM and its advocates "FETICHISTS." Many Socialists at

heart are as yet only Fetichists by profession. The ABUSE OF PRIVATE OWNERSHIP, WHICH IS MONOPOLY, should be prevented, as suggested in the following pages, but private owners should CONTROL what they own and MANAGE THEIR OWN BUSINESS.

Democratic Republicanism, which is the correct name for the principles advocated by both of the leading political parties in the United States of America, is founded on the idea of EQUAL and UNIVERSAL suffrage, and that citizens are "equal shareholders in a common property" and should exercise equal voting power. Timocratic Republicanism, as proposed in the following pages, is founded on the idea of RELATIVE and QUALIFIED suffrage, and that citizens are not "equal" but that they are "RELATIVE" shareholders in a common property, and should exercise "*Relative*" voting power. Essentially, therefore, the issue is between so-called equality, which is found nowhere in nature, and which, in social organizations, necessarily becomes a political or "boss" oligarchy; and EQUITABLE RELATIVITY, which is found everywhere in nature, and which is the only practical guarantee against a political or "boss" oligarchy. The spirit of generic Democratic Republicanism is hostile to all educational, rent, or tax-paying qualifications for citizenship and suffrage. "Mass Rule" implies no qualification except that of being one of the "mass." The spirit of Timocratic Republicanism is favorable to the aforesaid qualifications, relatively exercised, and proposes a plan by which relativity can be secured.

It holds that equality in suffrage, which controls

social organizations, is inconsistent with INEQUALITY in the ownership of those organizations, and that relative excellence in personality is more equitably shown or indicated by ownership and usership of property than by any other method.

There exists to-day throughout the entire world a strong sentiment in favor of Socialism or public ownership of all property, and of the means of production and distribution. There exists, also a stronger sentiment in favor of public ownership of so-called "PUBLIC UTILITIES." Both of these have become sufficiently crystalized and pronounced to be seriously reckoned with and considered, and, during some future commercial depression may become a serious political issue. It is held herein that the adoption of either to any considerable extent would cause social demoralization, and, if persisted in, social decay.

The following letter from one of the world's greatest thinkers was published in the *Brooklyn Eagle* on October the 14th, 1902.

It is very suggestive and ominous, and, unless present tendencies change, it will surely prove truly prophetic.

Timocracy seeks a way to counteract these tendencies, and to curtail instead of expand all public or governmental ownership and operation.

Herbert Spencer's letter to James Skilton, published in *Brooklyn Eagle* October 14, 1902.

FAIRFIELD PENSEY WILTS, May 28th, 1894.

DEAR MR. SKILTON:

I believe I wished you good speed in your enterprise, but I believe your enterprise is futile. In the United States as here and elsewhere, the movement

UNIV. OF CALIFORNIA

PREFACE

toward dissolution of existing social forms and re-organization on a socialistic basis I believe to be irresistible. We have had times before us and you have still more dreadful times before you—civil war, immense bloodshed and eventually military despotism of the severest type.

Truly yours,

HERBERT SPENCER.