The Forgotten Man
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The type and formula of most schemes of philanthropy or humanitarianism is this: A and B put their heads together to decide what C shall be made to do for D. The radical vice of all these schemes, from a sociological point of view, is that C is not allowed a voice in the matter, and his position, character, and interests, as well as the ultimate effects on society through C's interests, are entirely overlooked. I call C the Forgotten Man.

For once let us look him up and consider his case, for the characteristic of all social doctors is that they fix their minds on some man or group of men whose case appeals to the sympathies and the imagination, and they plan remedies addressed to the particular trouble; they do not understand that all the parts of society hold together, and that forces which are set in action act and react throughout the whole organism, until an equilibrium is produced by a readjustment of all interests and rights.

They therefore ignore entirely the source from which they must draw all the energy which they employ in their remedies, and they ignore all the effects on other members of society than the ones they have in view. They are always under the dominion of the superstition of government, and, forgetting that a government produces nothing at all, they leave out of sight the first fact to be remembered in all social discussion – that the state cannot get a cent for any man without taking it from some other man, and this latter must be a man who has produced and saved it. This latter is the Forgotten Man.

The friends of humanity start out with certain benevolent feelings toward "the poor," "the weak," "the laborers," and others of whom they make pets. They generalize these classes, and render them impersonal, and so constitute the classes into social pets. They turn to other classes and appeal to sympathy and generosity, and to all the other noble sentiments of the human heart. Action in the line proposed consists in a transfer of capital from the better off to the worse off.

Capital, however, as we have seen, is the force by which civilization is maintained and carried on. The same piece of capital cannot be used in two ways. Every bit of capital, therefore, which is given to a shiftless and inefficient member of society, who makes no return for it, is diverted from a reproductive use; but if it was put into reproductive use, it would have to be granted in wages to an efficient and productive laborer. Hence the real sufferer by that kind of benevolence which consists in an expenditure of capital to protect the good-for-nothing is the industrious laborer. The latter, however, is never thought of in this connection. It is assumed that he is provided for and out of the account. Such a notion only shows how little true notions of political economy have as yet become popularized.

There is an almost invincible prejudice that a man who gives a dollar to a beggar is generous and kind-hearted, but that a man who refuses the beggar and puts the dollar in a savings bank is stingy and mean. The former is putting capital where it is very sure to be wasted, and where it will be a kind of seed for a long succession of future dollars, which must be wasted to ward off a greater strain on the sympathies than would have been occasioned by a refusal in the first place. Inasmuch as the dollar might have been
turned into capital and given to a laborer who, while earning it, would have reproduced it, it must be regarded as taken from the latter.

When a millionaire gives a dollar to a beggar the gain of utility to the beggar is enormous, and the loss of utility to the millionaire is insignificant. Generally the discussion is allowed to rest there. But if the millionaire makes capital of the dollar, it must go upon the labor market, as a demand for productive services. Hence there is another party in interest – the person who supplies productive services.

There always are two parties. The second one is always the Forgotten Man, and any one who wants to truly understand the matter in question must go and search for the Forgotten Man. He will be found to be worthy, industrious, independent, and self-supporting. He is not, technically, "poor" or "weak"; he minds his own business, and makes no complaint. Consequently the philanthropists never think of him, and trample on him.

We hear a great deal of schemes for "improving the condition of the working-man." In the United States the farther down we go in the grade of labor, the greater is the advantage which the laborer has over the higher classes. A hod-carrier or digger here can, by one day's labor, command many times more days' labor of a carpenter, surveyor, book-keeper, or doctor than an unskilled laborer in Europe could command by one day's labor. The same is true, in a less degree, of the carpenter, as compared with the bookkeeper, surveyor, and doctor. This is why the United States is the great country for the unskilled laborer. The economic conditions all favor that class. There is a great continent to be subdued, and there is a fertile soil available to labor, with scarcely any need of capital. Hence the people who have the strong arms have what is most needed, and, if it were not for social consideration, higher education would not pay. Such being the case, the working-man needs no improvement in his condition except to be freed from the parasites who are living on him.

All schemes for patronizing "the working classes" savor of condescension. They are impertinent and out of place in this free democracy. There is not, in fact, any such state of things or any such relation as would make projects of this kind appropriate. Such projects demoralize both parties, flattering the vanity of one and undermining the self-respect of the other.

For our present purpose it is most important to notice that if we lift any man up we must have a fulcrum, or point of reaction. In society that means that to lift one man up we push another down. The schemes for improving the condition of the working classes interfere in the competition of workmen with each other. The beneficiaries are selected by favoritism, and are apt to be those who have recommended themselves to the friends of humanity by language or conduct which does not betoken independence and energy. Those who suffer a corresponding depression by the interference are the independent and self-reliant, who once more are forgotten or passed over; and the friends of humanity once more appear, in their zeal to help somebody, to be trampling on those who are trying to help themselves.

Trade unions adopt various devices for raising wages, and those who give their time to philanthropy are interested in these devices, and wish them success. They fix their minds entirely on the workmen for the time being in the trade, and do not take note of
any other workmen as interested in the matter. It is supposed that the fight is between
the workmen and their employers, and it is believed that one can give sympathy in that
contest to the workmen without feeling responsibility for anything farther.

It is soon seen, however, that the employer adds the trade union and strike risk to the
other risks of his business, and settles down to it philosophically. If, now, we go farther,
we see that he takes it philosophically because he has passed the loss along on the
public. It then appears that the public wealth has been diminished, and that the danger
of a trade war, like the danger of a revolution, is a constant reduction of the well-being of
all. So far, however, we have seen only things which could lower wages – nothing which
could raise them. The employer is worried, but that does not raise wages. The public
loses, but the loss goes to cover extra risk, and that does not raise wages.

A trade union raises wages by restricting the number of apprentices who may be taken
into the trade. This device acts directly on the supply of laborers, and that produces
effects on wages. If, however, the number of apprentices is limited, some are kept out
who want to get in. Those who are in have, therefore, made a monopoly, and constituted
themselves a privileged class on a basis exactly analogous to that of the old privileged
aristocracies. But whatever is gained by this arrangement for those who are in is won at
a greater loss to those who are kept out. Hence it is not upon the masters nor upon the
public that trade unions exert the pressure by which they raise wages; it is upon other
persons of the labor class who want to get into the trades, but, not being able to do so,
are pushed down into the unskilled labor class. These persons, however, are passed by
entirely without notice in all the discussions about trade unions. They are the Forgotten
Men. But, since they want to get into the trade and win their living in it, it is fair to
suppose that they are fit for it, would succeed at it, would do well for themselves and
society in it; that is to say, that, of all persons interested or concerned, they most
deserve our sympathy and attention.

The cases already mentioned involve no legislation. Society, however, maintains police,
sheriffs, and various institutions, the object of which is to protect people against
themselves – that is, against their own vices. Almost all legislative effort to prevent vice
is really protective of vice, because all such legislation saves the vicious man from the
penalty of his vice. Nature’s remedies against vice are terrible. She removes the victims
without pity. A drunkard in the gutter is just where he ought to be, according to the
fitness and tendency of things. Nature has set up on him the process of decline and
dissolution by which she removes things which have survived their usefulness. Gambling
and other less mentionable vices carry their own penalties with them. Now, we never can annihilate a penalty. We can only divert it from the head of the man
who has incurred it to the heads of others who have not incurred it. A vast amount of
“social reform” consists in just this operation. The consequence is that those who have
gone astray, being relieved from Nature’s fierce discipline, go on to worse, and that there
is a constantly heavier burden for the others to bear.

Who are the others? When we see a drunkard in the gutter we pity him. If a policeman
picks him up, we say that society has interfered to save him from perishing.

"Society" is a fine word, and it saves us the trouble of thinking.
The industrious and sober workman, who is mulcted of a percentage of his day's wages to pay the policeman, is the one who bears the penalty. But he is the Forgotten Man. He passes by and is never noticed, because he has behaved himself, fulfilled his contracts, and asked for nothing.

The fallacy of all prohibitory, sumptuary, and moral legislation is the same. A and B determine to be teetotalers, which is often a wise determination, and sometimes a necessary one. If A and B are moved by considerations which seem to them good, that is enough. But A and B put their heads together to get a law passed which shall force C to be a teetotaler for the sake of D, who is in danger of drinking too much. There is no pressure on A and B. They are having their own way, and they like it. There is rarely any pressure on D. He does not like it, and evades it. The pressure all comes on C.

The question then arises, Who is C? He is the man who wants alcoholic liquors for any honest purpose whatsoever, who would use his liberty without abusing it, who would occasion no public question, and trouble nobody at all. He is the Forgotten Man again, and as soon as he is drawn from his obscurity we see that he is just what each one of us ought to be.