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If You—

If you will consider why the children of the toilers have no chance at an education you will understand why the fine speeches of the plute agents do not turn the workers from Socialist ideals.

If you think over why the man who makes the cloth wears the shoddy clothes you will be able to see a vital reason for the great unrest which mere talk is not going to allay.

If you try to explain the proverb, "the shoemaker's wife goes poorest shod," you will have a lesson in economics that is deeper than all the old party platforms ever written.

If you will try to show why a few men who do no work should have all the good things of life while the many who do all the work have practically nothing, you will learn more of ethics and real religion than you will gather from a thousand sermons.

If you will ask yourself why the man who builds the houses has no home you will have a question that will lead you to Socialism.

If you will ask yourself why the man who builds automobiles never gets to ride in a buzz wagon you will understand what is behind the Socialist movement.

If you will ask yourself why the farmer who raises the fine grains and vegetables lives on the refuse, you will be on the way of solving the mystery of why the farmer is turning to Socialism.

If you will consider that every Socialist believes in woman suffrage while the old parties oppose an extension of democracy, you will see why the women are so rapidly turning toward Socialism.
I. SOCIALISM—ITS AIMS AND STRENGTH.

What does Socialism aim to do?

Its aims are two-fold. First, to socialize industry; second, to establish democratic or popular rule. If you wish to condense it more, it means giving the people control of their lives. The socialization of industry involves the collective ownership of all the machinery of production and distribution that is socially used. It does not mean the collective ownership of things that are used individually. It means, therefore, to have more private property for more people than is possible today. Democratic control of industry means that because the whole people own it, they shall have the power to control it. This will so change things that the people will control their own employment and the conditions of their employment. Under private ownership these things are necessarily controlled by the individual owners for their benefit. Under collective ownership the profits will be eliminated.

When, and where, and by whom was Socialism founded?

Socialism was not "founded" by anyone, at any time, or in any place. It is simply the growth of an idea, of a theory, of an understanding. Hundreds entered into the development of it on the start, and millions are helping to develop it now. The first analysis of the capitalist system which gives Socialism an understanding of its work was made by Karl Marx, a German Jew, in the '40s. The one demand of Socialism is the overthrow of the capitalist system and the substitution therefor of the Co-operative Commonwealth, in which the affairs shall be democratically administered and the toiler shall receive his full social product. It is not a cut and dried system, or the scheme of a few men, but is the natural evolution and development out of conditions that preceded it.

Will the present state and county governments remain about as they are now under Socialism? Would the congressional and legislative representation be apportioned according to the population at present?

No one can tell about such things. You might just as well ask whether things will always remain as they are under the capitalist system. Socialism purposes merely an end of exploitation and increase of democracy. The very fact that the people would rule means that whatever they wished would prevail.

If they thought the present methods were best suited to their interests they would continue. If they felt that a change was desirable in order to accomplish results, the change would be made. Socialism is a method, not a system of laws.
**What is the philosophy of Socialism which we hear so much about?**

The first essential thing is the proposition of surplus value. This is an analysis of the capitalist system which shows that the profit, interest and rent constitute a value above that which the worker receives for his labor. This, therefore, is a tribute, a theft, if you please, which Socialists propose to end. The second essential idea is that through collective ownership and democratic control of industry the tribute of profits, or the exploitation of the workers, may be ended. Third, comes the idea of evolution of industry. It teaches that industry under the revolution already worked by machinery, has become a socialized work, and that, in order to complete the circle, it will be necessary to have social control of the machinery of production and distribution that is socially used. The next point is the materialistic conception of history, or, as otherwise stated, the doctrine of economic determinism. This means, in effect, that a man will look out for his own material interest and therefore an appeal may be made to the working class to change social and industrial conditions for its benefit. It also means that the prevailing mode of industry determines the political, economic and social thought of the time, and with a change in the way of making a living there must come a corresponding political and economic change. Lastly, as a means of applying the philosophy already outlined, comes the recognition that past history has been a struggle of classes and that to end classes it will be necessary for the workers to throw off the riders of industry and make everybody workers. This is the fact of the class struggle. It is not taught to mean that classes are right. It is only intended to show that classes already exist and to point out the way by which caste and class may be ended.

I have heard it said that Socialism is not entirely the result of agitation but the logical outcome of social development. What does this mean?

We mean that the invention of machinery has effected a complete social change already and that political and economic conditions must adjust themselves to this change. Socialist agitation merely instructs and helps toward this adjustment. It is the absolute need of a change, however, that is forcing both the Socialist agitation and the revolution that is already under way. Revolution is not necessarily violent in nature. Socialists are working intelligently and earnestly to keep this from becoming violent. As already stated a revolution in the means of making a living has already been wrought, almost imperceptibly. Compare the way the pioneers lived with modern life and you will see this. It is a fact that production under the capitalist system for profits has become world wide, which has controlled most largely to making the demand for socialized production for the benefit of all world-wide in nature. They who urge that Socialism has no place in America, because of the fact that we have a republic here, do not understand the situation. It is because capitalism exists here as fully developed as anywhere on earth, and that its exactions are fully as great here as anywhere, that Socialism has a place in America and will continue to grow. Granting of simple demands such as the raising of wages will not end the unrest. The workers will never be
satisfied and never can be placated until they receive their full social product.

I have heard it charged that Socialists are free lovers, against religion and in favor of dividing up the property of all the people. Is that true?

It is not. These are charges made by enemies of Socialism who make them either through ignorance or malice. There is never a new idea advocated but that it has to run the gauntlet of misrepresentation. They charged that the public schools means irreligion, that early republicans believed in marriage of whites and blacks and even that Jesus was opposed to religion. Socialism is a political and economic question. It includes in its adherents all shades of religions and non-religious belief. All are united, however, on the proposition of ending the capitalist system through an industrial democracy, and though in different countries in different periods minor issues may press to the front as steps toward that end the aim is ever and everywhere the same. So far from believing in dividing up Socialism is opposed to dividing up the earnings of the workers through the paying of dividends. So far from advocation of “free love” (free lust) Socialists would make it possible for all men and women to marry, own homes of their own and raise their children with every comfort.

What is the present strength of Socialism?

Germany leads with more than 4,500,000 votes. France comes second with 1,120,000. Austria third with a little more than a million. The United States fourth with half a million, though Belgium, Australia and Great Britain are not far behind, while Finland, Italy, New Zealand and Russia each polls approximately a third of a million votes. It must be understood, however, that in Germany and some other countries in Europe the Socialist strength is greater than shown at the polls. There woman suffrage does not prevail and beside, property qualifications give the rich men a representation far in excess of their numerical strength. Because the population of the United States is so much greater than in some of the other countries, it has a far smaller representation in legislative halls than they have. All the countries named have numerous members both in state and national legislatures. Some of them are able almost to dominate legislation. In the United States, however, the Socialists cast about 1,000,000 votes and control more than 1,000 minor offices, with representation in six legislatures. Every nation named has its press—daily, weekly and monthly. The United States has about 300 papers, including five dailies and the Appeal to Reason, the largest, in circulation, of any political paper in the world. Socialism is now organized in practically every nation. Even China and Japan, several South African countries and Australia have their Socialist representatives in legislatures. It may be said with truth that while the vote may fluctuate slightly on account of removal of workers from one place to another, the history of Socialism both in the United States and Europe and all other countries, shows a steady increase from the first without a single retrograde movement.
II. OBJECTIONS TO SOCIALISM ANSWERED.

That Socialism is against religion.
Socialism is an economic political movement. While there may be individual Socialists who are unbelievers, Socialists stand for toleration in all matters of belief. They would not prohibit anyone from being religious if they could, and they could not if they would, for majorities will rule under Socialism, and even a majority could not make a man disbelieve anything he did believe. Socialists are free to condemn abuses in the name of religion, but after Socialism is inaugurated it will be possible to live a deeper religious life than can be lived while poverty and oppression are so prevalent; and when robbery of the worker ceases, the people who wish to do so will be better able to support the church by voluntary contributions than they are now. The cry that Socialism will destroy religion is no new cry. It was said of abolition, of public schools, of labor unions, and even of the Christian gospel itself.

That Socialism will break up the home.
A study of statistics will show how the present order is breaking up the home. Socialism will foster home making by making it possible for every family to own a home in its own right.

That Socialism is the same as anarchy.
Socialism stands for a fully organized society, and anarchy for the absence of organization. They are the very opposites. The present order is more nearly anarchistic than is Socialism, for the reason that while anarchy is absence of organization, the present order is partial organization, and Socialism is complete organization. Individualism, the thing which republicans and democrats both have sanctioned as the opposite of Socialism, is nothing more or less than anarchism.

That Socialism is a foreign movement.
The earlier efforts at socialization began in America. The Revolutionary war was fought to socialize or popularize government. The socializing of the post office, of the public roads, of the public schools were all fought out in America. The proposition of Socialism—the socializing of industry—is merely an extension of the work that has been in progress in the United States for several centuries. The securing of industrial democracy—the one demand of Socialism as to method—is the legitimate outgrowth of political democracy. But the socializing thought has now become world wide. It is foreign to no nation of earth. It belongs to America more than any other nation perhaps, because the machine and the trust are more fully developed here than anywhere else, making the need of it greater than in Europe. Seventy-one per cent of the Socialists of America are natives of America.

That Socialism means dividing up.
The motto of Socialism is: "Workers of the world, unite." Its efforts is to secure co-operation in the place of divisional work. It aims
to make the tools of production and distribution undivided public property instead of divided individual property, as they are now. In every way it is the opposite of division. They who declare that Socialists want to take all the property of the world and divide it equally among all the people either knowingly or ignorantly misrepresent Socialism. Such a thing has never been proposed by Socialists and is utterly repudiated by them.

That Socialism is disloyal.

Because the red flag is used by Socialists some assume that it is disloyal to American ideas. The fact is, Socialism is thoroughly in accord with real Americanism. The red flag is used, not as a substitute for the stars and stripes, but as a symbol of revolt that was used by Americans before the stars and stripes came into existence, and as a symbol of the international movement and universal brotherhood. The red flag means not rebellion against the country or government, but against abuses and exploitation.

That Socialism will be species of bossism.

We are under bossism now. A majority of men can work only as others employ them, and the employer has full say as to how things shall be done. Socialism is a system where the order will be reversed. Instead of a few employing and bossing the many, the many will own the machinery of production and employ the managers by electing them. Instead of the worker being in danger of being turned off or shut out, he, as part owner, will be sure of a job, and will have the power of recall over the superintendents and foremen. Bossism will thus virtually pass away.

That Socialism has been tried and proved a failure.

Socialism has never been tried. It was never even proposed until half a century ago. What has been tried was partial socialization, such as socialized roads, schools, postoffices, etc. These have not been failures, yet none of them, nor even all of them, constitute Socialism. Co-operative colonies and co-operative businesses are not Socialism, but only co-operative capitalism. Socialism stands for the socializing of industry, the end of capitalism, the destruction of the profit system, and these have never been tried.

That Socialism will take your farm away.

People who call on you to worry over a theory that someone else will take away your farm, while they are taking it away themselves, are evidently insincere. There are only 1,257,037 farmers in the United States who operate farms of their own, while 2,026,286 farmers rent their farms. Indeed, there are only 1,005,469 farmers who run their farms and own only one farm—less than half as many as rent farms. The rest own more than one farm, employing farm hands, too.
III. SOCIALISM AND LAND.

Under Socialism how would our farms be run? Would we manage our farms as individuals, raise and sell our cotton, corn and other products the same as now?

While the man who cultivates a small tract of ground himself is not an exploiter and probably would be permitted to continue such cultivation under Socialism, the tendency is in another direction. Already the farm expert, who understands soil, rotation and other necessary things, is being placed in charge of many farms, while in other sections counties are employing farm advisors. It will probably be found that better results can be obtained from having large areas of land cultivated under the direction of expert managers, using the greatest and best machinery possible. This will either come under syndicate farming or co-operative farming. The co-operative farm, under such conditions, would be very easily transferred into the socialized farm, the government, whether it be the nation, state, county, or even the municipality, assuming charge of this land. It is probable that when Socialism comes both the socialized farm and the individual small farm will exist. Which will predominate will depend, of course, on the result. If the socialized farm proves the most successful, both in giving better working conditions and larger returns to the workers, then the farmers will gradually adopt that, not through compulsion, but because they wish to do so. This is what we can see will be the final outcome of farming under Socialism.

How would Socialism benefit the farmer?

The farmer today must first buy the land. This means a big investment. Then he must buy machinery; then he must work hard himself; finally, he is at the mercy of the markets that are privately owned, and he pays a profit on what he sells and what he buys. Under Socialism the farmer would find a market where there was no profit exacted either way. This, in itself, would be a tremendous advantage to him. While the small private farmer would probably continue, if the cultivator wished to work with the government he would be able to farm without paying rent, or interest, and without an investment. As a result he would find employment under the very best of conditions and would receive his full social product. There is no man on earth who would be benefited more from the coming of Socialism than the farmer.

Has Socialism any definite plan for the distribution of land? Who would get the best land under collective ownership?

You seem to be much confused as to what collective ownership means. If all the land were to be collectively owned and held by the whole people, and did not go to individuals at all, of course, the whole people would get the best land. Socialism, however, does not say that the individual farmer may not operate the farm individually if he chooses to do so, provided he does not exploit another in order to do that. This would mean on
the one hand the small farm, and on the other the big farm. The method
proving the most successful, the most satisfactory, would probably gain
the ascendency though both might exist for many years together.

Suppose I have worked hard, bought a farm and improved it at a
cost of much labor. I am now sixty-seven years old and can't do any
more work. How am I going to make a living under Socialism? If my
land goes to the Socialists where will I get a house to live in?

You had to work in order to buy the land, which was wrong, as land
is something no one produces and all should have free access to the soil.
This does not mean that possession of land in actual use would not be
absolutely certain under Socialism. It merely means that those who hold
out land from use are depriving others of the right to live. Socialists
would provide pensions for disabled workers. If you do not believe this
investigate and you will find that in every country where Socialism is
even partly in power these old age pensions are already either proposed
or in force. Socialist Congressman Berger introduced such a pension bill
into the United States congress. This is not charity. The problem is
whether it would be better for the whole people to support the worn-out
worker or for him to make his living by exploiting one or two men. Cap-
italism says exploit the one or two. Socialism says place the burden on
the whole people. The burden would be equalized in the day of strength.
The worker would produce sufficient to provide for himself when he was
old.

How can co-operative farming be made a success under Socialism?
Will it not turn out something like co-operative housekeeping?

Co-operative farming is rapidly becoming a fact of the present day.
The private farmer is taking his cue from the public farm, from the state
agricultural college farms, which show that the co-operative work is after
all the best. It can be greatly improved on and will be. Now its work is
only a model. Later it will be recognized as the acme of scientific work.
Co-operative farming under Socialism will bear small resemblance to
partial co-operative housekeeping under capitalism.

Suppose in a given country there are 300,000 people and there is just
enough land to give each one ten acres. Then suppose another hundred
thousand moved to or were born in the island, what would become of them
under Socialism?

Land is something which cannot be materially increased. There are
only two alternatives when the country becomes crowded, either there
must develop a landed aristocracy and a system of landlordism, such as
has prevailed in almost every country on the earth, in which the masses
of the people, being without land, are made practically slaves or serfs;
or there must come socialization of land. Under socialization of land
that space now taken up with fences and many buildings will be saved
and labor will be conserved to the highest extent. Land will then be
cultivated scientifically and be made to produce anywhere from five to
ten times as much as it does now. In this way the earth will be able to
sustain well a population ten to fifteen times greater than it now has, and
it can do it in no other way. This is why ultimately socialization of land
will come. It will not be in our day, perhaps, because it will not be neces-
sary further than to break the monopoly which now prevails and afford
access to land for all. But when the country becomes highly developed
the people will go to it as the only solution of the problem of giving every-
body a home. It will not come because of agitation but because it will
be the most rational and satisfactory thing to do. We have been more
wasteful of land, the one thing that cannot be increased, than of any-
thing else in the world. More land in the United States is taken up
today by fences and forests than there is utilized in farming. More land
is devoted today to the raising of stock than there is to the raising of
produce for feeding men, when produce they would feed a cow or a hog
for a year would feed a human being. There will be changes in the future
as there have been in the past, because necessity will compel the changes.
The change that is imminent at present is not full socialization of land
but socialization of the machinery of production and distribution, and,
as the Socialist platform puts it, sufficient land to break the monopoly
and destroy landlordism.

I have a little farm that after much hard work is well equipped.
Would I have to give this up and start over under Socialism?

No. So long as you did not exploit another worker you might con-
tinue to farm in your own way. But to get that farm in shape you had
first to buy it and then to equip it with machinery, and lastly to pre-
pare it for use with almost infinite labor. Socialism will make it so the
man who owns nothing may get to the land without all this work. On
the farms that are socialized he may secure work, where he will get his
full social product, without having to buy the land, or the machinery
with which to farm the land. It is the only way in which the mass of
farm workers can ever have free access to land, for an opportunity to do
things for themselves.
IV. AS SOME THINGS MAY BE.

Will the present banking system exist under Socialism?

No. The present banking is private banking. Under Socialism banking will be a public affair. The government will pay out its own money, savings will be deposited with the government, and the present evils that are attached to the money system will be at an end.

Under Socialism, what would become of the small merchant like myself? Would I continue as now or would I run the business as an agent for the community?

The nation would sell all things at actual cost of production and distribution. If you could compete with this and conduct your little shop you would be privileged to do so under Socialism. If you could not you might get into the public service of distribution or if there weren't room there you could get into some form of productive work that would enable you to make more than you do now, yet not make it through profits or a tribute off the people, but by your own labor.

Would Socialists, if in power, uphold the liquor business? A man argued with me that when you came into power those that wanted saloons would have them.

The Socialist position is that the liquor traffic should be, like all other traffic, a public monopoly. This would mean that municipalities that wanted a saloon would have one established by the state where liquor would be sold at cost and where perfect order would be maintained by the elected officials in charge. The liquor traffic, as a money making business, operated by individuals, would be absolutely at an end under Socialism.

In the event of the Socialist party coming into power, how would they treat the holders of city and state bonds?

Bonds already out are a contract and they would have to be paid off. If Socialism came into operation the issuance of further bonds would become unnecessary, for the simple reason that Socialism would transact what is now known as productive business, besides having a monopoly of the issuance of money and banking, and, doing this, everything would pay its own way.

Would railroads be managed, under Socialism, as the postoffice is now run—by a political head in Washington?

No. Socialism provides not only for collective ownership of industries but also for democratic control. This would prevent the concentration of power in any individual or department.

How will the schools be conducted under Socialism?

Much as they are now. The schools are now socialized. The only
reason all may not enjoy them is because other things are not so fully socialized as to permit it. Of course, such methods will improve as people become more enlightened, but the general way in which the schools are conducted may be taken as a model for the management of other social business.

Of what will private property consist under Socialism and how can it be acquired?

Private property will consist of everything that the individual or family may want to use. To make it clear what should be public and what private, Socialism has often declared that those things which are socially used should be socially owned and those things which are privately used should be privately owned. With the big machinery now existing all manufactured articles are socially produced. The machinery, therefore, should be socially owned. The railroads are run not by individuals but by many working together. They should, therefore, be socially owned. Through the social operation you would become possessor of individual property just as you do now through working with a number of men in a factory, only the profit system would be entirely eliminated under Socialism and your returns would be much greater than now.
V. AS SOME PEOPLE MAY FARE.

As a railroad mail carrier is not a producer of wealth, in what way would his condition be improved under Socialism?

Who said a railroad mail carrier is not a producer? The mail service has become an absolute essential, not only for the convenience of the people, but also to facilitate exchange. In doing that work the mail clerk is a necessary factor in the production of both comforts and necessities. Production is never completed until distribution takes place.

How should an inventor be rewarded?

The invention should become the property of the whole people and the inventor be given a reward in accordance with the value of his idea to the people. The invention alone, without application of work, is valueless. Therefore, the workers themselves have a legitimate interest in it; but if a man proves he has something good he is entitled to a reward, which can easily be determined through agreement with the state. This is much better than the present plan, where the inventor often has to fight his way through poverty and is unable to get a hearing, and even when he does is often swindled out of all he should have.

Suppose, under Socialism, the government is using a certain machine; an inventor produces another machine that is so much better that he can, through the use of it, produce goods cheaper than the government and sell them at government prices, while at the same time making a profit. What is to prevent him continuing the profit system under these conditions?

The public interest and the right of eminent domain. The public interest is to take advantage of every opportunity for the good of all, and the right of eminent domain is such that even now private property can be taken over by the state on payment of an estimated fair remuneration. The new invention could be appropriated by the state under these conditions, the inventor receiving a remuneration that would be considered fair, and the whole people would benefit from the genius of the man and the labor of those who helped him to produce goods cheaper.

What will Socialism do for the negro?

Absolutely nothing. Socialism doesn’t do anything for anybody. It simply provides a means by which all may be able to do things for themselves. It will make it so the negro can control his own job just as it does for everybody else and so he may secure his full social product. It will provide conditions that would insure him a voice in the government and a voice in industry. If he chose to take advantage of these conditions he would fare as well as any white working man. If he did not choose to take advantage of them he would be in the same position with the idle and vicious white man—he would starve. A negro, under socialized conditions, could make $2,000 a year just as easily as a white man could.
What will become, under Socialism, of able bodied men who today force their wives to support them?

It is impossible to say what measures will be taken. The writer would favor forcing them to work for themselves. Even if this did not occur, the wife would be able to make a living much easier than she can now. The poor woman writing this question begs, "Print this without my name, for if my name were signed it would endanger my life by my husband." Don't you think the law ought to take hold of a brute of that kind and compel him to work, relieving the wife of the need of supporting him? The writer of this does.

What will prevent a man, under Socialism, from spending all his earnings and spare time in the saloons, gambling holes and red light districts, making him as poor a wretch as he is now?

At least you will admit he couldn't be worse than he is now. When he finds he can't bum his way through life, as he could not under Socialism, and that these gambling houses would be at an end and red lights almost extinguished, and saloons, as they are today, be banished, he would necessarily have to brace up. All these are products of capitalism just as much as a bum himself is. But why should you refuse the worker what rightfully belongs to him under the assumption that he will not spend it wisely?
VI. SOCIALIST ADJUSTMENTS.

I am now sixty years old and own ten houses, the purchase money of which I earned by the sweat of my own brow. I feel as if I deserved to rest the remainder of my life. What would become of me or my houses if Socialism prevailed?

Every change in society involves a change in ethics and in the way of making a living. Yet every change in the past meant greater opportunity than that which preceded it, and so Socialism in making changes will bring more opportunity to all. Before chattel slavery was destroyed there were no doubt men who had legitimately earned the money with which they had bought slaves. That, however, made no difference. Slavery ceased to be, and their slaves were freed. Under Socialism no man could live on rentals, just as no man can now live off the labor of a chattel slave. Nevertheless, Socialism purposes to give all opportunity to work at all times and retain the full value of their labor. As a result it will be quite possible for them to lay by sufficient to keep them in comfort and ease when they are old. Those who have grown old, like this friend, under the capitalist system, are deserving of support in the form of pensions from the public that they have served, but they are not deserving of making a living by exploiting individuals. Under Socialism their lot would be surer and better than it could possibly be from the rent of ten small houses. Yet no one would be exploited by them. You ask what would become of the houses. If they were satisfactory the public might take them for use, or they might be sold to individuals. If they were not considered satisfactory for people to live in, as many houses of the present will not be, then better houses would be built, because the workers could afford them, and these would simply be abandoned.

If there is to be no tariff under Socialism and no internal revenue collected, from what source will the government obtain its revenue?

Production under Socialism will be operated by and for the people. The returns of this industry, instead of going into private hands, will pay all running expenses and upkeep of machinery. It is possible, also, to make it pay for the expenses of political administration. If there is any tax required you may be sure that under Socialism it will be levied directly.

I have heard that there are various kinds of Socialists. Is it true?

There are individuals with various likings and viewpoints, but there is only one kind of Socialist. One man may view the Socialist ideal from a purely materialistic standpoint. Another can see in the same thing a fulfillment of his religious aspirations. A third would approach the ideal by short steps. A fourth will countenance nothing but the final outcome. For this reason some are called Utopian, some Fabian, some Marxian and some Christian. But all are seeking precisely the same thing—that is, the overthrow of the profit system through collective ownership and demo-
cratic control of industry. Capitalists have an idea of government ownership with this final thing left out, which they call "state Socialism." It is rather, however, state capitalism.

*What kind of money will be used under Socialism, or will any be necessary?*

Some kind of a medium of exchange will be necessary. Some think this should be based entirely on labor performed and hence should consist of labor checks. The one thing that must necessarily follow is that money and banking under Socialism will be government monopolies. It does not apparently matter much what kind of money is used so this fact prevails. Banking being a government monopoly, all private savings will be deposited with the government which has already begun to work in the postal savings banks. Money so deposited will be immediately available for the conduct of public business, so that the question of paying for and conducting business will solve itself.

*What is the Socialist attitude relative to the tariff?*

Socialism would abolish tariffs. Whatever revenue it may be necessary to raise under Socialism will be gathered through direct taxation and not through insidious methods that admit of tremendous private exploitation. The protection given the worker through the ownership of industry would assure him a job and his full social product would be a thousand-fold greater protection than anything that could come to him through a continuation of the tariff.

*What is the attitude of Socialism toward labor unions?*

Marx declared that a movement is worth more than a program. For this reason Socialism works with the trade union and farmers' union movement. We recognize that unions, so long as they merely ask for better conditions or greater wages or better markets, can never bring the full solution of the problem. But the thing is, unions are in the fight and must go on until the full social product is obtained. Other parties declare that they are friends of workingmen; Socialists are working people. Other parties "favor" unions; Socialists are members of unions and actively participate in strikes and agitation, both as individuals and as a party.
VII. SOME MISAPPREHENSIONS.

How many industrial classes are there? From my point of view, there are four—farmers, laborers, professionals, and middlemen.

Socialists hold there are but two classes—the exploiters and the exploited. The working class is always the exploited and includes the farmers, the wage earners and in a limited sense the professionals and middlemen. The exploiters are the capitalist class, those who are enabled to live off of rent, interest, and profit, which is necessarily at the expense of other people.

Do Socialists wish to force the colony idea on the people, and how far do they wish to enforce the public ownership proposition?

The colony idea is not Socialism in any sense. Collective ownership is desired of the means of production and distribution, and that only so all people may be afforded access to the means of life and an opportunity to make and retain private property.

What is meant by full social value? I am a shoemaker and can make two pairs a day. What is the full social value of my product? My brother is a barber. What is the full social value of his labor?

The full social value is the full value of the product of the individual worker. By this is meant that whatever the market value of your shoes may be you would get social credit for that and be able to exchange it for anything else you might wish. Whatever the market value of a shave would be, your brother would get in full accord with the product. Supply and demand would necessarily regulate the value of things under Socialism, much as they do now. Herein is the difference: instead of you making shoes and permitting half a dozen others to make a profit from it, you would get the entire retail value less the actual expense of marketing them.

Will Socialists have need of commerce, or will they destroy the railroads and ocean vessels?

The Socialist movement has come because machinery has developed to the point where people no longer live by communities. Commerce is one of the things that has brought the Socialist movement. So far from destroying machines, Socialism will provide for their increase and use in such a way as to benefit all. It is because Socialism has to do with the enlarged social life that it is impossible to confine it to a country, a state or a nation. It is world wide. It is bringing harmony into social relations in such a way as to accomplish the real brotherhood of man.

Under Socialism, what would be done with the property a man might leave?

It would probably descend to his heirs just as today. But you must remember what is known as income property would be at an end under Socialism. Therefore the piling up of fortunes would be at an end.
What is the difference between state Socialism and the Socialism you advocate? Does government ownership constitute state Socialism? If a municipality owns a public utility, such as waterworks or street railway, what change would be necessary to make them thoroughly socialistic?

Public ownership without an end of the capitalist-profit system constitutes state Socialism; it lacks democratic management in order to make it the proposition of the Socialist. Under such conditions, supplies are necessarily bought at a profit and employment rests with the managers, so that bossism, favoritism, and graft are possible. Socialists propose, not only collective ownership of all the means of production and distribution, but also democratic management of it. When all these things are collectively owned, then it will naturally follow that profit will cease; and with the ceasing of the profit system, there will be savings that are not possible now. Democratic control, leaving the selection of managers and foremen to the workers actually doing the work, with power lodged in the same workers to immediately recall their managers and foremen, will obviate graft and the concentration of power into few hands. The chief objection now urged against Socialism—that it would concentrate power and make the people merely hired hands of the political bosses—can apply justly to state Socialism, but falls to the ground before the proposition for democratic control of things at all times. Now public utilities are managed largely by a political organization. Under Socialism proper, the great organization of society will be industrial rather than political.

How is it possible to give the people articles at the cost of production when they will have to be delivered—often far from where they are produced?

The cost of production includes delivery. Nothing is really productive until it is where it can be used. The machinery of distribution must be socially owned as well as the machinery that merely makes.

What answer can be given to the argument that a man who has become a multi-millionaire by economy and hard work is entitled to his wealth?

That there is no man who has become a multi-millionaire in that way. No man can produce value to the excess of at most $15 a day, and no one can become a millionaire on an income of that kind. The hard work that produces millionaires is the hard work of exploiting others and is on a line with the hard work of driving slaves or of robbing stages.
VIII. SOME SOCIALIST PROBLEMS.

How could Socialism acquire the industries, which would cost hundreds of millions of dollars?

They could either be bought, confiscated or competed out of existence through new industries, using still better machinery, operating at cost. If purchased, the money which now goes for profits would in less than ten years pay for every industry. This money, if Socialism does not come, will be a dead loss to the people, whereas if used in the way suggested it would give them the means of becoming eternally rich.

How much money will be required to pay for all the railroads, factories, mines, etc.?

The purchase of these things, if made, will not necessarily require any money. Morgan did not require money when he merged the various big mills into the steel trust. He merely issued stocks against them. More than that, he issued stocks and bonds above the cost so that he made literally millions out of the transaction.

Why do not Socialists start industries and force capitalists out of business?

If it were possible for the workers to get enough capital to build factories such as would compete the trusts out of business, when they got through with it they would simply have another trust and would be run by capitalists themselves. The only remedy is to end the system.

Could the people compete the private railroads out of business?

Yes. If new roads are built by the whole people and operated at cost, the privately owned roads would have to make a profit or go out of business. Failing to meet the new need they would soon be bankrupt.

You oppose rent. When you go into a new place shall you camp out until you can build or buy a house, or shall you hire space from a comrade or should a comrade give you a place, or shall you go to a hotel?

Under Socialism a stranger in a city would find lodging places at public hotels, which would be made as attractive as possible. While there would be individual homes the municipality would also in all probabilities provide homes for transients. These would be given to them at the cost of maintaining them.

What will Socialists do with the national debt?

That is not for us to say. It is for the whole people to say, because Socialism is not our idea but their idea. The profits now collected from the industries, if used for that purpose, would pay the national debt within a year. How can it be paid as easily under capitalism?
IX. THE REBELLIOUS MASTERS.

If Socialism were in control what measures would be necessary to curb the big trusts which now control the necessities of life?

The government taking possession of the markets and selling goods at cost of production and distribution would break this up in no time, simply because they could not compete with it. It would not be necessary for the government to take away from them anything which they really have. They have a monopoly of selling because they have made it so that others cannot compete with them. If a stronger competitor—namely, the government—enters the field there will be nothing left to them because they had nothing at the start except power. Whether the government would finally take their plants or not would depend on circumstances. They probably would be only too eager to dispose of their plants at nominal prices.

If Socialism should come into power by a good majority would it be possible to overcome the capitalists' resistance without a panic or bloodshed?

Sure. If Socialism came into power by a good majority, not only the army and navy, but also the courts, would be in its hands, instead of in the hands of the capitalists. This would make the capitalists who tried to do anything against it traitors or rebels. If they endeavored to bring a panic the machinery of production and distribution could, under such conditions, be seized by the government and the panic very easily averted.

In case Socialists should come into power nationally, how would they take care of unemployment during the time of panic which is sure to follow on account of the employing class closing down the mills and factories and withdrawing its money from public use?

One cannot say directly what would be done. I can only say what might be done. The mills and factories that were closed down might be seized by the government under the plea of emergency and set to work. If they could not find employment in the mills and factories there would be plenty to do in draining swamps, dredging rivers, making roads and irrigating land. The resources of the nation could be utilized to do this work as they are being used today to dig the Panama canal.

Under Socialist rule, man is to have the full product of his labor. If Brandeis could save the railroad $1,000,000 a day, would he, under Socialism, be paid $1,000,000 a day?

Brandeis or no other man can save his employer, whether it be the government or some corporation, a million dollars a day. His ideas, without an army of workers to carry them out, would be entirely valueless. That million dollars a day which might be saved through the application of this man's ideas by other men would either go to all the employees who carried them out, including Brandeis, the originator, or else to society as a whole in increased returns.
APPEAL ANSWERS.

X. NICE ADJUSTMENTS UNDER SOCIALISM.

Would private ownership be permitted under Socialism? If so, how would a man be able to make anything if he had to compete with public control and pay his workers their full social product?

There would be no law required to keep men from engaging in private enterprises under Socialism. Some such enterprises, such as painting pictures, writing books and other things where the same size work may have various values, would probably succeed under Socialism. But the ordinary business of private nature would be ruled out from the fact that it could not compete with public enterprises paying a full social value of the product. In other words, the greatest efficiency of the new public method would make obsolete the inefficient private method.

If I should raise wheat on my own ground and market it myself, would the profits go to the general public or to me?

The proceeds would go to you. They would not be profits. If, in the raising of wheat, you were to employ somebody to aid you and not pay him all he produced, that would be profits. But since the worker could get all he produced elsewhere this would be out of the question.

Does Socialism provide for laying by for a rainy day?

It does. However, the laying by consists in the acquiring of collectively owned property which will be a provision that will give all persons security against unemployment and want. It is therefore the most effective provision against possible disaster that can be made. Individual laying by will always leave many unprovided for, while if practiced under capitalism by all it would completely destroy business and lead to the very disaster which it seeks to avoid. The commonwealth is the best bulwark for all, just as the common protection of the government is better than the arming of the individual to protect himself.

If all started even in wealth, would not inequalities soon appear?

Yes, providing the capitalist system remained in force. But Socialism does not propose an equal division of wealth. It proposes rather, socialized wealth, which is never dissipated. Public roads are not lost to the individual—neither are the public schools or anything else that is socialized.

Since the income of even $20 would not permit people under Socialism to pay $25,000 for a painting or $500 for a dress, would not business suffer because of lack of those who squander money?

Squandering money is merely dissipating the loot of those who have robbed the workers. If the wealth remained with the workers they could buy more than they do now. Pictures that are of real value ought to be owned by the whole people so that they could be seen not by a few, but by all.
Will one be permitted to save something for old age or a rainy day when Socialism comes into power?

If he chooses to do so he may. Under Socialism there will be no lack of a job for anyone who wishes work, and the children will be provided for while the old and decrepit will have pensions. There will be little need to lay by for old age. One may lay by if he chooses, but the commonwealth would make unnecessary the hoarding of private wealth.

What measures will be necessary to stop speculation and profit?

Nothing but the establishment of a more efficient system. Whenever industry is managed without profit it will be impossible to go back to the profit system just as it is impossible to restore as a system lighting of candles. Speculation is something that comes of haphazard work. Scientific adjustment ends it.

How would the nation protect itself under Socialism in case it were attacked by a foreign power that was hostile to the new government?

Its citizens would rally to its support, and a citizen-soldiery that has some property to protect is the best defense in the world. However, when Socialism comes to one country it will speedily be adopted by other countries and the idea of war will pass away.
XI. VERY SIMPLE SOLUTIONS.

How are you going to make tramps, drunkards and lazy people in general do their share of work under Socialism?

First, we are going to provide such an organization of industry as will enable every able bodied person to work if he wishes. Then we will apply the Pauline maxim, "If a man will not work, neither shall he eat." This will bring him to time. If a man is incapacitated for work it will be taken for granted that society owes him support—not as a matter of charity, but because of his condition and because he is a human being. Under capitalism it is impossible to provide work for all while the masters are able to avoid working. There are in America today 5,000,000 able-bodied people who do not work and as many more who do work that is of no real benefit to the people.

Public officials graft today. Why would they not graft under Socialism? Would Socialism change their natures?

Public officials graft today, first, because they can get away with it and, secondly, because it is often the only means by which they can get adequate returns. Under Socialism these same men would not graft because it would be easier to discover their peculations and to correct them and then they would gain nothing by grafting. Without the graft their future would be assured; with the graft they would merely be in danger of punishment.

Could not government employes adulterate the goods they make under Socialism and thus enrich themselves?

They could not, for the reason that the goods would be sold at cost and books audited by other public servants. This would prevent making anything out of adulteration. The only thing that causes adulteration now is the fact that profit can be made from it. When goods are made for use and not for sale they will be well made, because the ones who make them will also want to use them.

Would it not be possible for people, who more cunning than others, to deceive them in trade and so again reduce them to practical slavery?

Possibly the cunning might in some individual trades beat others, but these could not beat the system from the fact that public markets could make prices which prices with profit attached could not be possible.

Will all men—even the common laborer—be able to enjoy the luxuries of life under Socialism?

All men will be able to afford the luxuries of life. It requires certain aesthetic development to be able to enjoy some things—such as music and art. All will gradually learn how to appreciate these things, because when all men use them the general taste will be tremendously developed.
XII. SOCIALISM AND WOMEN.

How will the overworked wife be benefited by Socialism, especially if she is in poor health and is not permitted to hire help?

Socialism may consider the keeping of a house a service to society and give the wife pay in her own name for performing the service. If it does not do this, the income of the male worker will be sufficient to supply the wife with all the conveniences which Socialism will develop. Only within the last few years has the kitchen received any attention from inventors. The time is here even now when keeping of the house will not involve slavery, providing the best modern methods are employed. Socialism will make the best methods available, while girls will be taught in the schools how to do the necessary housework without becoming slaves.

How can you make the burdens equal between a single man and a married man who has many children, both working and receiving the same remuneration?

Already the way is pointed out by things that are being done. In some places the student at school is furnished a noon-day luncheon free. In other places he is given free dental and medical service. These aids to childhood might be extended so as to make the burden more equal to the burden of the single man. Besides, it might be considered that the woman keeping the house and raising a family was performing a public service which would entitle her to a remuneration equal to that of her husband. If so, this would nearly equalize the income compared with the number affected.
XIII. INSURANCE AND PENSIONS.

Is it consistent with principles of Socialism for a Socialist to carry life insurance for the protection of his family after his death?

We are still living under capitalism. While we do not believe in the profit system, the Socialist is not to be blamed if he takes profits now, nor if he takes rent, nor if he asks interest. In the same way a Socialist is entirely justified in carrying life insurance so long as things are so insecure as they are under the capitalist system. Indeed, it is a part of wisdom for him to do so. When Socialism comes it will be unnecessary, but now it is practically a necessity.

Will there be fire and life insurance companies under Socialism?

No. The government, acting for the people, will take care of fire losses. It may furnish fire protection to owners of private houses at actual cost. The guarantees of opportunity and full social product which Socialism will make will answer every purpose of life insurance and that without dues or assessments.

What will be done for the old soldiers under Socialism?

Nine-tenths of the old soldiers either are or have been workers. They would be entitled, when disabled, to good living pensions as workers, not as fighters. Socialists everywhere favor old age and disability pensions.
XIV. WHEN PEOPLE REALLY RULE.

Do Socialists favor the initiative, referendum and recall?

They do. These things are in the line of enlarged democracy and Socialists favor complete democracy, even in industries. Socialists practice the initiative and referendum in party management and even where recall does not prevail under the law, require all candidates to sign a resignation in blank so that in case they do not meet the approval of their constituents they may be recalled through the presentation of this resignation.

In talking to a friend a few days ago I stated that Socialism would install complete democracy. My opponent said that such a thing was impossible as this nation was a republic to begin with, therefore the republican party was the one that should be in power. Please explain, in language easily understood, the relation complete democracy would have to this nation as a republic.

It is true this nation is a republic. There is, however, a demand, extending far beyond the Socialist party, for an increase of democracy. Woman suffrage means that. The initiative and referendum means an extension of democracy. The right of recall is another extension of democracy. The election of senators by direct vote of the people, or better yet, the idea of abolishing the senate, is an extension of democracy. There are changes coming in this government almost imperceptibly without destroying the government yet making it most subservient to the will of the people. It was the arrogance of the republican party refusing to yield to what the people wanted which resulted in its complete repudiation by the people. The idea that a few representatives must control all is an exploded one. The world is going from that into the idea that the people must rule themselves. Socialism would go beyond any of these in affording not only democracy in politics but democracy in industry where now a few control industry for their own benefit.

It is my understanding that anyone employed in government service and dismissed for cause cannot re-enter any government service again. Would such a plan be operated under Socialism, and if so would it not deprive many of the right to live?

Such an order can come only from the assumption that the government is superior to the people. Under industrial democracy, which Socialists propose, the opposite would be true. A man, being part owner of the industries, and having a voice in their management, would have an inalienable right to a job. If he did not do his full duty he would simply lose in the returns, because Socialism would assure to every man what he made and nothing more.
Could not congress under Socialism enact vicious laws that would injure the people?

Possibly. But under Socialism the people could quickly recall these laws and also the men who made them. This would produce a feeling of responsibility on the part of congress which would keep it from going contrary to the will of the people.

How will Socialism keep power in the hands of the people?

It will merely put the power in their hands and depend on them to keep it. As they learn what it means to them they will keep economic power far more easily than they now keep political power.
XV. THE SOCIALIST ORGANIZATION.

How can we organize a Socialist local?

The best way is to write to the state secretary of your state asking him for blanks and a charter. It often happens that an organizer is near enough so that he can send one around to assist you. If not, he will send you instructions that will enable you to do the work yourself. If your state is not organized or if you do not know the name of your state secretary, write to the National Office—111 North Market street, Chicago—and it will give you instructions. If you are living where you cannot organize, because of not having a sufficient number of Socialists (it requires five or more to organize a local), write to either the state or national secretary, and become a member at large. In most states the dues are 25 cents a month. Five cents of this goes to the National Office, five cents to the state office and the remainder is kept at home to pay local expenses. Only dues-paying members of the party are eligible to nomination to office.

Is it true that the Socialist party holds secret meetings and has its grips and passwords?

Every meeting of the local is open to all who may wish to attend. There is nothing discussed but that may be heard by any outsider. There are no grips or secret work of any kind. It is simply a political organization seeking working class control, open and above board.
The A, B, C of Socialism

Anarchy is a capitalist condition, not a theory of impossibilists.

Ballot or bullet, bread or blood. Socialism merely shows the safe and easy way out of the horrors of the system.

Capitalism must have an army of unemployed in order to enable it to keep prices of labor down and insure its profits.

Desire is the dream of people half awake. It is succeeded by the vision of the Co-operative Commonwealth when the toiler awakes, and after that will come freedom and plenty for all.

Experience teaches that when people once grasp the idea of further liberty all denunciation and all suppression will not keep them from attaining it. It will be so relative to Socialism.

Fear of want is torment, driving the man racked with it to any crime. Fear of want is something that is inseparable from a system of exploitation, no difference how well fixed one may be.

Goodness does not consist in a mere sentiment, but in an understanding of what is wrong and a vigorous effort to correct that wrong. Goodness is not and cannot be entirely personal; it must be social as well.

Heaven and home may be a great conception; but he who lives in a hovel when he by his labor deserves more can have but a poor conception of a home, and he who rents a shack on earth can conceive of little better in Heaven.

Ignorance is the beginning and the end of evil. It blinds one eye with prejudice and the other with narrow views. It, however, is the only total blindness that can certainly be cured; and every man may cure his own.

Justice has been the dream of the ages. Men have combined in order to give it power, only to find that the power was used to defeat justice. They say justice is blind; but she can smell gold a mile away.

Kings rule by divine right just as much as capitalists do. Kings are entitled to their tribute just as much as the landlord and machine lord are entitled to theirs. Kings have as much right to transmit their crowns to others as capitalists have to transmit their fortunes to others.

Liberty has always been sought by gaining power so it might be given; but the gaining of power over other means their enslavement. It
can come only when we want it so much that we will refuse to enslave, when we are so true to truth we shall require it in ourselves.

Mankind has sought good by taking it from others and leaving them without good; but they found that when any were miserable they, too, must be miserable; that when any lacked, they might sometimes lack themselves. Good can come only through mutualism, and then it must be for all.

No man's thought is great enough to be your only thought; yet every man's thought belongs to you if you will take it.

Out of the past there came two voices, the shout of victory and the groan of the vanquished. Yet in every age the eye of faith has turned to the stars above this and expected better.

Poverty is not without cause. If it has a cause it can be cured, so soon as that cause is removed. They who claim it is eternal blame the Almighty with the injustice and misery of it.

Questions ask themselves or they are of no importance. They who seek issues have not discovered what the issue is and cannot do so. The question of Socialism would ask itself anew if all the Socialists were killed in one day.

Religion is not helped any by the misery of the people. Like all the flowers of creation, it will flourish better in the sun than in the night of ignorance and poverty and physical sorrow. Socialism will free it as it will free all things else.

Socialism, after all, is not so much of an ism or philosophy as it is a living thing. It is the breathing of the world of workers after better conditions. It must be interpreted according to the quivering heart of things and not according to theory.

The want of the world is father of human wants that ask for better things. The poor has endeavored to supply their wants and the rich have taken what the poor created; while with everything the poor produced and lost the feeling of want increased until now it is so strong it cannot be suppressed.

United effort is what produced the family, the church and the state. It is the power behind Socialism. The union of the workers in universal co-operation is the only possible union of men. It cannot be in opinion, but it can be in labors and helpfulness.

Victor and victims. Master and slaves. Superabundance and penury. This has been the order of human life. Man, the greatest creature, has from his very greatness of desire and power made the most stupendous failure, the most unendurable misery of any that is. He must rise above himself until he shall have reached his true and full altitude.
Whatever we may have thought about it, there can be no wealth except commonwealth. All you may individually acquire or save is but spoil and will not protect you from spoilation or misfortune. No man is rich or can be rich until all who live are enriched through possession of what they create even as they are wise through possession of what wisdom of the ages has accumulated.

Xerxes whipped the Hellespont, yet the storm did not cease. Canute commanded the tide to stand still, but it crept steadily on. Mohammed called for the mountain to come to him, but it did not move. They who today imagine they can stay the rising aspiration of the people are one with the olden fools.

You can not be happy while others are miserable. You cannot do your best while others are kept from doing the good they dream. You cannot be safe so long as any one is oppressed. Only through lifting the whole world can you be uplifted to the plane that humanity rightly should occupy.

"Zeal shall do this," says scripture. It is the earnest man and woman who accomplishes things. It is the united zeal of the nations that sweeps away ancient tyranny and brings conditions of plenty, peace and happiness to all. Where has there been such zeal as that shown by the Socialists of the world?
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"THE THIEVES' BOOK." Most startling facts ever collected, compiled from official sources. Shows that the property of the people was deliberately stolen from them in order to create a master class, and that the profit system came in because of the theft, not as a part of it.