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What is Socialism?

Socialism is a word having several more or less distinct but closely related meanings. It is used as the common name of a certain interpretation of history, a working-class philosophy, an economic science, a political movement and an ideal society. The socialist interpretation of history regards all history as fundamentally a series of class struggles between a wealth-owning ruling class on the one hand, and a subject working class on the other. The socialist philosophy is based upon the class antagonisms and consequent social divisions arising therefrom; and postulates the ultimate abolition of classes through the establishment of socialized industry democratically controlled. Socialist science analyzes the present capitalistic system of production, showing that human labor is the source and measure of value. As a political movement Socialism organizes the producers into a class-conscious political party to capture the political power as a means of realizing its ideal. Its ideal is a commonwealth based upon a socialized industrial system.

How do Socialists propose to capture political power and establish their Co-operative Commonwealth?

That is a question which requires time and space to answer, and patient study to fully comprehend. It is the purpose of this booklet to answer that question to the extent that its size and the ability of the writer will permit.

Do not practically all people work?

It may be so; but while part of the people work to produce those things needed to sustain life and make it worthwhile, another part of the people merely work
the worker. With reference to the means and methods by which they get a living the whole people consist mainly of two classes: the working class, who have little or no wealth and are therefore compelled by necessity to sell their labor power for a wage, and the capitalist class who own the means of production (that is, the land, factories, mines, etc.) and through such ownership obtain wealth produced by the real workers.

Do you mean to state that there are classes in free America?

I mean to assert that the classes herein referred to have existed from the time of primitive communism to the present day. In all nations and at all times they have appeared in a continuous class struggle, though they have not always been known as capitalists and wage workers. The classes have confronted each other as masters and slaves, patricians and plebeians, feudal lords and serfs, etc., according to the industrial development of the epoch considered. In effect, the man who works for wages in this boasted land of freedom is just as much a slave to the employing class as were the chattel slaves of olden times to the master class of their day.

But is not the word "slave" too harsh a term to apply to free laborers?

That depends upon whether you wish to be precise, or whether you prefer to patch fig leaves for the naked truth. The average chattel slave was compelled by the lash of his overseer to labor continuously for his owner, for which he received enough of the value his labor produced to keep him alive and in working order. The average wage worker is compelled by necessity to find an employing master who will permit him to work; and, when such a master is found, is compelled by the same necessity to serve him continuously and receive at his hands a wage amounting to only enough of his own product to keep him alive and in condition to labor. It is a harsh condition, which nothing but a harsh term can correctly designate. The so-called freedom of wage workers is more imaginary
than 'real, for the freedom to work or starve, and to starve unless you can find an employer, is not so glorious a thing as freedom is popularly supposed to be.

What is the program of the Socialist movement?

The **ultimate program** of the movement is for the members of the working class to organize themselves into a political party and by majority vote capture the political power which has hitherto been the exclusive possession of the master class; then to establish a system of industry in which all who wish to work may do so without dividing the proceeds of their industry and giving part of it to an owner of the land or machines. Private ownership of the means of production must be abolished and collective ownership established so that the workers may own their jobs and not be under the necessity of working for an employer on the employer's terms. The **immediate program** of the movement is to secure every advantage for the workers and force every concession from the capitalists that can be done without compromising the ultimate program.

By what means and methods do you expect to get hold of the land and machinery of production?

By much the same means as the republicans got hold of the negroes when they wished to change them from slaves to citizens. It may be that the workers will prefer to pay something for such property, just as there was a sentiment favorable to the purchase of the chattel slaves before the war; but whether this is done must depend upon circumstances and the attitude of the two classes when the majority declare in favor of the change. When a majority decide that wage slavery shall be no more, the way they go about its abolition must depend upon the manner in which their demands are met by the opposition. If the capitalists refuse to abide by the expressed will of the majority, it will become necessary to discipline them and teach them how to respect majority rule.
But wouldn't this work a great hardship to the owners of property?

It is always a hardship for the innocent purchaser to give up stolen goods to the rightful owner, but it must be remembered that this plan which we propose would give the former owners the same right to the use of the property as anyone else would have. It should also be noted that no individual can show a valid title to a square foot of land. Trace every title back to the first records and you will find that the first owner simply took the land and appropriated it to his own use. It is a more reasonable proposition and easier to prove that the earth exists for the use of the whole human family than to establish the right of any individual to it or any part of it. All other property was created by labor, and when the laborers of this or the next generation demand the right to use it they are only claiming the inheritance of their class, which was made by other generations of workers and dishonestly appropriated by those who have used it only to enslave the industrious.

But are not many of the owners of the property industrious, and have they not done more or less of the necessary work toward the making or development of this property?

It is no doubt true that many of the present owners of such property have contributed to its production, and to the extent they have they are entitled to remuneration. But, in this connection, it should be noted that the men who now own the most can scarcely be credited with any of the necessary labor that has made the wealth. How many oil wells has Mr. Rockefeller drilled? How many gallons of oil has he refined or delivered to consumers? All forms of wealth are going rapidly into the hands of such men, whose work, however strenuous it may have been, has always been principally directed toward getting hold of property rather than toward creating it. And at all times in the process of capitalist accumulation the many have been dispossessed in order that the few might have. Property is being confiscated continuously by the few. The
plan proposed is that the machinery of confiscation be reversed and that the property held by the few confiscators be restored to the many.

But there is only one Rockefeller, while there are thousands of small property holders. Would you treat the small capitalist the same as you would the worst examples of greed?

There is only one Rockefeller, but there are others like him—Hill, Morgan and their partners, for instance. These big capitalists are at present busily engaged in solving the problem you propose by taking from the smaller capitalists and piling up the property in fewer hands. The ownership of homes may be taken as an index to the distribution of property; and when the latest census report shows that over half of the sixteen millions of families in this country live in rented homes it shows that more than half of those families are practically propertyless, and, therefore, ready for Socialism when they understand it.

Is there not some less radical means by which the rapacity of the trusts and the excessively rich can be checked?

The populists and radical democrats have been vainly striving to do the thing you suggest, but cannot so much as get into political power. Every effort for the reform of the present system has only resulted in the real rulers getting a stronger hold on their power and privileges. Reformers are like physicians who salve a pimple and treat an effect when the only remedy lies in the revolutionary treatment of purifying the blood. Middle-class reformers are trying to patch up the system and perpetuate it in a slightly altered form. They ignore the scientific fact that society moves forward in harmony with the laws of evolution, and will not turn back. The trusts are a good thing—that is, for the people who are on the inside. Socialism would put all on the inside by the formation of the Co-operative Commonwealth, which would own all the trusts and be owned by all the people.

But if all those who feel the need of a change would only lay aside their petty differences and get together could they not
get what they need a little at a time and without the danger, which your plan threatens?

They have not made much progress in that direction—that is, either in getting together or in getting results! To get a little relief from the exactions of the ruling class means that the various strata of the middle class would have to unite with the propertyless workers to effect reforms that could benefit none but the property owners. Nothing will do the proletariat (the propertyless workers) any permanent good but the full program of Socialism. For that reason the proletarians will come in increasing numbers to Socialism and will be satisfied with nothing less. The middle class will likely flounder around like a fish out of water until disgusted with the futile efforts of such as Bryan and Hearst; but when they are separated from their money by the big capitalists they will join with the working class in the increasing demand for Socialism. When a man has nothing to lose but the chains of wage slavery he has no fear of the social revolution. Property makes men timid, but when the big capitalists relieve them of their property they will lose their timidity and become willing to stand and to strike for their rights.

What do you mean by saying that property makes men timid? Is not a man with money in his pocket more courageous than one who is penniless?

To the extent that his property assures him food and comfort it makes him courageous, but in excess of that it makes him an arrant coward. As old Shylock told the merchant: There are land rats and water rats, land thieves and water thieves, who are ever threatening property. The water rats may send Antonio's ships to the bottom or the land rats may cheat him out of the cargo. There is a never-ending struggle to retain, protect and add to large possessions that makes their owners deaf to every consideration but property considerations. The means resorted to to get property are never so desperate as those resorted to to protect and retain it. The man without property may commit crime to get it, and it is expected that he will rather
than starve; but the big crimes, and the cowardly crimes, are committed for the purpose, or in the hope, of keeping loot already acquired by one means or another. The owner has little thought for other than what he owns. He watches it and guards it and fears the things that threaten it more than the things that threaten his life. It has been drilled into him by the operation of the capitalist system, which honors and esteems a man not because of what he is but because of what he has.

Is not the plan you propose of one class taking the means of production from another, only robbing Peter to pay Paul? Why should one class be despoiled for the benefit of the other?

We propose to expropriate the few capitalists because the many workers need the property which the capitalists have taken from them. It is merely a restitution of stolen goods; though it was, in most instances, acquired through legal means, the laws were made by the expropriators for their own benefit. What we propose to do is to put the working class in power, which is easy since they outnumber their masters, and turn the tables on those who have heretofore had things their own way.

But if the owners got the property in a regular and legitimate way would it not be better to pay them for it?

The slaveholders at the time of the civil war in this country had become possessed of their slaves in a regular and legitimate way, but the right of one man to own another in time became a wrong in the estimation of the most numerous and powerful part of the people. And when the people once learn the cunning game that has been so systematically played upon them for centuries, and by which the products of their labor have been filched from them even before coming into their possession, the probability is that they will refuse to recognize the ownership of property by any man to be used by him as a means of exploiting labor.

But don't the capitalists use the mines and factories when they start them up and give the workers employment?

Yes, they use them; but use them by proxy. They
use them by hiring others to use them, and take care that they keep back a portion of what each of these hirelings produces. Each wage worker necessarily labors part of each working day to produce the equivalent of his wages. But he does not stop at this. If he did no more than produce the equivalent of his wages there would be nothing for his employer. He must, therefore, perform a greater or less amount of work for which he gets no pay, and it is this unpaid work which makes his employer wealthy and keeps him in a propertyless condition. It would be more nearly exact to say that the capitalists use the workers, and the workingman who once understands this naturally objects to being used like a slave or a draft horse.

But don't the machines do much of this work which you credit to human workers?

Yes; but it was the workers, not the capitalists, who made the machines. A capitalist may be insistent on the theory that his machines make much of his wealth, but he is as reluctant to pay the machines more than the oil and repairs required to keep them in running order as he is to pay the workers more than the equivalent of what is required to keep them in running or working order. Machines are themselves the result of labor previously performed; and, economically considered, amount only to an accumulation of value which they give up and transfer to their products as they wear out. Whatever help machinery may render in the making of things should be credited to labor, which made the machines as well as all other commodities.

Why do you Socialists always talk and write about wage-workers to the exclusion of other workers? Are there not productive laborers who do not work for wages?

There are many productive laborers who do not work for wages, but the wage workers are the more numerous and are typical of the system which we are trying to overthrow. The twelfth census shows that of 29,287,070 persons above the age of 10 that were engaged in various occupations, there were only 1,264,536
in the professions, 10,438,219 in agriculture and 17,584,315 in domestic and personal service, trade and transportation and manufacturing and mechanical pursuits. From this it is plain that there are decidedly more laborers working for wages than there are working for themselves. We talk about wage workers because they are the kind of workers that are peculiar to the system and distinguish it from previous systems. All who resort to labor as a means of getting part or all of their subsistence are subjected to the exploitation of the ruling class, and are fleeced of their surplus product though not in exactly the same way.

Does this plan you advocate not amount to taking the property of the industrious and dividing it up among the improvident and shiftless?

On the contrary, it amounts to putting all the property that is collectively used together, so all could benefit by its use. Those who now own it could then use it on the same terms as others. They would not be robbed of the benefits that such property can properly give, but they would no longer be able to use it as a means of dividing the wealth which laborers make and taking part of it to themselves. The "dividing-up" process is going on now, and it is the business of Socialists to put an end to it and see that each actual producer gets the full equivalent of what his labor brings forth. The old story about the Socialists dividing up is a joke so stale as to be thought of only by the most ignorant.

But what incentive would there be for people to do things and get ahead in the world?

The same incentive that has always moved people to get what they need or think they need. But the incentive would be greater were each laborer to get all of his product instead of having to give part of it to an owner of the things with which he must work. It would certainly be more encouraging to a worker to get all he could produce than it is to work for a miserly wage that merely keeps him alive when he has a job
and leaves him to starve in times of industrial panic, when no one will so much as give him wages. The doctrine that he gets from the employer and nothing from the State.

But would Socialism rob the rich?

That depends upon whether a robber can be robbed by the people he has previously robbed. If a man steals your coat and you catch him with the coat on his back, would it be robbery for you to take the coat away from him? This talk of those who have produced all wealth robbing those who have produced nothing is mere juggling of words. It is true that the many for ages consented to this smooth pocket-picking, but is that a good or valid reason for their submitting to it for all time to come? There is a time when patience ceases to be a virtue, and the limit has been about reached when idle men tramp the streets of cities in search of work denied them and babies die of hunger while the rich clothe pet dogs and cats in jewelled apparel. Workers, men who have the least courage and the ability to use their brains are getting tired of being plundered, and are showing the proper spirit when they demand the return of enough of the loot so they can work for themselves.

But why not such ideas as weld class hatred and pit the worker and capitalist at war with each other?

The war between the worker and the various parasites that have fattened at his expense has been waged for centuries. The worker, in his simplicity, has been asking for a greater and greater part of what he has made, but the time has come for him to make an organized demand for all he makes. This demand for all that belongs to him may make those who have it angry, but every demand made by the subject class has always had the same effect. When the workers so much as demanded an eight-hour work day, the masters were angry, and the many clashes between the employers and employed since there was such a thing as a labor movement have been productive of class feeling that will exist so long as one class of men hold an undue and unfair advantage over another class. It is
a fool slave who loves his master, and no man who is worthy of the name will be so craven as to willingly remain the slavish subject of another. It is cowardly fear, as well as ignorance of their power, that has made the working class so long content to work without living while those for whom they labor live without working.

But how would you pay the workers under the proposed system? Would all work for the same wages?

Wages is a thing peculiar to the present system and could have no place in the Co-operative Commonwealth. Each worker would get the total product of his labor, or its equivalent, measured by the average amount of labor required for its reproduction, in such products of other workers as he might desire. Each would, therefore, get in exact proportion to what he would produce. Were he to make little, he would get little; were he to make much, he would get much. His remuneration would be equal, as measured by labor, to his product. Each would be paid according to the amount and quality of what he would do.

Would it be necessary under the proposed system for all property to be collectively owned?

Such property as would be collectively used should be collectively owned. Such property as is individually used should generally be individually owned. Industries of whatever kind in which numbers of workers labor should be collectively owned, but an industry in which an individual might and would work by himself might be owned by that individual. The idea is to make the ownership of the means of production as collective as the labor that operates them so no individual could have the advantage over his fellows that individual ownership now gives the owner over the users. The essential evil of the present system which we seek to escape is the exploitation of one man's labor by another. The individual who would own and operate with his own labor his farm or shop would not exploit the labor of others, and would, therefore, do no harm
other than what he might do himself by losing the advantage of co-operation with his fellows. All things which would be privately used should be privately owned. It is so evident that each member of society should own his own clothing and personal effects that it is hardly necessary to mention it, but it may be said in connection with this that there is nothing in Socialism to conflict with individuals owning their homes and no reason why they shouldn't. A well-known Socialist propagandist used to answer this question by saying that collective ownership should end with the street and the sidewalk at each man's gate; and that private ownership should begin at each man's gate and include his home and all its private utilities.

If industry were socialized, how would society get possession of the land and other means of production now owned by individuals?

First of all it should be said that no one is authorized to state how anything will be in the proposed Socialist Republic; but it is perfectly proper to venture an opinion as to how these things may be. There are numerous methods by which society might acquire collective ownership of the land and factories. It might purchase them and pay the owners for them whatever they would ask. It might purchase them and pay for them what a board of appraisers would consider just. To provide the means for such purchase bonds could be issued as is now done to raise funds for great enterprises, or the present owners might be compensated with privileges which in the end would amount to the same thing to both buyers and sellers as would the gold. On the other hand, the majority, who would rule, might institute an investigation and determine what owners of property were possessed of a good and valid title by having earned the property claimed. None of these methods would or could be made effective and put in force unless supported by a majority of the people, who would have the power to do as they pleased, just as they do now and always have done when acting together. They might decide to conquer
the country as the Normans did England or as the colonists did much of this country from the Indians.

But would not such an act be confiscation?

It depends upon the viewpoint of the person interested. One might call it confiscation while another might call it restitution of stolen goods. It is certain that most of the land titles now in force have their basis in conquest of territory. Sometimes such conquest was consummated by might of muscle and sometimes by clever swindling, such as the swapping of worthless trinkets for priceless acres. In either instance there was a conquest by force of arms or by force of cunning. It might be that the all-powerful majority would decide to apply the methods of the original conqueror; and, if they should decide to do so, there would be no power to prevent. As to what will be done it is almost idle to guess. The thing now to be decided is whether the more numerous class of productive workers prefer to remain the hirelings of an owning class or whether they would rather own the land and machines with which they work and thereby own their jobs. The decision as to whether remuneration should be given must necessarily depend upon the people who would form the new society, and may be affected to a considerable extent by the amount of trouble caused them by those who would claim capitalist ownership.

With the land collectively owned how would the good, highly-productive land and the poorer land be allotted? Who would get the good and who the poor land?

To answer that question positively would be like building the bridge before getting to the stream. The probability is that the land collectively owned would be collectively farmed by wholesale methods, and under such conditions there would be no allotment. Moreover, there is more than enough good land in this country to provide all that could be desired, so that the poorer grades of land need not be used. Then, there are millions of acres of the finest land that cannot now
be used because of no means of irrigation. Society could add vastly to the acreage of the most fertile land by irrigation, and leave the poorer soil for many years or until such time as it might be found necessary to fertilize and bring it under cultivation to supply the needs of an increased population. It should be remembered that this country is now exporting enough products of the soil to feed another good-sized nation. All of which shows that there is no threatened shortage of good land for everybody’s use.

In the Co-operative Commonwealth, would all have to work under bosses? And, if so, who would appoint the bosses and assign the good jobs?

It is likely that the greater part of the people would prefer to work co-operatively, and it is necessary where numbers work together to organize the common effort and place executive officers in charge of the work to decide the many little questions that require immediate attention, and exercise such supervision as is usually done by superintendents and foremen. Since those working in each shop would have an equal ownership in the property, each would have an equal voice in deciding any question of regulation or operation that might arise. Those who would work in the shop would naturally choose their superintendents and foremen from among their own number, and all such officers would have to so conduct themselves and administer their affairs as to satisfy all or be removed by the superior power of greater numbers. All would be interested in having each work where he could accomplish the most, for if all were so placed the collective product would be the greater and each one’s part the more. Under such conditions those would get what you call the good jobs who were best fitted to make the most of them. It would be to the interest of no one to have himself or any other worker in a position where he could not accomplish the best possible results. Socialism presupposes a democratic rule of industry; that is, that those who work shall control the works and say the final word on any question of administration that
may arise. Under such conditions no one would want to be a boss unless qualified, since it would subject him to the disgrace of being tried and found incompetent; and those who could hold such a position would be truly honored by the unquestioned quality of the substantial compliment to their ability.

How would it be possible for the government to run all the industries. Would it not be too big an undertaking to be made successful?

Please note that a Socialist government would be a far different thing from any that the world has ever seen. Instead of being something separate and apart from the people, it would be the people themselves acting together. The people operate all these vast properties now, and what would prevent them doing what they are doing now when they become the owners of the industries instead of mere wage workers in them? This is an age of big things that promise bigger things for the future. The capitalists have organized industry so that each mine and factory runs like an automatic machine and without any danger from its bigness. The United States postal department is said to carry on the greatest business on earth, and that without a private owner. Though hampered by graft and bled by private interests, just as any political institution must be under a capitalist government, yet it performs a wonderful service, pays its labor comparatively well and carries mail at a lower rate than any corporation has offered to do. The bigness of an undertaking instead of being a disadvantage is really an advantage, since it admits of more perfect organization and a more thorough division of labor and the expert training of individuals for special work.

Wouldn't the public control of such an enormous enterprise open up greater opportunities for graft and afford a better opportunity for the fine work of irresponsible politicians?

Public ownership under a capitalist government certainly would afford a splendid opportunity for the fine hand of the professional politician and boodler. That is one of the reasons why Socialists never be-
come very enthusiastic over public ownership schemes that are advocated by the capitalist parties. So long as the right of the capitalist class to skin the workers is recognized, a public office will be regarded as a private snap and worked for all there is in it for the fellow who happens to have it in his control. Under the democratic organization of government and industry every officer would be directly responsible to his constituents and they would have the power to depose him at any time his official acts were not satisfactory. This could readily be done by means of a measure called the Imperative Mandate. This is a provision by which the voters can, at any time they may be dissatisfied with the way an official conducts his office, by petition of a percentage of the voters, cause a new election; and if the objection to the officer in question were supported by a majority they would oust the old officer by electing a new one. If the old officer should care to contest the objections of the petitioners he could become a candidate for re-election; and, if re-elected, would be vindicated as to his acts and retained in his position.

But things have always been very much as they are now. How can it be possible to change what seems to be a permanent and natural order of society?

Things have not always been as they now are, and they will not always be as they now are. Everything is in a perpetual state of change, always has been and probably always will be. We do not assert that the better system which would result from the adoption of Socialist principles would be perfect, or the final form of the things it would change. Instead of society crystalizing in an unchangeable form, the race would progress more rapidly under the improved conditions and changes would follow even more rapidly than at present or in the past. The natural order of society is progress, which involves inevitable change. This is true not because nothing is ever done as it should be, but because of the fact that no matter how well anything is done today it may not be adequate to the de-
mands of tomorrow. The probability is that if an institution is as nearly perfect as the ingenuity of man can make it today, the progress of the race will make that same thing imperfect for the requirements of society in the near future. The sickle was a splendid implement at one time, but the scythe took its place and was no doubt a marvel of ingenuity until it was modified to better do its work as a cradle. The cradle was unquestionably a wonder until the mowing machine followed, to be itself improved with a table rake, then with a binder and finally combined with a thresher.

The manner in which people have made their living has ever been changing and with that fundamental change other things have changed to conform. Old tools, old customs, old institutions, and old ideas have gone to the scrap-heap together, and the capitalist system, which has outlived its usefulness (for it has been good in its time), is destined to follow.

But why not leave well enough alone? We can get along somehow under the present system, so what's the use of experimenting with the untried projects of unknown and irresponsible agitators?

Those who think that this is good enough will probably be disposed to let it alone. Those who are fattening on profits extracted from the bodies of underpaid workers are no doubt content to let what is good enough for them alone for all time. They don't need Socialism and it is unlikely that they will make any effort to get what they don't need. But the great majority of the people need Socialism. The most of them are either distinctively working people, possessing little or no property, or are identified with the propertyless workers in their economic interests. To be sure, most of them do not realize this, and won't do so until they understand the nature of the present system and what it is doing to them. The continual war that has been going on for centuries between the working class and the capitalist class is becoming more serious and less endurable to the workers, and the class nature of government more apparent with each adverse de-
cision of the courts, and each use of the militia to intimidate them in case of disputes that arise with greater frequency between them and their masters. An experiment has no terrors for one who knows that he cannot endure the things that are. All agitators who agitate things worth while are necessarily unknown and irresponsible. Were they known and responsible they would be well fixed and would, therefore, have no reason to agitate. When the Christian religion had a place in the lives of the people its agitators were active though unknown fishermen and irresponsible tent makers; but its professed agitators have become well-groomed bishops and smooth preachers so well known and so responsible to the ruling class that they dare not agitate lest they disturb some one. The unknown and irresponsible agitator is the mouthpiece of the unknown and irresponsible mass that is such because renown and responsibility have been monopolized by others. He is a voice crying in the wilderness, a speaker clothed in camel's hair and a citizen who is undesirable to the privileged. If you are of the privileged class you will not care to hear him, but if you are of the oppressed you will hear him gladly and be willing to weigh his words with reference to your needs.

But isn't it a fact that all reap what they sow? Doesn't the law of compensation give to each what is really coming to him?

Laws give nothing. The most a law of any kind can do is to make it possible for the owner to take what is his own. It is the failure of the working class to claim and collect what is coming to them that keeps them in poverty and subjection to the masters they are so foolish and spiritless as to acknowledge. The law of compensation works only when someone works it. It operates like the fulfillment of prophecy. When the one concerning whom it is prophesied appears and does the things that are prophesied, then prophecy is fulfilled. The point is that there is an executor of all law, and it is the mission of the workers as a class to
do the things that they must do in order to fulfill their destiny. We are urging the workers to go forth and reap where they have sown, but they offer every possible excuse for not doing so. Many are obsessed with a fantastic notion that in some way their share will come to them anyhow—that they will get it in the next world if not in this, or that some mysterious power will add to them all that is subtracted from them by the operation of capitalistic greed. But the longer they wait for this the more certain it appears to the wise that what they get they must go after. Laws make it possible for each to get his own in some way at some time, but laws do not bring one's own to him on a silver platter. Nothing belongs to him who will take nothing, but the man who insists on having what is his will get a good share of it, if not all of it. It is time for the working class to claim what is theirs, and when they do they will get it as surely as the other fellow gets it now.

But what is wrong with the present system? Wouldn't all be well if each would do what is right?

For all to do right it is necessary first for all to know what is right. Most people think that they know what is right, but the fact that they differ with each other as to the rightness of things proves that some of them must be mistaken and suggests the reasonable possibility of all of them being mistaken. More than that, we find that the average man's conception of what is right is affected by his personal interest. Those who owned negro slaves had also a system of morals by which they proved to their own satisfaction at least that slavery was right. Their hearts were with their treasure and their ideas of right and justice were made to conform to an institution in which they were economically interested. From the viewpoint of the fox it is right to rob the roost and devour chickens, but from the standpoint of the chickens, and notably also from the viewpoint of the man who owns chickens, the chicken-eating fox is an undesirable citizen. For similar rea-
sons the capitalist is disposed to believe that the private ownership of things publicly used and the extraction of surplus value from his employes is right, while the intelligent, class-conscious workingman believes such a system to be wrong. To tell a man to do right is nothing more nor less than to tell him to do what he thinks is right; and what a man thinks is right is not determined by a universally recognized standard, but by the training, thought and condition of the individual. It is safe to say that most people now try to do what they think is right, and in so doing live as nearly as they can in conformity with their ideal; but the widely divergent ideas of what is right make right a decidedly indefinite rule of conduct for individuals in matters that affect all. Even those who make a special study of morals and ethics differ in what they conceive to be right and what they believe to be wrong. One thinks it is wrong to eat meat on Friday; his vegetarian neighbor thinks it is wrong to eat meat at all; while the great mass of people, in this country at least, eat meat whenever they feel like it—provided they can get it. The same difference of opinion exists with reference to the use of tobacco and liquors, the playing of games and a thousand of the details of life. Democracy, which is nothing more nor less than majority rule, does not stand on the rightness or wrongness of its institutions, but upon the expressed preference of the majority. For ninety years this country, supposed to be grounded on the rock of right and justice, officially recognized, supported and defended the institution of chattel slavery, then abolished it. The national idea of rightness and wrongness changed in regard to the matter. For a longer period the institution of wage slavery and kinred institutions of the capitalist system have been popularly supposed to be right, but the opinion of the working class, which is a majority, is changing in regard to that, and the results must follow.

But how could we get along without the capitalists? Would not any system need them with their ability to direct affairs?

It is not proposed to get along without the capi-
talist. What we want to do is to change him from a mere owner into a real producer. We do not propose to murder or otherwise make way with the capitalist, but to abolish capital—that is, to abolish the use of wealth by one man or one class of men to enslave another man or another class of men. We want to make a productive worker of the capitalist, which would secure for society the benefit of his services on the basis of paying him, like everyone else, according to what he would do, instead of, as at present, according to what he owns. It is one of the prevalent social illusions that the great owners of wealth possess superior ability which is used by them in the conduct of their enterprises. As a matter of fact they hire most of their mental work done the same as they hire their manual labor. The genius of a Rockefeller is not expended in locating oil wells, drilling them, bringing oil to the surface or refining it. The management, as well as the direct operation of these processes, is in the control of hirelings while the great oil king busies himself with the weightier problems of driving competitors out of business or reinvesting the profits derived from the joint efforts of his wage-paid workers and salaried managers. Private ownership of industry is no more necessary for its successful operation than would the private ownership of a war fleet be necessary for the winning of a battle. If a capitalist government can entrust fifty million dollars' worth of battleships to a salaried admiral to take around the world, society can surely entrust an equal or greater amount of industrial machinery to the management of a man who would have a special interest in its successful operation. There are many kinds of ability that are at present in demand. Some of these abilities would not be needed in a Socialist republic, while others would be in greater demand than ever. We would not need Mr. Rockefeller's peculiar ability to down rivals because there would be none such as that oily gentleman has so cleverly put out of business. Society would have no need for his ability to bulldoze the courts and defy the
law, to postpone indefinitely the payment of fines imposed upon him or to reinvest the values sweated out of his wage slaves and swiped from a patient and long-suffering public subdued by the magic of monopoly. The kind of ability that would be in demand would be, first of all, the ability to perform necessary labor; and, of equal though not superior importance, the ability to devise and improve ways and means of doing things. The things to be done and the objects to be accomplished would not be the enrichment of individuals, but the supplying to all who would work the means of labor and by such labor producing the material sustenance of life for each in quantity proportioned to what he would do toward its production.

But will not all these things come in their time by the inevitable process of evolution? Why all this fuss and fury to get something which the people as yet seem unprepared to receive?

Nothing will come without cause. The laws of evolution do not cause things, but are merely the flexible rules in conformity with which causes usually operate. If industry is ever socialized, and the working class seize and utilize political power to bring it about, it will be done by the voluntary and well-considered effort of human beings. It is true that mankind, to get results, must utilize natural and social forces, must act in harmony with the determined processes of evolution rather than come in collision with those forces; but when they do these things, setting about consciously and intelligently to put this old world in order and make it a better habitation, they will get better and quicker results. There is the same advantage in operating together and in harmony with historical tendencies that there is in cultivating wild fruits. Intelligent effort is no more wasted on efforts to reconstruct society and industry than it would be wasted on efforts to improve the quality of apples; but in both instances it is necessary to know what other factors are involved in the contemplated change and not run counter to them. The scientific analysis of the present system by Karl Marx
and other scientists has pointed out the line of action, the understanding of which will promote the change in proportion to its dissemination; for people will act when they understand, and human action is what will make the new society.

Couldn't we solve the problem of good government and remedy the abuse of power by electing good men to office from any party or all parties?

It is what men do, and not what they are, that affects both public and private affairs. The present condition are not due to the depravity of men or part of them, but are due to the relations that exist between men. The present social system is such that the man who fleeces his fellows cannot well do otherwise; and it is even more certain that the victims cannot do other than they are doing until the relations between them and their oppressors are changed through the transfer to themselves of the ownership of the means of production which they must use. No amount of goodness can effect this change unless reinforced by a knowledge of the social divisions and the class struggle. Socialists recognize and understand this war of the classes, and are, therefore, competent to deal with the problems growing out of it. The good men of the other political persuasions know no more of it than do the bad ones. Neither good nor bad supporters of the present system can reasonably be expected to abolish it. Were they disposed to do this needful thing they would be Socialists; and the fact that they are not Socialists is sufficient reason why they are unfit to do the things needed by the working class.

Wouldn't workingmen get along well enough if they would only save their money and especially quit spending their incomes for liquor?

The workingmen would probably do well to drink no liquor, but don’t make the fashionable mistake of thinking that workingmen drink all the liquors. One swell dinner of a capitalist nabob affords opportunity for the use of more alcoholic beverage than a whole
village of workingmen would consume in a year. The workingman drinks the cheap stuff, just as he wears shoddy clothes and eats adulterated foods, and for the same reason—it's the best he can afford. The wealthy chap drinks champagne, just as he wears the best of clothing and eats the choicest viands, and for the same reason—the workers produce for him the wealth with which to buy these things. And what would it profit a man who gets less than enough to live on to mistreat himself the more and do with less? Then, consider the effect on those who live by selling things to the worker. What would be the effect on a groceryman whose customers should suddenly decide to spend only half as much with him the coming year as they had in the past year? It is the man who spends his income that makes the wheels of industry and commerce go round. If you are planning to preserve the present system don't introduce the scheme of saving; for saving by people who do not get enough with which to live properly amounts to long-drawn-out privation for him who saves and is as hard on the system as the occasional locking up by bankers of the available supply of money. The thing for the workingman to save is the surplus value which is now held out of his wages. He cannot save that until he gets it, and he can't get it until he joins in a class-conscious political movement to capture political power for the workers and thereby establish an industrial system in which he can get the full value of what his labor produces.

Why don't the workers join with the reformers who believe in public ownership, and get these things without the slow process of building up a party of their own?

Because the reformers are not working to the same end that Socialists are. Reformers of all kinds wish to patch up the present system and perpetuate wage slavery, which is the father of all the economic evils that are in existence. Socialists would abolish the wage system in order to establish a form of industry in which each producer could get the full value of all
he would make. There is this fundamental difference between the reformers and the Socialists, who are not reformers but are revolutionists.

What is a revolutionist?

In an economic sense, a revolutionist is one who seeks to depose the class that is in power and place political power in the hands of another class. Socialists are revolutionary because they wish to overthrow the institutions of the capitalist class and establish others in their place in harmony with working-class rule. They are also revolutionary because they know the social revolution to be necessary and inevitable.

But isn't it dangerous to resort to revolutionary methods with the bloodshed and violence that go with them?

Revolutions are sometimes bloody and sometimes peaceful, and it is often more dangerous to adhere to the old than to press forward to the new. The turbulence that has resulted from some revolutions has been more often caused by the conservative than by the radical element, and many reforms have been effected only by means of sanguinary strife. Strictly speaking, there is no necessary connection between a revolution and violence, as is illustrated by history in numerous instances. If a majority of the voters express by their ballots a desire that the present domination of the capitalist class shall cease, and that the working class shall assume control of government and industry, there need be no trouble over the change unless the present rulers resist the consummation of what the majority demand. In that case the burden and blame for violence would be on the conservatives and not on the revolutionists. The essential meaning of revolution is a turning around. This may be accomplished peaceably or otherwise according to the temper of the individuals who are being turned up or turned down. There is nothing new about violence in the labor movement. At times when the men who work demand a greater share of their product or better working
conditions, and go on strike to get such things, their masters resort to the use of detectives or militia, to precipitate trouble, which is ever to their advantage. The workingman generally favors peaceable means because he has no militia and peace is to his advantage.

But wouldn't government control of the corporations and trusts solve the problems for the time at least?

That depends upon what kind of a government controls the trusts and what class of people control the government. The only way to wholly control a thing is to own it. When the workers come into the ownership of government by capture of political power they will be able to control corporations because they will then own them, and that is the only practical way of doing it. More than that, the big business interests already control government so how can you expect the thing controlled to control the controller? It is a historical fact that the men who have owned the wealth of nations have always controlled them. Ownership confers the power of control, which can be had from no other source. The supreme power in all countries where the capitalist system of production prevails is vested in those who own the wealth, and the only way to change the ownership of supreme power is to change the ownership of wealth.

Why not tax predatory wealth into submission? Why not so change the laws of taxation as to throw the burden of public affairs upon the wealthy and thus relieve the laboring man?

There are two kinds of tax: One which the capitalist pays to the government because he owns property, and one which the worker pays to the capitalist for the same reason. The worker owns little property and therefore pays little tax to the government, but for the same reason he pays a large tax to the capitalist in the form of surplus labor for which he does not get the value in wages. The whole Socialist movement is to the end of escaping this latter tax, and workingmen have no interest in questions of property tax which involve the capitalist with his own government.
The workers being as a class practically propertyless, have no interest in laws which affect charges on property; but they have a vital interest in all laws which affect human life, which is the material out of which their labor power is made.

Would there be money in the proposed Socialist republic?

Not being a prophet the writer does not care to say what the majority may choose to do with reference to such things as that. Socialism is neither a human invention nor a ready-made scheme of government handed down from the skies, and its application will depend wholly upon the will of the people when they decide in sufficient numbers to put it in operation. It may be that the present monetary system could be so modified as to meet the requirements of the new system, and it might be that a system of due bills for labor performed would be used. Those are details which could not be provided for at this time since the people of the Socialist Republic must be self-governing and would not be bound by provisions handed down to them by us. The only things concerning the Co-operative Commonwealth which we can predict with any certainty are those which necessarily follow from the fundamental principles of the movement which are generally accepted by the present generation of Socialists and probably will be by succeeding generations.

Does Socialism or the Socialist movement oppose religion?

There is one kind of religion, if it can be called religion, which Socialism opposes; and that is the political kind of religion which apologizes for the evils of the capitalist system and goes out of its way to antagonize the Socialist movement. Socialism is purely economic, concerning itself wholly with the bread and butter question. Its adherents are of every religious and philosophical belief, and there is nothing in the teachings of Socialism that would exclude a Methodist, a Mormon, or a Mohammedan, an atheist,
an agnostic, or any kind or quality of an infidel. In that respect it is the same as republicanism or democracy. It recognizes the fact that in this country church and state are separate, and its program is directed toward the transformation of the state without any interference whatever with the religious views of any one. The enemies of the movement seek to arouse prejudice against it by repeating absurdities concerning how Socialism would destroy morals and religion, but they are never prepared to say how when particulars are called for. Were any church or religious organization to go into politics and come in collision with Socialism on the political field it would then become necessary for Socialists to fight that church's politics but not its religion.

But can a man be a consistent Christian and be a true Socialist at the same time?

I do not see how any man can be a consistent Christian or adhere to any wholesome view of life without being a Socialist at heart, whether conscious of it or not. The Encyclopedia Britannica is authority for the statement that the ethics of Socialism and Christianity are identical. In so far as the economics of Socialism affect ethics this is undoubtedly true. But, however that may be, there is nothing in Socialism to conflict with the Christian religion; and, so far as I can learn, nothing in the Christian religion that necessarily conflicts with Socialism, though there are Socialists who are not Christians and Christians who are not Socialists, and a large and growing number who are both.

But I have heard that all Socialists are atheists. If this is not wholly true to what extent is it true?

You can hear anything that might be said to the detriment of Socialism if you will go to the right place to hear it. It has been said that the Socialists are all Roman Catholics and that they are all Jews and that they are all infidels. These statements are always made with reference to the audience and with a view to
arousing prejudice and preventing an investigation of what Socialism really is. If Socialism is a scheme with an evil purpose why don't these critics encourage a study of the subject instead of trying to frighten the timid away by such misrepresentations? It is possible that a greater percentage of atheists are Socialists than are identified with other political parties. This is only a guess, however, which is based only on the personal opinion of the writer. If true it is to be accounted for from the fact that atheists are naturally less conservative than other people, and are therefore attracted more readily by any kind of a radical movement.

What effect would the triumph of Socialism have upon religion?

Not being endowed with the gift of prophecy, any answer made to this must necessarily be more or less speculative. But, since the enemies of Socialism so persistently declare that Socialism would destroy religion, thereby assuming a knowledge of the future, it may not be amiss to discuss the question. The well-known theory of the Salvation Army that you can't get religion on an empty stomach is one that contains an immense amount of common sense. It is a matter of common knowledge that those who suffer for the lack of material comforts have little time and less inclination for the refining influences of civilization. It is also a matter of common knowledge, often discussed in pulpit and print, that the working class have become indifferent to religion. They are not hostile to religion as a class, but as a class they are becoming indifferent and less disposed to give it their attention. The Salvation Army knows why, and makes progress among the unhappy and unfortunate by first ministering to their bodily wants—by first saving their lives, and then teaching them their doctrines as to how life can be made better. Socialism seeks to abolish poverty and place every human being beyond the fear or the possible experience of want. If it succeeds in doing that, and we believe it will, the whole human family will be
in a condition to consider and accept anything that will humanize, refine and elevate them. Before a man can live a religious life he must live. When the material means of living are assured, or the opportunity to obtain the means of living is afforded to all, the best conceivable foundation is laid for things spiritual. We can readily forgive those who, in their ignorance, heed the rum-soaked mouthings of cheap politicians defending the crimes of capital by declaring Socialism to be anti-religious, for they know not what they do. As for the deliberate falsifiers, their reward shall follow them.

But they tell me that Socialism would destroy morality?

There is no doubt that it would destroy much of the bogus morality; which, in reality, is not morality. It would destroy that double standard of morality which forbids horse-racing and kindred sports to the poor man, but views with complacency the wholesale horse-racing of the aristocrat who keeps a stable full of racers for his amusement. It would destroy that moral duplicity that brands a drunken workingman as a vile wretch and lauds a whisky-soaked capitalist as a “good fellow.” By what stretch of the imagination can it be believed that, because the material needs of the people would be better provided for, they would neglect those morals which make a man stronger both mentally and physically and more capable of enjoying life? Do we today find the most moral people among those who are most in need? Is poverty necessary to morality? If so, how is it that the rich have so much to say on the subject. If that is true, capitalism destroys the morality of those who are its staunchest upholders; and, for that reason, if no other, the defenders of the present system cross themselves when they talk about Socialism antagonizing morals. We shall need morals in the Co-operative Commonwealth, and it is certain that the conditions will favor more of the genuine kind than they do under the present dog-eat-dog regime of capital.
I am told that Socialism would break up the home. Are Socialists not opposed to marriage?

If Socialists were opposed to marriage they would not marry. That is one thing which, if believed in by Socialists, could be practiced even under capitalism. The only class of people who are opposed to marriage and prove it by refusing to marry are the priests, who are the most persistent in accusing Socialists of this thing yet universally practice it themselves. This is one striking illustration of the consistency with which Socialism is attacked in an effort to prejudice the thoughtless. Because we say that women should be economically independent and relieved of dependence upon man, those who are eagerly watching to pick a flaw seize upon this as a pretext to assert that the wicked Socialists are going to establish common ownership of women. What Socialism seeks with reference to women is to save them from the degradation of being property in any sense. While Socialists marry the same as other people; they do not care to exercise proprietorship over their wives as they do over a horse or dog. The economic dependence of women upon men has the same effect upon the woman that economic dependence of wage workers upon an employer has upon the workers. The woman who marries merely to get a home, as many of them are compelled to do, simply sells herself and becomes the slave of the masculine buyer. If she happens to marry a wage worker under such conditions she becomes the most unhappy of creatures, for she is then the slave of a slave and needs the emancipation that Socialism offers more than any human being on earth. But there is no need to wait for the operation of Socialism or the action of Socialists to break up the home. The record of the divorce courts tells what is being done in that direction under the capitalist system. Poverty is an effective home breaker and is destroying the homes of the poor, while the divorce courts afford the means for the rich man to get his "affinity" for the price of the lawyer and the evidence. We Socialists are trying to bring about a kind of home life that would be free
from poverty and provided with these comforts which are necessary to any family before it can be truly said to have a home. Less than half of the families of this nation now live in their own homes free from debt. Socialists have a higher conception of home than a hired roof and a higher conception of marriage than the ownership of a woman.

Wouldn't Socialism make people thriftless, indolent and lazy?

If we arc to believe what the capitalists say, and they are the ones who repeat these objections to Socialism and teach them to the foolish, all those who now work, for wages are already shiftless, indolent and lazy. The capitalists and their hired mouthpieces say that the man who works is already good for nothing but to serve a master under the lash of hunger—and hardly that; so why should they worry about his condition under Socialism? If he is no good anyhow, what's the difference? All Socialism offers to do for anyone is to give him the value of what his labor produces, and it strains the imagination to guess at how such a condition would make men lazy and thriftless. Possibly the capitalist thinks that well-fed men would not work because he has been used to driving help into his factory from homes of want. It is possible that the employer of today has become so accustomed to having hirelings who are poorly fed and poorly paid that he can conceive of no man doing a reasonable amount of work unless confronted with starvation. Of course, the capitalist employer is not to blame for thinking that way, because it is what he has been accustomed to; and he is not to be blamed for not knowing better; for he has devoted practically all his time to the accumulation of dollars instead of the accumulation of wisdom and accurate information.

But wouldn't the triumph of Socialism break down all restrictions and result in a reign of lawlessness?

It would certainly break down many restrictions, but it doesn't necessarily follow that the abolition of
restrictions that are unnecessary and oppressive would bring about a reign of lawlessness. History shows that the more freedom people obtain the more law-abiding they become. It is when people feel and know that laws are made by one class to be used against another class that they become restless and rebel against government. People do not become rebels by habit, but by necessity. As the American Declaration of Independence says, people are more disposed to endure political wrongs than to rebel to right them. The people are by nature long-suffering and disposed to endure the ills of oppression rather than make the effort to abolish them. If men need economic masters to exercise restriction over them, then the idea and dream of freedom is a delusion. If men cannot direct their own affairs without a privileged boss to drive them, then it was a mistake to abolish kings and do away with chattel slavery. If it is true that the average man needs a master to make him good, it would certainly be better for each of these men to be the permanent property of some master who would look after him all the time instead of turning him loose in times of panic. But, it is not so.

*If Socialism were established, what would be the effect on education?*

It is generally conceded by intelligent people that that plan of education is best which develops the mental, moral and physical qualities of citizens to the greatest extent. A sound mind in a sound body, with sane ideas as to the use to be made of life, should be the object of education. Today young men too often seek what they call an education in order to escape work. They imagine, with some degree of correctness, that if they can only jam their heads full of unimportant information they will be able either to get a job teaching the same stuff to others with like ambitions, or will, in some way, have an advantage over those who know no better than to work for a living. There is nothing so hopeless, helpless or tiresome as an educated fool, and those who are educated with that idea in
mind are it. They should know, as the foundation and condition of anything that is worthy the name of education, that labor is the common lot of mankind. They should know that labor is not drudgery when each does his part. On the contrary, the mechanical facilities now available as assistants make the necessary labor of mankind scarcely more than enough for exercise if it were done co-operatively under conditions of equality and justice. The very constitution of society under Socialism would teach these rudiments of education that are now missed in the disgraceful scramble for dollars; and would, moreover, because of the ability of each to earn in excess of his material needs, enable thousands to enjoy the advantage of travel, to hear the best music, to see the best dramatic productions, and the many things that quicken the sensibilities and broaden the mind. Under Socialism the funds for schools, colleges, and universities need not first go through the hands of a Rockefeller and a Carnegie, and be shorn for the benefit of individuals. The wealth-producing power of society would be so much greater that the equipment of schools, like other material means of life, would be available to a degree that we can now scarcely comprehend.

Shouldn't all public schools be abolished? Why should the man who has no children to educate be compelled to pay taxes to be used in the schooling of other people's children?

If the question is to be considered on purely economic grounds it would be very easy to argue the public school out of existence; for, if we live wholly to accumulate money, the man who has children, as well as the man who has none, could make more money by abolishing the school and keeping his children at home to work for him until they are of age. But there are other considerations that are of greater moment than the accumulation of wealth. We are all benefited by the higher standard of intelligence that the public schools have established throughout the country. It is no wonder that there is an occasional objection made to the expense of the public schools. The wonder
is that there is not more, for the public school system is an institution in advance of the present times. It is a product of the just-awakening social consciousness which feels the mutual dependence of every man upon his fellows to get the best out of life on his long journey through a sometimes dreary world. This same social consciousness is behind every co-operative effort; and, like co-operation, is in the ascendant. The public schools are here to stay, for they are in harmony with present-day tendencies, and the man or institution which comes in collision with this great means of popular education is already whipped and routed.

Would parochial schools be allowed in the Co-operative Commonwealth?

It is not for an individual of today to say just what would be allowed in a society that is not yet organized, but there is nothing in the principles of Socialism that conflicts with the idea of parochial schools or any other schools conducted for the purpose of teaching special branches such as would not likely be taught in a public school. All such things as this would, however, depend upon the will of the majority, which would rule under Socialism in fact as it now does in theory. There is no reason why the teaching of anything that is not positively detrimental to the people should ever be prohibited.

In your scheme of government where would education end and work begin?

Socialism is not a scheme of government. One of the popular illusions is that Socialism is a ready-made heaven-on-earth to be set up soon as a majority endorse the scheme. On the contrary, Socialism is but little more than an analysis of the present system. While it presents an ideal of a new society dominated by working-class rule, it does not offer plans and specifications the working out of which must necessarily be left to the people who are to enter on the promised land. It may be said, however, that education and
work are so closely related that they can hardly be separated even now. It takes work to get an education, and it takes an education to be able to work with any degree of success. The boy who doesn't work at school is likely to be as much of an ignoramus as the man whose education ends when he leaves school. Work and education should begin with life and end with it. The part that schools and teachers play in the process is secondary and often accidental, though magnified by many who do not realize how little the short schooling of the average man has to do with his real mental development, or how much his manual training has to do with the clearness and precision of his thought.

If everything is to be perfect, what is the use of people having an education in the Socialist republic?

No one with any conception of social evolution such as is required to understand Socialism has any idea that the Socialist Republic or Co-operative Commonwealth will be the final form of society, or that it will be perfect. Perfection in human institutions is like tomorrow: always coming, but never here. Man's long journey from the cave does not end anywhere. It is a perpetual progress on and on and on toward the perfection that fortunately can never be reached, because if it could it would leave the race nothing more to do. Progress and action are inseparable. Perfection could be only the beginning of stagnation; the condition for the repetition of the traditional "fall." Education is more than the mere absorption of information or the training of head and hand. It means the unfolding of all the faculties and the broadening of the individual in keeping with his increasing control of Nature and Nature's forces. We are so accustomed to measuring everything by the capitalist standard of earning capacity that it is difficult to look upon education as being worth anything save as it gives us an advantage in the struggle for existence or enables us to get more in a material way for a less expenditure of
effort, but education means more than that even as the new society means more than bread and butter.

What does Socialism offer women?
Socialism offers women the same that it offers men: the opportunity to work as best they can for the political ascendancy of the working class and participation in the benefits of an industrial democracy. If the lot of a wage workingman is to be deplored, that of his wife is even more unhappy, since she must share all his misfortunes without the opportunity to exercise the power of suffrage and have a voice in the making of the laws by which she is governed. It is enough to say that the wife of the workingman and the unmarried woman who has to work for wages are the victims of the system to the same extent and in the same way that their husbands and brothers are. For this reason they are equally interested in the overthrow of the system and the establishment of working-class rule, to the end that each may escape the necessity of finding a master, and, when employed, the necessity of dividing the products of her labor with the owner of her job. Women who work are equally interested with men who work in securing the full value of what their labor produces, and there is no way either proposed or possible by which this can be done save through the triumph of Socialism.

Do Socialists believe in woman suffrage?
The national platforms and international platforms of the Socialist party always declare for equal manhood and womanhood suffrage; and, what is of more importance, they declare for the industrial emancipation of every human being without reference to sex. Women join the Socialist party on the same conditions and with the same privileges as men. They participate in the nomination of Socialist tickets, though denied by capitalist-made laws the right to vote for their candidates in other than a few of the states. They have an equal voice with other comrades in the formation
of the party's policy and in every rule and regulation affecting the organized movement. And this is done not to flatter the few women who demand the right of suffrage, but because it is recognized by all Socialists that working men and working women have a common cause in the emancipation of their class: a cause which needs the help of the women as much as that of the men. There is far more significance to the Socialist demand for equal suffrage than there is to the bourgeois fad that seeks the vote for women on sentimental grounds. Socialists realize that women of the proletariat have a mission to perform that is co-ordinate with that of the male proletarian. Equal suffrage is a serious matter to those who depend upon brains and ballots to overcome the power of bayonets and bullets.

Would not the possession of equal political power and the industrial emancipation of women rob them of the power they now exercise in public and private affairs?

It is not clear just what this power "now exercised by women" is. There is much said and written about the hand that rocks the cradle being the hand that rules the world; but not all women choose to rock the cradle, and those who don't feel the same need of laws in their interest as those who do. Moreover, there is more poetry than truth in the oft-quoted sentence. The woman who rocks the cradle may impress the generation which occupies the cradle with more or less of her personality, but the effect of that influence is felt by the world at too late a date for its author to get the benefit. It must yet be shown by those who oppose Socialism and would keep woman in subjection wherein she would lose by exchanging an uncertain and undefined power for a certain and clearly defined right. Those chivalrous masculine members of society who think that it adds to a woman's power and prestige to cover her head, hide her face, and get her opinions and spending money from her husband, prove on investigation to be narrow-minded bigots who prefer to class their wives with their other property and keep them in awe-inspired subjection. The power
exercised by the wives of such monstrosities is more apparent in fiction than in real life.

Would women have to earn their living under Socialism?

The probability is that they would, and they would find it a much easier thing to do than it is under the reign of capitalism. The spectacle of women taking the place of men in industry, and doing the same work for a fraction of the pay granted men, is a thing that would be wholly impossible under such a regime as Socialists propose. Under such an organization of the means of production as is proposed by Socialists, woman, as well as man, would at all times have access to the means of production and therefore never be necessarily out of a job. This would make her economically independent. She would not, under any circumstances, be under the necessity of marrying merely to get a home and escape the drudgery of employment, but would be the master of her own fate so far as the making of a living is concerned, which is a matter of more consequence to her than is commonly supposed by those who have never studied the question or learned what it is by sad experience. The ability to earn her own living, whether married or unmarried, would not necessarily compel one to do so under matrimonial conditions, but, whether done or not, would broaden woman's life to a degree impossible when the slave of a wage slave and isolated from the world in her kitchen or cottage.

Would women in the Co-operative Commonwealth get the same pay as men?

That would depend on whether they were to do the same quantity and quality of work. It is supposed that in socialized industry each would be paid for his or her services according to the value of his or her product, such value to be determined by the amount of human labor socially required for its production. Labor is both the source and measure of value, and all qualities or kinds of work can be reduced, for purposes of estimation, to common abstract labor which enters
into all things made, in greater or lesser quantities. If the average woman would produce an equal amount of a given product in the same time required by an average man, the result would be the same pay for the same work. If the woman would do more—produce more—than the man she would get more pay, etc. In determining the wages of men and women at the present time the amount of their product has little to do with it save that they must produce a greater value than they get in wages in order for the employer to "get his." The value of labor and the value of what the same labor produces are two separate and distinct quantities, the difference between which is the surplus value or the profit of the employer.

If Socialism is a working-class movement, why not get Socialism through the unions instead of going to the trouble and expense of organizing a new party?

Because most of the unions were organized before there was a general demand for political action, and are therefore intended only for economic action. Moreover, the Socialist party is a party of the whole working class while the unions represent but that small portion of the workers who are members of them. It has been found by experience that both the political and economic organizations are necessary, and that the labor movement can be better served by the two separate forces each acting in its own field. There are many thousands of workingmen who feel the need of Socialism who are working upon farms and in industries that the unions have not yet been able to reach. These non-union workers find a place in the labor movement by attaching themselves to the political branch of it and thereby come into touch with the members of their class, learning labor history and assisting in the solution of the common problem. Each wing of the labor army picks up the recruits that are ready for it and the solidarity of labor grows from two roots. One cannot take the place of the other, because both are needed.
Should unionists be Socialists? If so, why?

Unionists should be Socialists because, no matter what concessions the unions may be able to wring from the employing class, wages can never be regarded as full compensation for labor performed. The only way for the man who works to get his own, and all of it, is through Socialism. The unions have served a purpose, but have their limitations. They are powerless when the courts, militia and other powers of government are turned against them; a solid array of workingmen voting in their own interests is the one terror that makes the plutocrats stay their hands, as it has for years in Germany and is beginning to do in this country. While the unions devote their efforts almost exclusively to getting immediate results, and the Socialist party is concerned principally with other than immediate demands, yet the gradual growth of a class-conscious political party commands respect for and deference toward the immediate demands of the proletariat. It is like an advancing army marching to the rescue of a beleagured fortress. Though not on the field, its presence is felt. The best union men of the country are already Socialists, and practically all of them will be when education and experience have taught them a few more lessons.

Do Socialists endorse any particular union?

Individual Socialists are members of practically all of the unions, and the party has never officially endorsed any particular union, since, as before stated, Socialism is for the entire working class, including the members of all unions and those workers who are unorganized. Many of the officials of labor unions are hostile toward Socialism, but not all of them are; and the great mass of the union membership is so leavened with Socialism that it is a question of but a short time when they will be with us. It is not considered good policy for the party to endorse other organizations of workingmen, and it is considered equally inadvisable for unions to endorse the Socialist or any other party.
The idea is to keep the two separate so the worker can accept either as he realizes his need for it without being repelled by something else, the need of which he does not feel.

What is industrial unionism?

Industrial unionism is that form of labor organization in which all who work in an industry are members of the same union. For instance, all the different kinds of employees on a railroad would, under industrial organization, belong to the same union instead of the firemen in one, the engineers in another, the switchmen in another, and so on. The need of industrial organization becomes apparent when, for instance, the members of the Switchmen’s union go out on a strike and the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen are induced by the company officials to take the jobs vacated by the strikers. Or, when the locomotive engineers might go on a strike and the firemen, being in a separate organization, would take their places. There is no doubt that all the unions must sooner or later adopt the industrial form, and the tendency in this direction is apparent where all the crafts in the building trades of a city join together in a federation for mutual offense and defense. Socialists are interested in these matters because they are benefited by anything that strengthens their class in its contests with the capitalist class.

What would Socialism do for the negro?

The same that it would do for the white race: namely, make him the owner of the means of production used by him, thereby assuring him the opportunity to work at any time. It would also, by abolishing the private ownership of these means of production, machinery, etc., put an end to a capitalist owner’s taking part of what each of his employes would produce. Each negro worker, like each white worker, would receive for himself the full product of his labor or its equivalent. The other benefits that would follow from this are too numerous to be mentioned or
even to be thought of at this time. It means the real emancipation of the negro from dependence on the favor of others. When the black man got his freedom from the owner of his body he was yet left dependent upon others for the chance to earn the means of sustaining his life. Though he had escaped from service to an owner, he was compelled to at once find another master who would buy him a little at a time, paying for him by the day or week instead of buying him outright. So long as he can find a wage master he can work and get enough to live upon, just as he did when a slave; but when he fails to find an employer he is in a worse condition than when in slavery. Socialism would make all men free in reality; the negro as well as the Caucasian.

Under Socialism would white people and negroes have to work together?

Since the workers would have control of the industries and workshops, it would be for them to say. Both white and black workers are now so anxious to get and hold work that they are disposed to work wherever they can. But, under democratic control of industry—that is, when the shops and other places of industry are bossed as well as operated by the workers in them—it will be for the workers to prescribe the rules and regulations governing their labor. They could work together then as they do now, or they could separate the races and have black shops run exclusively by the negroes, and white shops run altogether by white workers, each under such regulations as would be agreeable. There would be no necessity for the mingling of the races, and there is no reason why they couldn't work together if it were mutually satisfactory. Inasmuch as the whites are the more numerous, they would have more to say in any controversy that might arise between the races since Socialism means majority rule in everything affecting the public. It would be possible for those doing the work to have much more to say concerning this and the conditions of
their labor than is possible today when industry is ruled wholly by private owners.

Does Socialism mean equality of all people and all races? Would white men have to work under negro bosses?

Socialism does not teach nor assume that all men or all races are equal. It recognizes the fact that no two men are exactly alike, and for that reason it is impossible for mankind to be other than unequal in almost every attribute. The only equality sought by Socialists is an equality of opportunity to work and for each to get the full value of what he would produce. No artificial regulation can make men equal who are born with or acquire different degrees of ability; but the institutions of society, all of which are made by man, can be so disposed as to reward each in proportion to what he does, be that great or small. And this can be done without making one race of people associate with another race unless such association were mutually agreeable. Equality of opportunity does not mean equality in all things. The man who is born white cannot be equally black with the African, neither can the man born with a small sluggish brain be made equal to the individual born with a large brain of fine quality. Since the workers would elect their own foreman and superintendents, they would not have black bosses unless by their own choice.

If society is to be wholly under the control of those who perform productive labor, what will be the effect on children? Will they not have to work in order to live?

It is assumed that parents will then have the same interest in and affection for their children that they now have. And it is certain that parents will then be better able to provide for themselves and those dependent upon them. They can do more for their children when no longer required to do for a class of parasites, and it is reasonable to suppose that under such circumstances parents will be willing, as well as able, to provide more wisely and more fully for the needs of their offspring than is possible from their scanty
earnings as wage workers. When parents are no longer compelled to divide their earnings with private employers they will have the more with which to provide for their children; and will then be the better prepared to secure for them educational and other advantages that are now out of the reach of working people. When the head of a family is able to earn enough to support that family, and do so without fear of being thrown on charity in old age, there will be no more child labor in the factories and children will not be robbed of their childhood by the profit-mongering owners of the mills.

Would children in the Socialist republic be under the control of their parents or under that of the state?

Nobody knows. A few Socialist writers seem to think that children should be the wards of the state, but a greater number are opposed to it. Just what will be is a matter that the people of that time must decide. However that may be, the regulation and rearing of children is no essential part of Socialism, and that will depend in the future, as it has in the past, on the will of the elder generation. The probability is that both the social organization and the parents of children will have a part in the control of the young. That is the case today, since the state requires a certain amount of attendance at school from each child, and imposes other requirements which even the parents cannot set aside. Certain opponents of Socialism are very busy creating the impression that under Socialism all children would be taken away from their parents and placed in charge of official nurses. It is so ridiculous as to scarcely merit attention because the Socialist party has never so much as intimated adherence to such ideas, which originated in the imaginations of our opponents.

I am told by a Roman Catholic priest that Socialism would be a blight on children because it would deprive them of the fatherly and motherly care needed by them in their tender years.

That assertion, which is often made by persons of
that profession, is inspired more by hatred of Socialism than by love of children. It is only one of a series of objections by means of which it is hoped to prejudice the thoughtless and prevent their investigating and learning what Socialism really is. Such protestations of concern for the welfare of mothers and children from those who themselves refuse to marry and assume the responsibilities of husband and father can be regarded only as a joke by all who have the least sense of humor. Of course, there are people who will believe such silly assertions just as there are people who will believe anything handed down to them by those whom they are trained to look upon as their superiors, but the people who take their opinions on politics and other matters second-handed are not usually intelligent enough to understand Socialism or independent enough to stand up for their own interests and help establish the Co-operative Commonwealth. Children under Socialism would receive more parental care than they now do for the simple reason that their parents would be the better prepared to give it.

Are Socialists opposed to law and order?

Socialists are opposed to some laws and to some kinds of order. They are opposed to laws which favor the rich at the expense of the poor. They are opposed to that kind of order which requires militia rifles and policemen’s clubs to keep the hungry in subjection to a class of idle drones. But we are not opposed to all law and order, because we seek to establish an orderly system of society by means of law. If, as our reckless opponents so often assert, we were intent on nothing but destruction and overthrow of all law and order, how could we hope to establish or maintain the Co-operative Commonwealth which is the Socialist’s ideal? When we see the laws so perverted that a poor man is sent to the penitentiary for stealing something to keep him from starving, and a rich man is sent to the United States senate for stealing a railroad, we do not hesitate to say that we are opposed to that kind of law,
if it can be called law. We are opposed to that kind of order which carefully keeps the streets clear of Socialist speakers and working-class demonstrations but carefully encourages and protects the fakir of so-called patent medicines who occupies and obstructs the same streets for the express and understood purpose of selling worthless dope. Socialists are opposed to outlaws and disorder.

How would the Socialists make laws if they were in power?

By any means that would faithfully register the will of the majority on the statute books. And it might be added that Socialists would have such laws enforced without interference of dead men's decisions or precedents handed down from the past. We have enough faith in the people living on earth today to believe that they are competent to govern themselves, but we do not think them competent to govern the people who are to live after them. We are today ruled by laws that had their beginning in the decrees of half-civilized Roman aristocrats. It is through these remnants of old laws and customs that many privileges of the ruling class are retained to the discomfort and oppression of those who toil. Because of popular stupidity this country now maintains nine learned judges, appointed for life, empowered to set aside or mutilate in any way they may see fit any legislative or congressional act hostile to them or to the aristocratic class to which they owe their position. While not qualified to predict all the details of the proposed society it can safely be asserted that when Socialists make laws it will be so done that no supreme court or any other court can set them aside and thereby annul the will of the voting majority. Under Socialism the majority will make the laws and make them so they will stay made until unmade by the same power.

What is Direct Legislation?

Direct legislation is law-making directly by the people who are to be governed by the law. The Initiative
is one feature of direct legislation by which a reason-
able number of people of a municipality, state or na-
tion can, by petition, cause a proposed law to be sub-
mitted to popular vote for adoption or rejection. The
Referendum is that feature of direct legislation by
which all proposed laws may be referred back to the
voters for their approval or disapproval. The opera-
tion of direct legislation means virtually the abolition
of representative government, since the majority will
have the power to pass on every law by which they are
governed, and also the power to initiate such new laws
or acts to repeal or amend old laws as they may wish.
Direct legislation may, however, be in full force and
operation together with some sort of law-making com-
mittee similar to congress, legislatures or boards of
aldermen; but all the acts of such bodies would be re-
ferable to the voters if demanded. Socialists favor di-
rect legislation, not because it will solve all or any of
the problems that confront the world in general and
the working class in particular, but because when es-
tablished it will afford a better means of getting and
using political power by the working class.

What is the Imperative Mandate?
The Imperative Mandate is a provision which, when
adopted, would make it possible for the constituency
of any official to demand and secure an election for the
office held by him; in which, if his acts had been such
as to render him an undesirable incumbent of the office,
another could be elected in his stead and he deposed.
In short, it would enable the voters, at any time a suf-
cient number felt aggrieved at or dissatisfied with the
official conduct of an office holder, to have him placed
on trial before the entire community and exonerated or
ousted as the majority would decide. Its effect is to
make the officer holding under it directly responsible
at all times to the people who elect him. The logical
outcome of its operation would be that officers would
not likely be elected for a given period, but would
simply be elected to the office and put to work with the
understanding that they would remain so long as satisfactory to the electors, and that when unsatisfactory they would have to go. It would be a very bad thing for the professional politician, but good, so far as it goes, for everybody else.

Are Socialism and anarchism the same? If not, what is the difference?

The difference between Socialism and anarchism is fundamental. The Socialist and the anarchist each have an ideal, each has his own conception of a new society which is desirable to him and which he seeks to establish in place of the present regime. But the respective ideals of the Socialist and of the anarchist differ as much as two ideals could differ. The Socialist would extend government to include industry as well as politics, while the anarchist would abolish even political government. Socialism is the flower of co-operation, while anarchism is individualism gone to seed. The anarchist is by no means so wicked and bloodthirsty a character as certain of the so-called “respectable element” would have us believe, but, to a Socialist, anarchism is the height of folly. Socialism is not only an ideal. In addition to its idea of a better social system it offers a scientific analysis of the present system with a program for the transition from the old to the new. But anarchism rests on the assumption that because the governments of the past and present have been oppressive, all governments must be so and the only relief lies in the abolition of all government. Socialists contend that it is the class character of past and present governments that has made them oppressive to the subjected non-ruling class. We maintain that the working class is to get its own by organizing as a political party and capturing the power which it can do by class-conscious political action. In short, the Socialist is for the extension and perfection of government, while the anarchist is for the abolition of all government. All people who have taken the least pains to investigate know this to be a fact, but the cheap politician, whose stock in trade consists
principal in epithets and catch-words, with equal facility calls Socialists anarchists and call anarchists murderers and assassins. It would be more legal to refer to capitalists as assassins and bomb throwers, for we know that capitalist governments expend fabulous sums in the manufacture of machines, called cannon, with which to throw bombs and engage in wars for the sake of commercial prestige that amounts to nothing less than wholesale murder both of their own people and of the enemy. The continuous rule of the capitalist class depends largely upon the prejudice and confusion that can be thrown upon and around words with which most people are unfamiliar. If they can make you shudder whenever you hear the word anarchist, and can then make you believe that all Socialists are anarchists, they hope by so doing to keep on practicing the worst form of anarchy under the seductive title and disguising it with a cloak of "law and order."

But it is said that Socialism is a stepping stone to anarchy, and that an anarchist is no more than a radical Socialist.

It is true that they say such things, and more. It is also true that some individuals get a grudge at everybody and everything in general and imagine themselves Socialists merely because the Socialists are active in their protests against existing conditions. It is likely that such characters as these soon get sore on Socialism, as they are at everything else, and become anarchists either in reality or in their imagination. But these instances are exceptional rather than numerous. The principles of Scientific Socialism and philosophical anarchy are so radically opposed to each other that it is inconceivable how an intelligent person who really believes in one could pass to the other without a mental cataclysm, such as seldom happens without a collapse of the mind. People who wish to know the truth, the truth about Socialism especially, would do well to take what "they say" with a grain of salt, and go to reliable sources for their information. You would not go to Satan for a true
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A statement of the principles of Christianity, or to a democrat for a faithful exposition of what the republican party advocates. To learn what Socialism stands for, read the national platform of the Socialist party.

Is the red flag a symbol of Socialism or anarchism?

No, it has a monopoly on the red flag. For ages it has been the banner of labor, the insignia of the working class, both on the battlefield and in the peaceful pursuits of industry. Socialists use the red flag not because of any proprietary interest held by them in this emblem, but because Socialism is a working-class movement, and naturally marches under the colors of the class of which it is the political representative. The crimson banner is the flag of the working-class not because of any formal adoption, but because it has been used by the proletariat of practically all lands. Anarchists have used the red flag on the plea that they are agitating in behalf of the oppressed; but the aristocrats have also used the red flag at times to gain favor with the class to which it was dear. It is told that the Roman generals, after they had admitted the proletariat to their army, were in the habit of throwing a red flag into the ranks of the enemy with the result that their proletarian troops would wage the fight with renewed ferocity in order to recover their colors. An extensive history of the red flag is to be found in "The Ancient Lowly," by Osborni Ward. It is also interesting to note that red predominates in the tri-colored flag of the United States.

Why do so many confuse Socialism with anarchism?

Because of their ignorance and the teachings of the ruling class, which labor assiduously through the press, through the pulpit, and other means of reaching the people, to confuse the ideas of their subjects concerning everything that has of consequence to them in the struggle between the classes. Though anarchism and its supporters have never been strong enough
to threaten capitalism, they have been of remarkable utility to the capitalists as a bugbear and terror. The anarchist has long been a startling spook and a gruesome goblin, and his alleged philosophy, as well as his propaganda of the deed, fine material for feature articles for newspapers. His name, under the circumstances, also furnished an epithet which has been used to advantage in frightening timid people away from anything or anybody to whom it might be applied. All this confusion and fear is of material advantage to those who so diligently propagate it, so it is not to be wondered that it is so common among those who have had no opportunity to have illusion dispelled while seeing Socialism and anarchy linked together on every possible occasion in the headlines of the press.

What would be the erect of Socialism on fine art? Would it not make people indifferent to the finer products of hand and brain?

John Ruskin, who was perhaps the greatest art critic of the nineteenth century and certainly the most analytical of all modern critics, said that fine art is the expression of the workingman’s joy in his work. Ruskin emphasizes the assertion that fine art cannot be produced for wages, but only for the gratification of the producer. It, therefore, follows that so long as things are generally made for the sole purpose of selling or for the wages paid the labor by which they are made, fine art is so nearly impossible as to be exceptional. It is only when men who are not ashamed to work have the leisure to expend their genius without any thought to pay for the effort so put forth that they will do their best work. They will then have their heart, as well as their hands, in their work; and the results will correspond with the higher incentive. Socialism would make it possible for all to obtain the necessities of life with comparative little time and effort, and the effect of this would be to leave the artist with much time, and not distressed by want, to do the things he would like to
do and produce the things that delight as well as satisfy.

What do Socialists mean by The Revolution?

By the social revolution they mean the overthrow of capitalist class rule and the domination of politics and industry by the working class, which would then cease to be a class because it would comprise all. A revolution is a turning around, and a social revolution is a turning round of society so that a hitherto ruling class is deposed and a previously subject class becomes dominant. The triumph of the working class would mark the last of the social revolutions because the workers are the last class in economic subjection. Their victory will not only overthrow the rule of the capitalist class, but will abolish all classes, because the existence of classes presupposes one class in power and one or more classes under that power. The end of the social revolutions means, therefore, the end of the class struggle and of all the strife that grows out of the economic advantage of one social division over another. The Socialists are revolutionary because the social revolution is the end and ultimate purpose of their propaganda and effort. They differ from the various reformers in that the reformer never proposes the overthrow of the ruling class. Reformers confine their efforts to measures by which they hope to improve conditions without removing the present masters from supreme power.

Can the revolution take place without violence?

Violence is not a necessary part of revolution, so we are safe in saying that the revolution can take place peacefully, though no one knows what may happen. When the unemployed of modern cities cannot so much as peacefully assemble to confer and declare their need without being attacked by the police of the ruling class, and when the present ruling power, which prides itself upon its devotion to law and order, cannot so much as conduct a general election without some one being killed, there is little to base prophecies
of peace upon when the blessed privileges of the man on top are not only threatened, but are actually being taken from him. It all depends upon how those now in the saddle conduct themselves when they see their advantage over the man who labors slipping away. If they make good their professions of loyalty to law and obedience to the will of the majority, the change may come without so much as a ripple on the surface; but if the masters of the wage slaves refuse to abide by the will of the majority, as the masters of the chattel slaves did when Lincoln was elected, it will be necessary to make them behave even if it requires the use of a shillelah.

But can't the change be brought about by means of a revolution in the hearts of the people?

That is the only way it ever can be brought about; but revolutions of the heart never moved a nation unless founded on a material revolution. Where a man's treasure is, there will his heart be. The treasure of the present ruling class is in their property and the power it gives them over the propertyless. For this they live and struggle and even commit crimes against both their victims and themselves. To bring about a revolution in the hearts of these people that would cause them to let go of their graft would be to do the impossible thing of producing a necessary cause by means of an effect. The capitalists themselves are bringing about a change of heart on the part of the workers by robbing and reducing them more and more to a state of economic dependence that threatens and sometimes accomplishes starvation. The notorious Taff-Vale decision in England and the Danbury hat case in this country are illustrations of how the capitalists through their courts work to their own material advantage and at the same time move the victims of those outrageous decisions to a change of heart. The change of heart is coming, but don't make the mistake of trying to put the cart before the horse.
If Socialism is a revolutionary movement why do Socialists favor the unions in their reform demands for shortened workdays, better wages, better working conditions, etc.?

The Socialists favor such measures as immediate demands because the agitation for them and their realization strengthens the working class for the greater contest to come, and educates them to some extent in organizing for and waging the fight for their emancipation. Every time the wage workers succeed in shortening their labor day they gain a material advantage over the capitalist class, inasmuch as the man who works eight hours a day is not exploited to the extent that he was when he worked nine hours. For the same reason we would favor a seven-hour day and a six-hour day until the capitalists' surplus labor time was reduced to the minimum and finally obliterated. We favor the increase of the workingman's wages until, if possible, his wages equal the value of his product. Though such an end is impossible so long as the capitalist system is in operation, every concession gained and every encroachment successfully resisted makes for the solidarity of the workers and correspondingly checks the aggressions of the economic enemy. These are reforms that directly affect the working class and are not to be classed with the middle-class reforms from which the workers have nothing to gain.

In what respect does the Socialist party organization differ from that of other parties?

In the first place, no one can become a member of the Socialist party until he or she has renounced all affiliation with and allegiance to all other political parties, and recognizes the class struggle as the basis of political action. The loyalty of each member is also tested by the required payment of dues, which are used to maintain and extend the organization and its propaganda. The Socialist party, unlike all other parties, is international, and maintains an international bureau at Brussels, Belgium. The national organization is also permanent and maintains present headquarters at Chicago, a state organization in each or-
ganized state and territory and local organizations composed of five or more members wherever that number can be brought together. Its candidates are nominated and its platforms adopted by referendum vote, which places the affairs of the party in the control of the membership and reduces the influence of aspiring would-be leaders to the minimum. Wherever individuals wish to join the party and cannot secure enough members to form a local, they can join as members at large, of their state if it is organized, and if it is not, they may join as members at large through the national office. All Socialists should be members of the party.

But can't Socialists talk and vote and work for the cause without being members of the party?

Yes; but without being party members they can do none of these things as they should, and without membership they can have no part in the nomination of a Socialist ticket, which is of even greater importance than voting for it when nominated. The party is necessary to the propaganda, to the work in politics and to the education of its members. This education consists not only in learning the history of the labor movement and the economics and philosophy of Socialism, but in, what is of equal or superior importance, the experience gained by the workers in doing things co-operatively as they must do when Socialism becomes a reality. The importance of every Socialist being a party member cannot be overestimated or emphasized too much. What you learn from books or papers concerning the work of overthrowing the capitalist system and building the Cooperative Commonwealth amounts to nothing compared with the practical work that the members must take up and carry forward in the little groups that form the various local organizations and in the aggregated locals as state and national bodies. Join the party at the earliest opportunity and help the party that it may the better help you.
But why should we pay dues? Is this not a serious burden on many who are really unable to make a sacrifice?

It is a historical fact that the character of all organizations is determined by the nature of their economic support. Were the Socialist party supported by the office-seekers or by contributors who could afford to pay large sums for the privilege, the workers would have no more to say concerning its policies than do those workers who vote capitalist tickets and thereby support policies that are to their detriment. The members pay dues so they can control the party, and keep professional politicians out of it. It certainly is a burden and a sacrifice to pay the dues as well as to do much of the other work incidental to the progress of the movement, but nothing worth having can be had without in some way paying for it. The man who thinks that he is to be wafted through the portals of the Co-operative Commonwealth on flowery beds of ease is as seriously mistaken as he was when giving his vote to the masters to perpetuate their power. If you earnestly desire the triumph of the working class you should regard it as a privilege that you are able to do your part though it be hard to do. Those who have not enough interest in the movement to do as much could not safely be trusted to direct it, as every member of the party does.
Human life depends upon food, clothing and shelter. Only with these assured are freedom, culture and higher human development possible. To produce food, clothing, or shelter, land and machinery are needed. Land alone does not satisfy human needs. Human labor creates machinery and applies it to the land for the production of raw materials and food. Whoever has control of land and machinery controls human labor, and with it human life and liberty.

To-day the machinery and the land used for industrial purposes are owned by a rapidly decreasing minority. So long as machinery is simple and easily handled by one man, its owner cannot dominate the sources of life of others. But when machinery becomes more complex and expensive, and requires the organized effort of many workers, its influence reaches over wide circles of life. The owners of such machinery become the dominant class.

In proportion as the number of such machine owners compared to all other classes decreases, their power in the nation and in the world increases. They bring ever larger masses of working people under their control, reducing them to the point where muscle and brain are their only productive property. Millions of formerly self-employing workers thus become the helpless wage slaves of industrial masters.

As the economic power of the ruling class grows it becomes less useful in the life of the nation. All the useful work of the nation falls upon the shoulders of the class whose only property is its manual and mental
labor power—the wage worker—or of the class who have but little land and little effective machinery outside of their labor power—the small traders and small farmers. The ruling minority is steadily becoming useless and parasitic.

A bitter struggle over the division of the products of labor is waged between the exploiting propertied classes on the one hand and the exploited propertyless class on the other. In this struggle the wage working class cannot expect adequate relief from any reform of the present order at the hands of the dominant class.

The wage workers are therefore the most determined and irreconcilable antagonists of the ruling class. They suffer most from the curse of class rule. The fact that a few capitalists are permitted to control all the country's industrial resources and social tools for their individual profit, and to make the production of the necessaries of life the object of competitive private enterprise and speculation is at the bottom of all the social evils of our time.

In spite of the organization of trusts, pools and combinations, the capitalists are powerless to regulate production for social ends. Industries are largely conducted in a planless manner. Through periods of feverish activity the strength and health of the workers are mercilessly used up, and during periods of enforced idleness the workers are frequently reduced to starvation.

The climaxes of this system of production are the regularly recurring industrial depressions and crises which paralyze the nation every fifteen or twenty years.

The capitalist class, in its mad race for profits, is bound to exploit the workers to the very limit of their endurance and to sacrifice their physical, moral and mental welfare to its own insatiable greed. Capitalism keeps the masses of workingmen in poverty, destitution, physical exhaustion and ignorance. It drags their wives from their homes to the mill and factory. It snatches their children from the playgrounds and
schools and grinds their slender bodies and unformed minds into cold dollars. It disfigures, maims and kills hundreds of thousands of workingmen annually in mines, on railroads and in factories. It drives millions of workers into the ranks of the unemployed and forces large numbers of them into beggary, vagrancy and all forms of crime and vice.

To maintain their rule over their fellow men, the capitalists must keep in their pay all organs of the public powers, public mind and public conscience. They control the dominant parties and, through them, the elected public officials. They select the executives, bribe the legislatures and corrupt the courts of justice. They own and censor the press. They dominate the educational institutions. They own the nation politically and intellectually just as they own it industrially.

The struggle between wage workers and capitalists grows ever fiercer, and has now become the only vital issue before the American people. The wage-working class, therefore, has the most direct interest in abolishing the capitalist system. But in abolishing the present system, the workingmen will free not only their own class, but also all other classes of modern society: The small farmer, who is to-day exploited by large capital more indirectly but not less effectively than is the wage laborer; the small manufacturer and trader, who is engaged in a desperate and losing struggle for economic independence in the face of the all-conquering power of concentrated capital; and even the capitalist himself, who is the slave of his wealth rather than its master. The struggle of the working class against the capitalist class, while it is a class struggle, is thus at the same time a struggle for the abolition of all classes and class privileges.

The private ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation, is the rock upon which class rule is built, political government is its indispensable instrument. The wage-workers cannot be freed from exploitation without conquering the political power and substituting collective for private
ownership of the land and means of production used for exploitation.

The basis for such transformation is rapidly developing within present capitalist society. The factory system, with its complex machinery and minute division of labor, is rapidly destroying all vestiges of individual production in manufacture. Modern production is already very largely a collective and social process. The great trusts and monopolies which have sprung up in recent years have organized the work and management of the principal industries on a national scale, and have fitted them for collective use and operation.

The Socialist Party is primarily an economic and political movement. It is not concerned with matters of religious belief.

In the struggle for freedom the interests of all modern workers are identical. The struggle is not only national but international. It embraces the world and will be carried to ultimate victory by the united workers of the world.

To unite the workers of the nation and their allies and sympathizers of all other classes to this end, is the mission of the Socialist Party. In this battle for freedom the Socialist Party does not strive to substitute working class rule for capitalist class rule, but by working class victory, to free all humanity from class rule and to realize the international brotherhood of man.
SOCIALIST PERIODICALS

The International Socialist Review is the greatest Socialist monthly in the world, and is the only illustrated magazine that is of, by and for the working class. Every month it publishes articles telling of the recent events that most vitally affect wage-workers, together with photographs from the scene of action. Circulation doubled twice within two years. Ten cents a copy; $1.00 a year. To Canada, $1.20 a year; to other countries, $1.36.

The Chicago Daily Socialist gives six times a week the real news that the capitalist dailies suppress, $3.00 a year, $1.00 for four months. For sample copy address Workers' Publishing Society, 180 Washington street, Chicago.

The Appeal to Reason is the greatest Socialist weekly in the world. It has half a million circulation and is steadily climbing toward a million. For sample copy address J. A. Wayland, Girard, Kansas.

Three for the Price of One. For $3.00 we will mail to any address in the United States the Review a year, the Daily a year, and the Appeal forty weeks. We do not receive subscriptions for the Daily or Appeal to foreign countries.

CHARLES H. KERR & COMPANY
118 West Kinzie Street, Chicago.
The International
Socialist Review

is now the largest and best socialist magazine in any language or country. It is the only illustrated magazine that is of, by and for the working class. Each month it gives the latest news of the Class Struggle from all over the world, with vivid photographs from each new scene of action. Not a dull page in the whole magazine. The ablest writers in the organized socialist movement are among its contributors. Editorialy it stands for a clear, uncompromising working-class movement, both at the polls and in the shops. Monthly, $1.00 a year, 10 cents copy. Some news dealers sell it, but the safe and sure way to get each issue promptly is to use the blank below.
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