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PREFACE

In 1912 I wrote a series of articles for the Metropolitan Magazine in which I endeavored to set forth the main aims, methods and achievements of the Socialist movement in concise form and simple language, as an exposition for the unitiated and an introduction to a more thorough study of the subject. The articles were subsequently reprinted as a booklet under the title "Socialism Summed Up," which has gone through several large editions. Recently I was asked by the National Campaign Committee of the Socialist Party to revise the text of the booklet with a view of bringing the subject down to date.

I found the task well nigh impossible. The Socialist movement to-day is not the movement that it was in 1912. The world war and the great political and social revolutions which have followed in its wake have not altered the fundamental program and philosophy of international Socialism, but they have introduced a number of new questions of theory and problems of method and tactics. They have radically changed the physical aspects of the movement. The portions of the old booklet which dealt with the Socialist criticism of the present social order and with the ultimate aims of the Socialist movement have been retained with substantial revisions of the text, but the chapters on the extent, practical policies and concrete achievements of modern Socialism have been entirely rewritten, and a new chapter has been added on the experiments, accomplishments, and prospects of Soviet Russia.

The booklet here presented is thus practically new and the subject matter of its treatment, as much as possisible within its limited scope, up to date. It was to emphasize this feature that the new title, "Present-Day Socialism," has been adopted.

MORRIS HILLQUIT.

September 15, 1920.
C

CHARLES THE FIFTH once said that the sun never set on his empire. We Socialists may apply these words to our movement, and say that the sun never sets on the countries in which the red banner floats.”

With these words the eloquent Belgian Socialist, Emile Vandervelde, opened the International Socialist Congress held in Stuttgart in 1907. It was not an empty boast. Even before the war the Socialist movement was as wide as the world. In Europe its power was felt alike in the highly civilized central and northern countries, in autocratic Russia, in apathetic Spain and in the backward Balkan kingdoms. The "red specter" had invaded the Celestial empire, Persia and Japan; Transvaal and the Australian colonies; the South American republics and the Dominion of Canada.

In Great Britain the new doctrine was rapidly winning over the masses of the workers; in the United States it was fast establishing itself as a permanent political factor.

The gospel of Socialism was preached in more than sixty tongues. Its creed was accepted by thirty million persons.

The collapse of the old system as a result of the world war has infinitely increased the sweep and strength of the Socialist movement. In Russia and Sweden, in Germany, Austria and Czecko-Slovakia Socialism is the predominating political creed. The great issues in these countries are no longer between Socialism and Capitalism, but between contending methods of establishing the Socialist order. In Italy, Belgium and France; in the newly created border states of Russia as in Yugo-Slovakia Socialism is challenging the rule of the possessing classes; in all other advanced
countries of Europe, America and Australia it has attained a position of social and political importance.

A movement of such magnitude and universality obviously did not spring up without a cause, or grow without a historical purpose. To quell it by force is impossible. To ignore it is folly. It must be faced. It should be understood.

And Socialism can be understood very readily. Despite all assertions to the contrary, the mainsprings of the movement are quite obvious, its philosophy is exceedingly simple and its program is very definite.
Present-Day Socialism

CHAPTER I

The Causes That Make for Socialism

Socialism is distinctly a modern movement. Contrary to prevailing notions, it has no connection, historical or intellectual, with the Utopias of Plato or More, or with the practices of the communistic sects of former ages.

The Socialist movement was called into life by economic conditions which have developed within very recent times.

Its program is an attempted solution of the problems inherent in these conditions.

The cardinal demand of Socialism is the abolition of private ownership in the vital sources and instruments of wealth production, and there was practically no physical basis and no rational justification for such a demand before about the beginning of the nineteenth century.

As an illustration, we may take the economic condition of the United States in the early days of the republic. The main industry of the country was agriculture, and land was plentiful and accessible to all. The mechanical arts and crafts were practised on a small scale, and on the basis of individual effort and use. Such tools as there were, were in the main hand tools, simple and inexpensive. The old-time mechanic could readily acquire them and ply his trade in his home or small workshop. It was not capital, but skill
and knowledge that the worker required. As a rule, the apprentice or helper was not in a position of permanent dependence upon his employer. He was a pupil learning the trade from the "master," and as soon as he was equipped for the task, he could set up in business as an independent producer. His tool was his own, his skill was his own, and the finished product was his own in the moral as well as in the legal sense of the term. He relied on his individual efforts for his living. He had the means for earning his living always ready at hand. It is obvious that under such conditions no advantage could be gained from socializing the tool or from national or collective operation of the industries.

But within the last generations a silent revolution has taken place in our methods of producing and distributing wealth. The simple tool of the old-time mechanic has gradually evolved into the modern machine of wonderful complexity and gigantic dimensions, propelled by steam or electricity, and oftentimes doing the work of hundreds of human hands. The modest workshop of our grandparents has grown into the immense modern factory under whose roof hundreds, sometimes thousands of workers are congregated for joint labor. Mass production, division of labor and specialization of functions have largely superseded individual effort, general efficiency and acquired skill in industry. The impersonal "market" has replaced the specific "customer." Production has become social in character, methods and object.

This economic evolution has brought about a most thoroughgoing change in the social conditions and relations of the people.

For the first time in history free producers found themselves divorced from the tools of their labor. The modern worker cannot revert to the simple tool of his forefathers. He must have access to the up-to-date plants, machinery and equipment. His entire social usefulness depends on that machinery. Without it he is an industrial cripple. But the individual worker cannot own the modern machine,
and the workers collectively do not own it. The machines, factories and plants, the land, mines and railroads—in brief, all the modern sources and instruments of wealth production are owned and controlled by a class of persons other than the workers.

The most gruesome picture of physical and mental torture ever evolved by the human brain is probably the familiar fable of Tantalus. The victim of divine wrath stands in water up to his chin with the choicest fruit hanging over his head. He is maddened with thirst and hunger. He eagerly bends his parched lips to the cool and sweet water around him and stretches his trembling hand for the luscious fruit temptingly dangling before his eyes. But the water always recedes, the fruit always retreats, and Tantalus is left to starve amid plenty.

The morbid imagination of Greek antiquity has become a social and economic fact in modern America. Our country abounds with natural wealth. Millions of workers yearn for the necessaries of life. The material for the production of these necessaries is right around them. They are eager to make their food and clothing with their own toil. They have the requisite skill and ability. But between them and their living stands the modern tool, the key to all wealth, and behind the tool stands the capitalist owner, with power to withhold its use from the people. In normal times about two million workers in this country are denied the right to work, and in times of acute industrial depression the number of "unemployed" mounts to five millions or more. Yet all that time the people need food and commodities, and are ready to produce them, and all that time the land abounds with raw material waiting for the magic touch of labor to be turned into consumable products. Our economic system condemns the worker to suffering and privation amid wealth and affluence.

With the loss of their tools the workers have lost their economic independence. They work and they live or they idle and starve according to the convenience of the powerful tool-owners. The reward of their industry is at best a mere
subsistence wage. The fruits of their labor go largely to the possessor of the productive capital as an involuntary tax or license fee.

Thus modern society is split into two principal economic groups or classes: the users of the machinery of production, who do not own it, and the owners, who do not use it; the employers and the employees, the capitalists and the workers, those who derive their income from "profits" and those who depend for their living on "wages." The classes are not fixed by law, but they are determined just as effectively by economic position, and as the modern industrial system is unfolding, they tend to become permanent and even hereditary. A lucky workingman or clerk may still be lifted into the coveted realms of wealth and power, but the probabilities of such a rise are not much greater than the proverbial chances of each soldier in the Napoleonic army to be advanced to the rank of field marshal. The vast mass of wage-earners are doomed to wage work for life, and their children are predestined industrial workers. And similarly capitalism is rapidly becoming a hereditary status. The "self-made man," the pioneer of a new industry, is passing away. Modern wealth is largely in the hands of second or third generations. The gay heir who squanders his fortune and is reduced to the original poverty of his grandsires, becomes rarer, as the fortunes of the individual capitalists grow in bulk, and corporate management supersedes individual initiative.

It is not contended that the entire population is definitely divided into the two classes mentioned. There are, of course, the more or less indefinite and undefinable economic groups, generally designated as the "middle classes," with all shades of special interests, but the main factors in modern industrial life are clearly represented by the two most pronounced types or classes—the capitalists and the wage-earners, the latter comprising all grades of hired manual and mental workers.

And there is war between and among the classes. War, sometimes overt and violent, sometimes concealed and even
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unconscious, but war nevertheless. The war is all the more intense and irrepressible because it springs not from personal hostility or accidental misunderstandings, but from ever-present basic economic antagonism.

There is war between employer and employee.

The employer is in business for profits. Industrial profits come from the work of the hired hand. The employee works for wages. Wages represent the product of his labor after deduction of the employer’s profit. The larger the share of the profit, the smaller that of the wages. The employer must strive to maintain or increase his profits under penalty of industrial extermination. His personal views and feelings cannot alter the situation. The employee must strive to maintain or increase his wages under pain of physical destruction. His personal inclinations do not count. Sometimes this antagonism of interests expresses itself in peaceful bargaining and haggling, and at other times it assumes the form of violent conflicts: strikes, boycotts and riots, and on the other hand lockouts, black lists, injunctions and jails.

There is war between employer and employer.

Under normal conditions of competition each capitalist controls a share of an industry. The greater the share, the larger his profit. His natural desire is to increase his share. He can do that easiest at the expense of his neighbor. Hence the mad industrial competition, the merciless rivalry for the “market,” the mutual underbidding and underselling, the adulteration and falsification of commodities, the senseless speculative enterprises, and finally, wholesale failure and ruin.

There is war between worker and worker.

Modern machinery, although inherently of untold blessing to mankind, operates as a curse upon the toiler under the prevailing system of individual ownership. It does not lighten his burdens. It does not reduce his hours of labor—it displaces him from his employment. The marvelous productivity of the machine creates legions of jobless workers,
fierce competition for a chance to work and consequent lowering of wages below the living standard.

The automatic, almost self-operating machine makes child- and woman labor possible and profitable, and the children and wives of the workers are drafted into the service of industry in competition with their fathers and husbands. The more women and children are at work in the factories, the rarer become the opportunities for men to find work and the lower become their wages. Child- and woman labor mean lower wages for men. Low wages for men mean more child- and woman labor, and so the workers move forever in a vicious circle of misery and privation.

There is war between producer and user.

Business is conducted for profits. The larger the prices of the commodity or the higher the charge for service, the greater is ordinarily the profit of the capitalist. Hence the everlasting quarrels between the seller and buyer, the landlord and tenant, the carrier and passenger: the inexorable “producer” and the pitiable “ultimate consumer.”

The individualistic and competitive system of industry is a system of general social warfare, and ugly, brutal fight of all against all. It is a mad, embittered race for wealth or bread without plan or system, without pity or mercy. It has produced the abnormal type of the multi-millionaire with a hoard of material wealth enough to last thousands of families for countless generations to come, and the children of the slums succumbing for lack of the barest necessities of life. It operates through periods of feverish activity during which men, women and even children of tender age are worked to exhaustion, and periods of inactivity and depression during which millions of willing workers are forced into idleness and starvation.

The social conflicts thus bred by the system of competitive capitalism are not confined within national bounds. As capitalism grows international it becomes fraught with danger to the peace of the world.

At a more advanced state of development every industrial country accumulates a “surplus” of commodities. The
workers cannot repurchase all they have produced because their total wages are less than the value of their total product. The capitalists are physically unable to consume the entire "surplus." Hence commodities must be exported to foreign countries.

When the natural resources and industrial enterprises of a modern country approach the point of full development and exploitation, its opportunities for attractive investments naturally contract, and the capitalists are forced to look to new and foreign countries for fields of remunerative investments.

The most advanced countries of Europe moreover are inadequately supplied with food and raw material to meet the demands of their dense industrial populations. They largely depend for such raw material and supplies on foreign sources.

In a world organized on the basis of competing national capitalistic groups, this situation inevitably leads to commercial struggles between the nations. Such struggles assume the form of rival efforts for the acquisition and extension of foreign colonies, and spheres of commercial and political influence. As the domain of the leading nations extends and the world's field of conquest narrows down, the conflicts for commercial supremacy grow more embittered and intense. They lead to the fatal policy of international intrigues, secret diplomacy, rival armaments and defensive and offensive alliance. They divide the world into hostile camps of national groups and ultimately provoke armed conflicts.

It was this system of capitalistic imperialism which was in the last analysis responsible for the tragic world war just closed.

The system of capitalist competition has not been without merit in the progress of civilization. It has organized industry, stimulated invention and increased human productivity. It has created vast wealth and evolved higher standards of life. It has introduced a world-wide identity of culture and civilization. It has played a most important and useful part in the history of human growth.
But sharing the fate of all other industrial systems, competition finally reaches a stage when its mission is accomplished, and its usefulness is outlived. Competition, which in its youth and vigor is "the life of trade," becomes in old age a plague and a nuisance. In the long run it demoralizes the industrial life of the nation and exhausts and ruins the competitors themselves. At that point competition begins to yield, gradually but surely, to a new industrial form—combination. Then arises the modern business corporations, followed by trade agreements and pools, and finally by trusts and national monopolies.

The trusts are not the invention of ingenious financial manipulators, nor are they accidental and preventable evils. They are the inevitable culmination of the process of capitalist development, the mature fruit of the system of industrial individualism. They represent a superior and more efficient method of industrial management than competition, just as the modern machine is a superior and more efficient medium of industrial operation than the antiquated hand-tool.

The trusts are a powerful factor in the industrial life of the nation, and they modify the social conditions of the country both for the better and the worse. As large consolidations of capital operating in unison over the area of an entire industry or a considerable part of it, they tend to eliminate much of the chaos and anarchy of the competitive system. They have the power to regulate the supply of commodities in accord with the demand, to curb waste and overproduction and to diminish the evil of periodical industrial depression and financial crisis.

But the beneficial features of the trusts are more than balanced by the new evils which they breed. The trusts, like all other modern industrial institutions, are primarily conducted for the profits of their individual owners and promoters. They are therefore afflicted with all the vices of private capitalist ownership and management, and their tremendous powers intensify the evils. The trusts have developed the art of overcapitalization to a most audacious and alarming extent. Billions of dollars of their watered "se-
" securities" are afloat in this country, and the workers pay an annual tribute of hundreds of millions to the holders of this paper, in the shape of interest and dividends. It is practically a blanket mortgage which the trusts thus hold on the people and upon the products of the toil of generations yet unborn.

The trusts are the most important and sometimes the sole employers of labor in their industries. Hence they have practically absolute power to dictate the terms of employment to their workers. Most trustified industries are characterized by long hours, miserable wages and general ill-treatment of the employees.

The trusts, as complete or practical monopolies, also have the power to arbitrarily fix the prices of commodities. In most trustified industries the prices of goods or charges for services have increased enormously notwithstanding the great economies in production. The trusts have largely contributed to the vexatious new problem familiarly and intimately known as "the high cost of living."

But more baneful even than the economic evils of the trusts are their corrupting effects on the public and political life of the country—their notorious influence on the old political parties, the government, legislatures and judiciary, and their control of the public press. The trusts are a most serious menace to democracy.

Thus capitalist management of the industries, both competitive and trustified, has produced most of the social maladies of our day and generation.

It has divided the people into classes with antagonistic economic interests and has bred national struggles and international wars.

It has placed inordinate wealth and power in the hands of the few, and has reduced the many to a state of drudgery and poverty.

It has cast out of the active industrial life of the nation large masses of willing and able workers and has driven them into shiftlessness, vice and crime.
It has brought uncertainty and misery to all classes of the people, and happiness to none.

The wage-earner is not the only one to suffer from the effects of capitalistic mismanagement.

For the small merchant or manufacturer, placed between the nether millstone of competition with his own kind and the upper millstone of powerful industrial combinations, business is an embittered and pitiful struggle. He fights hard to maintain his industrial independence, but it is a losing fight against the superior force of irresistible economic development. His doom is sealed. It is only a question of time when he will find his abiding place in the service of the trust or in the ranks of propertyless wage labor.

The precarious status of the small business man drives his sons and daughters in ever greater numbers into the liberal professions. The latter become congested, unregulated, uncertain and unremunerative. The professional classes have their armies of unemployed or partly unemployed often to the same extent as the wage-workers. The "intellectual proletarian" is not much better situated than the proletarian of the manual variety.

The farmer is dominated, controlled and exploited by the power of capitalism just as much as the other producing classes. By means of leases or mortgages, freight rates, elevator and storage charges and prices of monopolistically produced farm implements and machinery, the capitalists manage to appropriate the lion's share of his labor as effectively, though not quite as directly, as that of the hired factory hand.

And even the capitalist, the sole beneficiary of the modern industrial system, does not always lead a life of joy, leisure and mental repose. The active capitalist is driven by the system more than he is driving it. He is the slave as well as the master of his wealth.

No individual or class of individuals can be held responsible for this general social unhappiness. The average capitalist is inherently as good as the average worker. The average worker is by nature no better than the average
capitalist. The ills of our society are the direct and inevitable results of a system that allows one group of persons to own the tools which are indispensable to the lives of all persons, and thus makes the few the absolute masters of the many. So long as this system endures, no individual can escape from its toils. The industrial juggernaut places each man in his position and assigns to him his part. He toils or he loafs, he robs or is robbed, according to his place in the general industrial scheme. Moral sermons and abstract social ethics are helpless against this situation, and the political reformers who attempt to remove the effects of the baneful system without grasping its substance or attacking its foundation are ludicrously ineffective. The evil outgrowth of the capitalist system can only be cured by the removal of its main source and cause—the private ownership of the social tools of wealth production.

The operation of industries as a social function upon a rational and scientific basis is alone capable of doing away with the two greatest scourges of modern civilization—class war and poverty.

Class divisions have always existed in the recorded history of the human race. But advancing civilization has gradually abolished all privileges based on birth and caste, and it has been left to the capitalist system of production to evolve a new form of economic classes based on the relation to the ownership of the tools of production.

The Socialists do not exult in the existence of classes and class struggles, and do not "preach" class hatred. They merely point out the obvious fact of economic classes and class antagonism. It is no more reasonable to charge the "Socialist agitator" with fomenting class wars than it would be to hold the meteorologist responsible for storms. As a matter of fact, the Socialist movement is the only organized force in modern society which consciously seeks to abolish all class divisions and class struggles.

The dominant Socialist party of Russia (now known as the Communist Party) has established a political regime based upon the absolute and exclusive rule of the working
classes. This system, styled The Dictatorship of the Proletariat, has for a time been followed by the Communists of Hungary, and is advocated by some "extreme" groups of Socialists of the different countries of Europe and in America. Within the ranks of the Socialist movement at large opinion is sharply divided upon the issue of the Dictatorship of the Proletariat. But whether the principle is sound or unsound, or whether it is of general or special applicability, it is not incompatible with the Socialist ideal of a classless society. For neither the Russian Communists nor any other adherents of the "dictatorship," profess to see in it any more than a transitory and passing form of political organization, a sort of war measure in the Socialist struggle to abolish the capitalist system and to combat counter-revolutionary movements. With the disappearance of the idle exploiting classes and the transformation of the whole able-bodied and sound-minded population into useful workers, the rule of the workers will automatically become synonymous with the rule of the people; the "dictatorship" of the working class will yield to the democratic government of an equal and classless nation of productive men and women.

Poverty, as such, is of course also not a new and specifically capitalistic phenomenon. The poor have always been with us. But the poverty of former eras was an unavoidable evil due to the simple fact that man had not yet learned to produce a sufficient supply of necessaries by means of proper tools. Modern poverty is entirely artificial and wholly unnecessary. The marvelous growth of the productivity of labor within the last generations has enabled mankind for the first time in history to produce enough to satisfy all reasonable needs of all reasonable human beings. The mass-poverty of to-day is due solely to irrational and faulty industrial organization.
CHAPTER II

The Socialist Aim

The Socialists demand that the basic industries of the nation, the business of providing the necessaries of life, be conducted by the community for the benefit of its members.

The fundamental principle upon which society rests to-day is that wealth production is purely an individual function. Our industries are not organized by the people with a view to the needs of the community, but by individual capitalists for private profits. The enterprising captains of industry care little for the social value of the goods they produce. They will manufacture Bibles or guns, medicine or poison, ploughs or flying-machines, all according to the prospects of gain.

The fact that more than one hundred millions of their fellow-beings in this country need food, clothing, houses, furniture, heat, light, books, amusement and means of transportation and communication to maintain themselves in health and comfort, means nothing to them in itself—it is merely their opportunity to extract profits.

Socialism would substitute the prevailing method of private enterprise for individual profit by a system of social production for collective use.

We would not leave our political destinies in the hands of an oligarchy with power to use the government of the United States for their individual ends without regard to the popular will or public needs, but that is precisely what we are doing with our more vital economic interests.
As democracy means political self-government, so Socialism stands for industrial self-government.

Stated in more concrete terms, the Socialist program calls for the public or collective ownership and operation of the principal instruments and agencies for the production and distribution of wealth—the land, mines, railroads, steamboats, telegraph and telephone lines, mills, banks, factories and modern machinery.

This is the main program of the whole Socialist movement and the political creed of all Socialists. It is the unfailing test of Socialist conformity, and admits of no limitation or variation. Whoever accepts this program is a Socialist, whoever does not, is not.

Socialists may differ in their general social conceptions. They may come to the Socialist ideal by various roads. They may disagree with each other on questions of method or policy. But they are all in accord on the main object of the movement. The common taunt about the "numerous varieties of Socialism" springs from a superficial knowledge of the Socialist philosophy. As a matter of fact, no political party has ever advanced a social program as definite, consistent and uniform as that of international Socialism.

But simple as is the Socialist program, it signifies a revolution in our industrial life and social relations. It advocates a new order. Hence it is bound to be misrepresented by the beneficiaries of the present régime and misunderstood by the conservative multitude.

A closer analysis of the definition as here formulated will help to dispel some of the most common misconceptions.

As has been stated, Socialism demands the collective ownership of the instruments of wealth production. This demand is often translated by the critics of the movement into the unceremonious formula: "Socialism stands for a division of wealth." The chancellor of one of our metropolitan universities not very long ago spent his vacation on the other side of the Atlantic, and on that occasion was received
in audience by King Haakon, then just called to the newly created or vacated throne of Norway. On his return to this country the learned chancellor in a published interview expressed his admiration of the intelligence and sound common sense of the young ruler. As evidence of these commendable qualities the professor related the following conversation between himself and his majesty (I quote from memory): “What progress is Socialism making in your country?” inquired the American savant. “Oh, it is growing some,” observed the king, “but it is not a serious menace. Socialism is bound to fail because of the utter silliness of its program. Suppose we should to-day divide the wealth of Norway equally among all inhabitants. An hour after the process a new baby is born. What then? Should we proceed to a new redistribution, or should the baby be left entirely destitute?” Both his majesty and our chancellor agreed that Socialism put the baby, and the baby put Socialism into a most awkward predicament. By one simple hypothesis two great minds had once more destroyed a Socialist ghost of their own creation to the entire satisfaction of themselves.

Socialism, of course, does not advocate a division of wealth. The Socialist program does not deal with consumable wealth, but with productive wealth; it does not assail wealth as a means of private enjoyment, but as an instrument of social oppression and exploitation. The Socialist would socialize the tools of production, not the products.

They view with placid indifference the private ownership of dwelling houses and gowns, automobiles and yachts. They do not even covet the innocent individual tool, and do not reach out an avaricious hand for the artist’s paint brush or the housewife’s needle or sewing machine. What they object to is the individual ownership of social instruments of work, the sources or implements of general wealth, operated by the masses, producing goods for the “market,” and indispensable to the life and well-being of society as a whole.

And even within this restricted area the Socialist plan
is not one of division or distribution, but, on the contrary, one of common and undivided ownership. The principle may be illustrated by comparison with the functions and character of our public streets. The streets are the common or public property of our cities. They are laid out, paved and repaired at public expense. They are maintained for our joint use and benefit. We all own them. But we do not divide up the cobblestones ratably among all citizens.

The common ownership of all property, consumable as well as productive, such as practiced by the early Christian communities, and many later-day sects and organizations, is a principle of Communism, which must be strictly distinguished from modern Socialism. The term Communism as applied to certain contemporaneous schools of Socialism, such as the Bolshevists of Russia and their followers in other countries is a misnomer. The infractions of the Soviet government upon the private possessions of the rich must be regarded in the light of a revolutionary measure. The Communists of Russia like the Western Socialists seek to establish a system of publicly owned industries; they do not advocate a community of consumable goods.

Similarly unfounded is the widespread notion that Socialism stands for equal reward of all labor. Socialism is opposed to the practice of allowing the idlers to appropriate part of the workers' product in the shape of profits. It demands that the total social product, after due allowance for social needs, go uncurtailed to all persons participating in the process of production by manual or mental labor. But it does not contemplate an equal distribution of the product among the individual workers. Socialism admits of reasonable variations in the scale of compensation based on the distinctions of effort, skill and needs.

Another source of persistent misinterpretation lurks in the term "public" or "collective" ownership as used in the formulation of the Socialist program. The superficial critics of the Socialist philosophy invariably identify that
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expression with "government ownership," and thence jump at the conclusion that the Socialists contemplate a state of society in which all industries of the country, large and small, will be operated and directed from one great national center. This is the origin and foundation of the bugaboo of "Socialist paternalism and tyranny."

Not so long ago, Mr. David M. Parry, one-time president of the National Manufacturers' Association, wrote a novel entitled "The Scarlet Empire," and mainly centering around a description of "the Socialist state" as the author conceived it. It is a repellent state. Governmental regulation is the rule in all private and public pursuits of the citizens. The government fixes the occupation of each person, prepares a uniform menu for all inhabitants from day to day, prescribes the fashion, cut and pattern of their dress, and regulates their routine of daily life, their religion, marriages and amusements. It is a reign of relentless tyranny, a life of insufferable uniformity and monotony. Mr. Parry had set himself the task of conjuring a picture of an order of society even more oppressive than the present régime, and he almost succeeded.

The book was intended as a satire on the Socialist ideal. If the genial author could only appreciate what a delightful satire he had unconsciously produced on the mental caliber of a certain class of critics of the Socialist philosophy!

Public ownership does not necessarily mean government ownership, and government ownership does not imply centralized administration. In the practical application of the Socialist scheme of industrial organization, it is quite conceivable that certain industries would be operated by the national government. Railroad systems, telegraph and telephone lines are inherently national in their functions, and many other industries are already organized on a country-wide scale and adjusted to centralized operations. To the latter class belong all great trustified industries. On the other hand, other important industries are purely local in their character, and
can best be administered by local governmental agencies. Street railways, water and gas works, for instance, must logically come within the purview of municipal governments, and numerous smaller industries may be conducted by local co-operative groups under appropriate rules and regulations. It is even conceivable that some callings may continue to be exercised in a purely individual way under a Socialist régime. There is no reason why the state should interfere with individual pursuits of arts and handicraft or with the farmer cultivating his farm without the employment of hired labor. What Socialism opposes is industrial exploitation of one man by another; what it advocates is social production rationally and democratically organized and conducted.

An illuminating analogy of such a scheme of organization is offered by the political framework of the government of the United States. Our laws are made and administered by "the government," but does that mean that the political administration of the country in all its divisions and subdivisions is lodged in the hands of one central authority? By no means. We have our federal statutes, our state laws, municipal ordinances and rules and regulations of subordinate local bodies, such as health boards, fire and police departments, etc. Each class of laws operates within its own proper sphere, and is administered by executive bodies or individuals elected or appointed and classified and graded according to their functions and places in the general administrative scheme. The political functions of the country are not entrusted to a power above the people and independent of them, nor are they regulated in all particulars and at all times by the direct action of all the people. Our government is neither intended to be bureaucracy nor a system of mob rule. It is designed as an organized democracy, which allows its affairs to be administered by appropriate general and local agencies, deriving their powers from the people and exercising them in conformity with their will. The official government furthermore is supplemented by a number of voluntary "quasi-official" insti-
tutions, philanthropic, educational, political, etc., whose powers and functions are as a rule regulated by law. We do not allow such voluntary institutions to exercise vital political powers affecting the rights of the citizens, but we do not interfere with their self-imposed social tasks so long as they only concern those who choose to come within the sphere of their operations. The Socialists demand that our industrial affairs be reorganized on similar principles.

It is quite conceivable and even probable that our present machinery of government, devised for purely political purposes, would prove inadequate for the discharge of large economic functions. In that case it would either gradually modify its forms to meet the requirements of the new tasks or be supplemented by a co-ordinate system of industrial administration.

"But then the industries of the country would be controlled by the politicians and infested with graft and corruption," objects the ever-ready critic. The Socialists see no ground for such apprehension. The "professional politician," in the opprobrious sense of the term, as we know him to-day, is a person who seeks private economic advantages in public life and uses his political office or influence for the promotion of his own pecuniary profits or those of certain business interests behind him. Graft and corruption are the logical methods of such "statesmen."

Socialized industries would exclude large private business interests, and thus strike at the very root of professional politics for private gain, the main fountain-head of wholesale graft and corruption.

The Socialist program is thus primarily one of economic reform. It is not directly concerned with religious or domestic institutions, moral conceptions or intellectual problems. It does not "threaten the home" or "attack religion," and is not hostile to true modern culture. It advocates a definite plan of industrial reorganization and
is chargeable with all that is fairly inferable from that plan, but no more.

Socialism has for that reason sometimes been characterized as a grossly materialistic movement. It is anything but that. The Socialists appreciate very keenly all efficient political, social and moral reforms. But they expect such reforms to follow economic improvements as the effect follows the cause. The common ownership of the sources and instruments of wealth production would necessarily mean a more equitable distribution of wealth among the people and greater economic security for all human beings. It would do away with the mad competitive struggle for individual gain, and would remove the principal cause of civic and political corruption, crime, vice, brutality and ignorance. Just because the Socialist movement is based on a solid and sound economic foundation, it holds out a true social ideal.
CHAPTER III

The Trend of Social Development

In the Socialist conception economic systems and political institutions are not immutable forms. They are products of growth and subject to change. The present system of industry has not been consciously planned and devised by cunning capitalist minds. It has evolved from an older economic order by a series of imperceptible changes, accumulating steadily and irresistibly through several centuries. The feudal régime, which preceded the modern or capitalist order, had its economic root in agriculture, and was characterized by serfdom of labor and the rule of the land-owning nobles. Slowly and gradually commerce and manufacture grew up alongside of agriculture. The discovery of America and of a sea route to the Indies and the introduction and perfection of the mariner’s compass gave a tremendous impetus to navigation and trading, and trading stimulated manufacture. The growth of commerce and manufacture engendered a general search for labor-saving devices, and led to the era of epoch-making industrial inventions. The latter half of the eighteenth century witnessed the appearance of the first great mechanical devices in industry. Hargreave’s spinning jenny, Arkwright’s mill, Cartwright’s power-loom, Watt’s engine and Whitney’s cotton gin were all invented within the brief period of 1704-1792, and railways were in operation within the first quarter of the last century. These inventions in turn served to stimulate trade and manufacture. Factories were built and they lured the farm laborers. Cities
were founded and they attracted the rural population. Merchants and manufacturers amassed fortunes, and with material wealth came political power. Towards the beginning of the eighteenth century commerce and manufacture had grown to be serious rivals to agriculture. The traders and manufacturers, the incipient modern capitalists, engaged in a contest for political supremacy with the landed nobility. Towards the end of the century the great social conflict was fought out. Agriculture receded to the background, yielding the command of the economic world-forces to manufacture, commerce and finance. Feudalism was dethroned by triumphant capitalism. Government passed from the lord of the manor to the autocrat of the factory, shop and counting-room; from the aristocracy of birth to the aristocracy of the purse. With the passing of the old economic régime, its political counterpart, the feudal form of government, was discarded, and a new political dress, adjusted to the strong and growing limbs and the free and rapid movements of the young economic body, was devised. The countless miniature kingdoms and principalities were consolidated into large nations, following the transformation of the small workshops for local trade into big factories for national markets. Autocratic monarchies were supplanted by constitutional kingdoms or republics, as the absolute rule of the feudal lord in his domain yielded to the business contract in the new economic order. Courts and court cliques were succeeded by parliaments and chosen representatives, as the hereditary noble was replaced by the "self-made" man of affairs. The "will of the king," the basis of the feudal political order, was displaced by the controlling political principal of "democracy," reflecting the triumph of free competition in industry over the crystallized, localized forms of medieval agriculture and the absolute rule of the feudal lord in his domain.

Thus the modern or capitalist order of society, economic, political and social evolved gradually within the loins of the feudal order, and is in turn bound to give
birth to a new social order. For every economic or social system of society is good only for limited time. History assigns a certain rôle to it, and when its part is played and its task performed, the curtain of the ages opens upon the next act in the eternal drama of human progress. The feudal régime in its very bloom contained the germs of the capitalist system, and capitalism even to-day germinates a new and superior social order—Socialism.

Socialism, as an economic and political principle, had begun to grow within the very heart of capitalist society generations ago, and to-day it has attained world-wide dimensions.

The gentlemen who so learnedly assure us of the "impracticability" or "impossibility" of Socialism, take the same enlightened stand as the familiar lad in the menagerie, who, after critically examining the eccentricities of form of the giraffe, judiciously announces, "There ain't no such animal." We are at least ankle-deep in Socialism already, and it is not improbable that the future historian will date the beginnings of the Socialist régime from the end of the last or the beginning of the present century, just as we are now placing the beginnings of the capitalist era a century or more back of the great French Revolution.

The germs of a Socialist order are clearly discernible not only in the countries of Europe in which the Socialists are wholly or partly in political control, but even in those countries which are still considered strongholds of the capitalistic order.

The capitalist civilization was in its inception based almost entirely on the principles of individual effort in production and unrestricted competition in the management of industries. The individualistic laissez faire doctrine which was proclaimed by the founders of the "classical" school of economics, was but the academic reflection of the convictions, sentiment and, it may be added, interests of the capitalist class in its bloom. This doc-
trine, which holds that all industrial needs and relations are adjusted automatically by the free play of the forces of supply and demand, without government interference or regulation, has gained such universal currency that it dominates the average mind even to-day. The orthodox lecturer or text-book writer on political economy is still earnestly discussing the merits of individual enterprise as against collective action and the advantages of competition over combination. He stubbornly refuses to notice that the mute forces of economic development, unconcerned by his learned theories, have nullified the very basis of his argument, and are rapidly destroying individual effort and competition in industry. It always has been the privilege of men of learning to live in the thoughts and conditions of past ages.

The modern factories, mines, railroads and other great industrial enterprises are co-operative institutions in their organization and methods of operation. Perfected machinery and division of labor have entirely obliterated the individuality of the worker's product. The individual worker in modern, up-to-date industries does not produce consumable commodities or render usable service. He creates particles and performs fractional operations, useless and meaningless by themselves and acquiring value only in conjunction with other products and services of their fellow workers. Production has become a distinctly social process—the collective efforts of the workers sustain our modern industries—their individual efforts, standing alone, count for nothing. And similarly with the management of industries. The entire trend of modern economic development has been away from competition and towards combination. The true meaning of the great trust movement of the last generation is just the simple fact, that competition has become inadequate and incompatible with the modern large-scale industry, and must yield to combination. Probably more than one half of our staple commodities are to-day produced and marketed without competition, and it is only a question
of a short time when combination will become the absolute rule in industry.

It is not contended that factories or trusts are instalments of the Socialist commonwealth. Under their present system of private and capitalistic ownership they are anything but that. But what the Socialists claim is that both factories and trusts represent a distinct tendency towards co-operation in industry and are developing the material basis for a Socialist form of industrial organization.

In the domain of modern legislation the socialistic tendencies have been even more pronounced than in the industrial field.

The modern industrial state came into existence as a protest against the excessive centralization of the feudal state. It was organized on the principle of non-interference with the affairs of the citizens. It proclaimed the doctrine that that state governs best which governs least, and it tried to govern as little as possible, leaving it to the citizens of all conditions, ages and sexes to fight their own battles. "Administrative Nihilism," to borrow an expression from Huxley, was the rule of politics and legislation just as the doctrine laissez faire was the law of industry.

These conceptions of the functions of the state and legislation may have claimed some justification in the early phases of our era, when social contrasts were not very marked, and opportunities were more abundant.

But when the unprecedented economic development of the last generations began to divide the population of every advanced country into distinct economic classes, the working class devoid of property and opportunity and dependent for the very right to live upon the powerful capitalistic class, the owners of all national industries; when the struggle for existence became an unequal war between the weak and the strong, the principle of non-interference by state and legislation lost all moral justi-
Gradually and steadily the government assumed the task of protecting its helpless and defenseless members from the oppression of their powerful and inconsiderate fellow men. Gradually it also began to realize that the work of providing food, clothing, shelter and other necessaries for the population is not an individual task, but a social function. The state and the legislatures have openly invaded the domain of "private" industry, and they claim the right to exercise control over it.

When in 1802 Sir Robert Peel introduced in the British Parliament the first bill for the regulation of the labor of apprenticed children, it was denounced as revolutionary, and dire disasters were predicted from its adoption. The measure was called forth by the inhuman conditions in the English cotton mills to which thousands of orphaned and pauper children of the most tender ages were bound out by the parishes. The unfortunate children were forced to work practically without interruption, and when they dropped from exhaustion they would be carried to crowded, pent-up and filthy barracks adjoining the mills. There they were allowed to rest until taken to work again early on the following morning. They were growing up in conditions of physical, mental and moral degeneracy, a menace to the future of the laboring population. The Peel Bill provided for some restriction upon this heartless exploitation. It was opposed by the liberal statesmen of England as an attempted legislative invasion of the rights of the working children. The measure was finally passed under the pretext that it was a mere amendment of the old Elizabethan "Apprenticeship Act." But its passage marked the doom of the individualistic doctrine in politics and legislation. It established the principle of state protection for the working class. In England the law of 1802 was followed first by the timid amendments of 1819, 1825 and 1833, then by the more radical enactments of the latter half of the last century. Starting with the regulation of apprenticed children, it soon extended its operation to the
"free" working children, then to the working women and finally to all workers. From England the principle of factory legislation spread to the United States, Germany, France and Switzerland, and gradually it established itself in all industrial countries.

More than forty years ago, Prince Bismarck, Germany's "Iron" Chancellor, proclaimed the duty of the state to take care of its disabled, sick and aged workingmen, the veterans and invalids of the modern industrial warfare. Germany introduced the system of state insurance for workingmen against accidents, sickness and disability and old age, and its example was soon followed by all advanced countries of Europe and Australia.

Within the last generations the legislatures of all countries have begun to supervise and regulate the most vital branches of business, the slaughter houses and bakeries, the railroads and steamships, banking and insurance, and many industries of a similar character. They prescribe the conditions upon which these industries may exist and operate, and they interfere actively and directly in the management of "their" affairs. The legislature goes even farther—it assumes a certain control of the individual wealth of its citizens by income, inheritance and other taxes.

The United States is practically the only civilized country in the world which does not provide through government channels for its aged or disabled workers. But even American conservatism is visibly beginning to surrender to the irresistible forces of universal social progress. Almost all the industrial states of the Union have introduced at least some forms of workmen's compensation or state labor insurance, and most states have established progressive income and inheritance tax laws.

These political measures and institutions are by no means to be considered as part of a deliberate government program for the gradual introduction of a Socialist order. On the contrary they are concessions of the ruling classes, in most cases made grudgingly and with the
prime object of making the rule of capitalism more palatable to the discontented masses of the workers. Nor can they be considered as instalments of the Socialist state any more than the trusts can be taken as partial realization of the Socialist economic system.

But they are of great symptomatic importance.

The modern principle of control and regulation of industries by the government signalizes the complete collapse of the purely capitalist ideal of non-interference, and demonstrates that the government may change from an instrument of class rule and exploitation into one of social service. Like the industries, the government is becoming socialized. The general tendency of both is distinctly towards a Socialist order.
CHAPTER IV

The Methods of Socialism

THE Socialist conception of industrial and political evolution as sketched in the preceding chapter, has been characterized by critics of the movement as a "Philosophy of Fatalism." The mistake underlying this criticism is the notion that the Socialists expect the realization of their social ideal to come about automatically through the unconscious workings of the inherent forces of social development. As a matter of fact, the Socialists are very far from harboring any such illusion. They hold that no system can be radically changed until it is ripe for the transformation, and they consider the social economics and political conditions of every country of prime importance in determining whether it offers fertile ground for the success of Socialism. But they realize that the mere readiness of a country for the Socialist régime will not produce Socialism without conscious, planned and deliberate action on the part of such portion of the people as have the desire, power and sagacity to accomplish the concrete task of the socialization of the industries and the reorganization of government to that end. If we attempt to grow oranges, we must first make sure that we have selected the proper soil and climate, but the soil and climate will not produce oranges unless we sow the seed and tend, care for, and aid the plant during all the stages of its growth. Or to take an historic illustration. The ruling classes of to-day, the capitalists, could not and did not gain political supremacy until they had attained economic ascendancy, but when that point was reached their actual political
victories were brought about by the propaganda of their
writers and speakers, by the work of their leaders, and
above all, by the organizations of their class and its
supporters.

Under normal conditions the introduction of a Social-
ist régime depends on two main conditions:

First: The economic situation of the country must be ripe for the change.

Second: The people of the country must be ready for it.

The first condition takes care of itself. The task of the Socialist movement is to bring about the second, and it is this aim which determines the methods and the practical program of the movement.

Whether the Socialist order be ushered in by a revolu-
tionary coup d’état, or by a series of legislative enact-
ments or executive orders, it can be maintained only by the people in control of the country. In other words, So-
cialism, like any other national political program, can be realized only when its adherents, sympathizers and supporters, are numerous enough to wrest the machinery of government from their opponents, and to use it for the realization of their program.

In those countries in which the Socialist parties have already acquired absolute or partial political control they rely upon the continued and whole-hearted support of the large masses of the people for their ability to maintain themselves in power, to ward off counter-revolutionary attacks and to carry out their program of socialization. In countries in which the Socialists are still in the minor-
ity their prime object is to gain sufficient public support to secure political control.

In either case the great task of the Socialist move-
ment is to increase the number of Socialists, to convert the people to the Socialist creed. Socialism is primarily a movement of education and propaganda. The Social-
ist propaganda does not originate from a mere desire to
spread the truth—for the benefit of the unconverted, as
the Christian propaganda is said to be inspired by a gen-
eral ethical zeal to save souls. The Socialist propaganda
is the very life-nerve of the movement. Upon its suc-
cess or failure depends the fate of Socialism. The edu-
cational and propagandist activities dominate all other
forms of organized Socialist work, and none but the
closest observers can appreciate the gigantic accomplish-
ments of the movement in this field.

In every general electoral campaign the Socialist party,
through its national, state and local organizations, prints
and distributes many millions of Socialist pamphlets and
leaflets.

But the Socialist propaganda is by no means limited
to campaigns. The dissemination of Socialist literature
goes on steadily and systematically, though on a smaller
scale, every day of the year, and it is not confined to
pamphleteering. The Socialist Party in this country is
supported by numerous periodical publications: daily and
weekly newspapers and monthly magazines. Every lan-
guage of any importance spoken in this country is rep-
resented in the Socialist press and all of them are pri-
marily given to propaganda. Unlike the ordinary press,
their political creed is not a mere incident—it is the en-
tire object and reason for their existence. They are pub-
lished to preach Socialism; every other consideration is
subordinated to that purpose.

And side by side with the propaganda of the printed
word goes the equally effective oral propaganda. The
Socialist Party has many thousands of dues-paying mem-
ers, and almost every one of these is an ardent propa-
gandist. If he is not blessed with the gift of public
oratory, he talks Socialism at his home, in his shop, in
his union, or his club. Thousands of meetings are held
every year in all parts of the country—public demonstra-
tions, campaign meetings, debates or lectures, and all
of them deal with the one paramount topic—Socialism.
And with all that it must be borne in mind that the Socialist movement is only beginning to gain a foothold in this country. Its educational and propaganda work is tame compared with the accomplishment of the older and stronger Socialist movements in the countries of Europe. The work of Socialist education all over the world is one of the most active intellectual factor operating in modern society.

The Socialists do not address themselves to an indiscriminate audience. They realize that their program does not appeal with equal force to all classes of the people. Socialism aims at the destruction of all economic privileges and all class rule. The Socialist contend that the realization of their program will ultimately benefit the entire human race, but they fully and frankly recognize that its immediate effects will be damaging to the beneficiaries of the present order and advantageous to its victims. In other words, Socialism necessarily involves an immediate material loss to the capitalist classes—and a corresponding gain to the working classes. The Socialists, therefore, make their appeal primarily to the workers. They do not disdain the support of men and women from the more privileged classes. A rather considerable proportion of active Socialists has always been recruited from the ranks of non-workers. But numerous as these cases may be, they are still the exception to the rule. An individual may be guided by purely ethical motives and rise above his material advantages, but economic classes as such are always moved by their immediate interests. The capitalist revolution was organized and led by the capitalists, although many members of the privileged classes of the nobility and clergy inspired by the new spirit of "liberty and democracy," made common cause with the enemies of their own class.

Nor are the Socialist activities confined to the work of propaganda.

While the developments which have accompanied and followed the world war have demonstrated that the So-
cialist movement may receive a strong impetus from sudden and violent social and political catastrophes, the Socialists neither desire nor rely upon catastrophes. They are, of course, ever ready to take advantage of every condition of popular misery and social disorganization brought about by the mismanagement of the ruling classes in order to abolish the entire capitalist source of such misery and disorganization, but they prefer to usher in the Socialist Commonwealth without violence and suffering and without sacrificing the lives and well-being of the men and women of their own generation to the happiness of the generations to come.

The Socialist program contemplates the planful building of the new order by an intelligent and disciplined working class, thoroughly organized, well trained, and fully qualified to assume the reins of government and the management of the industries. Next to the education of the workers in the philosophy of Socialism, the prime task of the Socialist movement is, therefore, their political and economic organization. The Socialist movement of each country presents itself primarily as a political party, the party of the working class. Like all other political parties, the Socialist Party nominates candidates and strives to win elections and to pass legislative measures, but unlike other parties it attributes but slight importance to such temporary political victories. The deeper objects of Socialist politics are: (1) To make propaganda for the cause of Socialism, for which political campaigns always offer favorable opportunities. (2) To acquaint the workers with the concrete political problems of the country and to educate them in practical politics. (3) To gain representation in the legislatures and in executive offices in order to secure true reforms for the workers, to train them in the art of statesmanship and to afford them larger opportunities for propaganda. (4) To wean the workers from the influence of the old parties, to develop their political independence and class consciousness and to organize them for the final practical
task of the Socialist movement—the winning of the government for the workers.

This view accounts for the seeming peculiarities of Socialist politics—the insistence of the Socialist Party on nominating full tickets even where its candidates have not the remotest chance of election, and its obstinate refusal to combine with the old political parties for any purpose. For the ultimate aim of Socialism the clearness, integrity and purity of the movement mean more than office or temporary political success.

In the Socialist conception, politics is only a means to an end. Temporary and local political power is valuable, mainly as affording an opportunity for economic reform, and the final national political victory of the workers will be of vital importance only as a necessary preliminary to the introduction of the system of collective and co-operative industries. A general political victory of the workers would be barren of results if the workers were not at the same time prepared to take over the management of the industries. The Socialist, therefore, seek to train the workers in economic no less than in political self-government.

It is for that reason that the movement everywhere seeks alliance with the economic organizations of labor, the unions and the co-operative societies.

The labor unions are efficient instruments for the organization of the productive forces of industry; the co-operative movement trains the workers in the independent, collective management of industrial functions. The Socialists are ever active in the organization of labor unions and co-operative workingmen’s societies and in the support of their works and struggles. In Germany, Austria and other countries in which the Socialist movement antedated the economic organizations of labor, the latter largely owe their existence to the Socialists. In Belgium and the Scandinavian countries the Socialist Party, trade-unions and co-operative societies are almost organically united. In the English-speaking
countries, in which the beginning of the Socialist move-
ment found the economic organizations of labor fully
established, the Socialists bend every effort to bring about
a friendly understanding with them and a policy of mu-
tual support. The Socialist activities in the economic
organizations of labor are not mere meddling or political
flirtation. They are an organic part of the practical work
of the Socialist Party. Socialism, labor unionism and
the co-operative movement are but different phases of
the general modern labor movement. Within their re-
spective spheres all of them, consciously or uncon-
sciously, make for the same goal, and each of them gains
strength and efficacy from the support of the others.

The struggles of labor have besides another deep so-
cial significance for the Socialists. Every material im-
provement in the workers' lives tends to raise their in-
tellectual level, and to develop their ability to organize
and fight for a social ideal. The Socialist movement
recruits its adherents mostly from among the better
trained and more intelligent workers. The unfortunate
"slum proletarians," whose energies, hopes and ambitions
have been crushed out by misery and destitution, can
rarely be relied on to rally to the virile battle cry of
Socialism.

The main points in the Socialist program of practical
work may thus be summarized under the three heads of
Education, Organization and Struggle for the Material
Improvement of the Working Class.

The objective point of the Socialist attack is the capi-
talist system, not the individual capitalists. The strug-
gles of the movement represent the organized efforts of
the entire working class, not the daring of the individual
leader or hero. The intellectual level and political ripe-
ness of the working class are determined by the train-
ing of the men and women constituting that class, and
not by the more advanced visions of a small group of it.
A country can be educated, led and transformed into So-
cialism, but it can not be driven, or forced into it. This
accepted position of the modern Socialist movement is, however, not to be interpreted as one of pacifist non-resistance. It may well happen that the classes in power in one country or another may refuse to yield the control of the government to the working class even after a political victory. In that case a violent conflict is bound to result, as it did under somewhat similar circumstances in 1861. But such spectacular and sanguinary outbreaks, which sometimes accompany radical economic and political changes, are purely incidental—they do not make the social transformation. Thus in England the revolution, which transferred the actual control of the country from the nobility to the capitalists, was accomplished by gradual and peaceful stages, without violence or bloodshed. In France the same process culminated in the sanguinary fights of the Great Revolution of 1789. But who will say that the transition in England was less thorough and radical than in France? As a matter of fact, street fights do not make a social revolution any more than fire-crackers make the Fourth of July.

It is sometimes helpful to elucidate an abstract principle by a concrete and simple example. The manner in which the present order is to change into Socialism may be illustrated by the familiar process of chicken-hatching.

A normal hen’s egg will be converted into a live chicken if kept twenty-one days in a temperature of 98½ degrees.

Now observe some of the most striking phases of the process.

An egg is entirely and radically different from a chicken in form. Under ordinary circumstances, it can be readily determined whether an object is the one or the other. But after the egg has passed a few days in the life-producing temperature radiating from the hatching hen, its identity is no longer so clear. The embryo of the chicken may be discerned in the contents of the egg. And every day thereafter the substance of the egg continues changing—every day it becomes a little less
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egg and a little more chicken, until on the last day nothing is left of the egg but the form, the substance inside is a live, complete and fully organized chicken. Similarly the feudal order of society is quite distinct from the capitalist order. Europe of the fifteenth century presents a system of unalloyed feudalism; Europe of the end of the eighteenth century is just as unmistakably capitalistic, but Europe of the seventeenth century is like the egg in the early periods of hatching—it represents a feudal form of government with a decided capitalist embryo inside of it. And so likewise the capitalist egg has been set to hatching generations ago, and to-day it contains a noticeable Socialist embryo notwithstanding the deceiving appearance of the egg-shell.

Further: during the entire process of incubation the shell of the egg has remained intact. Every drop of its fluid contents has been changed into flesh, bones and feathers, but the shell has not been absorbed or modified by the process—it has obstinately persisted in holding within its grip the new substance instead of the old. Now for a loose and liquid egg, a hard shell is a very convenient cover, but it becomes rather a nuisance to a young, enthusiastic chick. As soon as the latter develops sufficient strength and sense, it just cracks the old shell from the inside. The shell breaks into a number of fragments with great noise, the rebellious chick jumps out, and to the superficial observer this act appears to be the revolution which has destroyed the egg and created a chicken. As a matter of fact, however, the actual revolution has taken place in the gradual growth of the chicken embryo at the expense of the egg substance. The breaking of the shell was but a manifestation of the accomplishment of the more significant process inside. Had the shell been soft and yielding, it would not even have produced much noise in cracking. The street fight, barricades and armed conflicts which occasionally accompany a social revolution are the cracking of the superficial political shell—the revolutions themselves are
slowly accomplished within the industrial substance of society.

The breaking of the shell becomes a useful and liberating act only when the chicken is fully developed within it. When that point is reached, the chicken itself takes care of the shell. The hen has nothing to do with that part of the performance. It is her business to sit on the egg the full period of time required for hatching, to supply the proper heat and not to shirk her task for any period of time. Should the hen become impatient or get into her feathery head the notion to “hasten the process,” and should she attempt to break the shell before the time, she would only destroy the embryonic life of the chicken.

And finally, the process of incubation may be used to make clear the relation of the Socialist propaganda to the process of natural economic evolution. To hatch a chicken, the hen must have an egg, an object containing the germs of a chicken. No amount of hatching will turn a stone into a chicken. On the other hand, an egg will remain an egg forever unless deliberately taken by the hen into hatching. No system of society can be transformed into a Socialist commonwealth unless it has in it the germs of a Socialist order, and on the other hand, no system of society will grow into a Socialist state unless planfully directed to it. The capitalist state is the egg—the Socialists do the hatching!
CHAPTER V

The Political Program

If the Socialists were in control of Congress, what would be the first thing they would do?

This is one of the questions most frequently addressed to the Socialist propagandist. On the surface the question seems perfectly legitimate, but on closer analysis it will be found to be based on a misconception of the Socialist philosophy and a mistaken notion of the established course of social and political progress.

The one great aim of all Socialists is the socialization of the industries, but that is obviously not the "first thing" that Socialists in office could attempt to bring about. The collective ownership of the social instruments of wealth production cannot be established by a single legislative enactment. Rather must it be the culmination of a series of political and industrial measures of a socialistic nature. Such measures are likely to be numerous and varied in character and scope. Some of them will have to be dealt with by Congress, others by state legislatures or local political and non-political units. The measures will probably not present themselves always and everywhere in the identical form and sequence. Accidental occurrences and local conditions may force different issues to the front at different times and places. To determine in advance the exact succession of proposed Socialist reforms would be an idle undertaking. The test of practicability of Socialist politics is not whether the Socialists are agreed on a "first" practical measure, but whether they present a political pro-
gram comprehensive enough to meet all important social problems of the day. They do.

The Socialist Party has a very definite political program, which differs radically from the platforms of all other political parties in scope, structure and contents.

The political platforms of the old parties are built largely on the same plan as a menu à la carte in an opulent restaurant. They are framed to meet all tastes and to satisfy all appetites. Their object is to "catch votes"—all kinds of votes, and each of their "planks" is designed to appeal to a special class of voters. The manufacturers and the workers, the railroad magnates and the farmers, the producers and consumers, the foreign-born citizens and the negroes of the South in turn receive promises, pledges or compliments. The platforms are mainly adjusted to the minor "issues" of the hour and usually fight shy of the more vital and permanent social problems. The planks are often inconsistent and meaningless, and are never cemented by a cohesive social philosophy. There is hardly a pledge in the platform of the Republican Party that could not find legitimate lodgment in that of the Democratic Party and vice versa. Very often it is a race between the two old parties for the most popular issue, and sometimes both endorse the same popular demands with varying degrees of emphasis. It would be a vain task to attempt to distinguish the social philosophy of the Bryan platform of 1908 from that of the Roosevelt platform of 1904, or that of the Parker platform of 1904 from the Taft platform of 1912, or that of the Republican platform of 1920 from its Democratic contemporary.

The political platform of the Socialist Party, on the other hand, is based on a definite social conception and on a dominant and consistent political purpose. The Socialist aim in politics is to better the lot of the workers, to curb the power of the capitalist classes, to extend the social and industrial functions of the government and to place the latter more directly in the hands of the people—
all with the ultimate object of transforming the present industrial and political system into a social democracy. These aims are formulated in concrete and definite planks or "demands," which constitute the invariable political platform of Socialism. The Socialist platform may be redrafted periodically and greater prominence may be given to the issues surging to the foreground at a particular time, but on the whole it is practically unchangeable. It could not consistently be otherwise. The Socialist Party was organized for the accomplishment of a definite social and political purpose. Its platform is but the expression of that purpose and a statement of the steps by which it is expected to be realized. So long as that purpose remains unaccomplished and so long as the party adheres to its main aim, principles and methods, so long must the substance of its platform remain intact.

As the capitalist interests become more dominant and acute, representative government gradually ceases to be a government "of, for and by the people," and becomes tainted with class bias, lawlessness and corruption. The subversion of popular government to the interests of the great money powers and their avowed representatives in politics grows more menacing every year, and gives rise to the numerous movements for political reform within and without the established political organizations.

The main currents of such reform movements proceed along two lines.

The first of these is directed against the personal unfitness or corruption of individual office-holders or politicians. To this class of reforms belong all sporadic movements of the good citizens to "turn the rascals out of office," which furnish the periodical political excitements in local elections. They all proceed from the assumption that "good" officials make a "good" government.

The Socialists attach but slight importance to these "good government" movements. They hold that the paramount factor in politics is measures, not men—class interests, not personal qualities.
The Republican and the Democratic parties and every reform party organized by "respectable" citizens are alike founded on the present order of society, and consciously or unconsciously they stand for the preservation of that order and for the domination of wealth. They are managed and financed by the possessing classes and their political officials spring from these classes or are dependent on them for their careers. Whether they are personally good, bad or indifferent, honest or dishonest, capable or incompetent, they are tied to the capitalist class by environment, training, instinct and interest. Experience has demonstrated time and time again that "good government" is powerless even to check simple corruption in politics for any considerable length of time. It is ludicrously ineffectual as an instrument for the betterment of the lot of the toilers.

What the Socialists are striving for is not a government of good capitalists for good capitalists, but a government of workers for all workers.

The more important reform movements are concerned with problems of permanent improvement of political methods and institutions, and advocate social and industrial measures intended to remove the sharp edge of oppression from capitalism and to establish a "fair and reasonable" modus vivendi between the employing classes and the workers. Such movements strive to secure unbossed nominations of public officials, honest elections, increased political power of the people and greater control over their chosen representatives. As a rule they also stress the civil rights and liberties of the citizens, such as freedom of the press, speech and assemblage, and the right of the workers to collective bargaining. Sometimes such political planks are coupled with demands for certain reforms in methods of taxation and even more important industrial reforms including government ownership of "public utilities."

But the characteristic mark of all such non-Socialist reforms is that they are built entirely upon the founda-
tions of the capitalist order. They would subject the industries to a measure of government control not in order to have them eventually absorbed by the people, but on the contrary to make them safe for continued private ownership by adjusting their operations to the exigencies of the modern spirit and conditions. They would improve the lot of the workers not in order to free them eventually from all forms of exploitation, but on the contrary, to reconcile them to a perpetual condition of economic dependence inherent in the institution of wage labor. As enlightened and far-sighted partizans of the prevailing order the leaders of such reform movements seek to prolong the tottering capitalist class rule by liberalizing its oppressive political institutions and palliating its disastrous social effects.

The Socialist platform also contains planks and demands "which can be realized within the framework of the capitalist order," but all Socialist reform measures are formulated with the distinct object of improving the position of the workers in their struggle for the ultimate overthrow of the entire system of capitalism. They are measures which in the language of the official Declaration of Principles of the Socialist party, would tend to "immediately benefit the workers, raise the standards of life, increase their power and stiffen their resistance to capitalist aggression."

Among the political planks contained in the Socialist platform of 1920, are the following:

"The power of the courts to restrain workers in their struggles against employers by the Writ of Injunction or otherwise, and their power to nullify congressional legislation, should be abrogated.

"Federal judges should be elected by the people and be subject to recall.

"The President and Vice-President of the United States should be elected by direct popular election, and be subject to recall. All members of the Cabinet should
be elected by Congress and be responsible at all times to the vote thereof.

"Suffrage should be equal and unrestricted in fact as well as in law for all men and women throughout the nation.

"The Constitution of the United States should be amended to strengthen the safeguards of civil and political liberty, and to remove all obstacles to industrial and social reform and reconstruction, including the changes enumerated in this program, in keeping with the will and interest of the people. It should be made amendable by a majority of the voters of the nation upon their own initiative, or upon the initiative of Congress."

The curtailment of the powers of our courts is one of the most fundamental political measure advocated by the Socialists. No free nation can safely permit a small group of men to set aside its laws and to nullify the expressed will of the people. These extraordinary powers are distinctive attributes of absolute and autocratic sovereignty. So long as the people of the United States leave their political and social destinies at the ultimate mercy of nine men, appointed for life and often out of touch and sympathy with the needs, struggles and aspirations of the great masses, so long will our "self-government" be a sham and our "democracy" a delusion.

The great modern problems can be solved peacefully and rationally only by a people free to shape its own destinies, and to model and remodel its institutions without the arbitrary interference of a few old men nourished by the musty legal wisdom of the dead past. The Socialists therefore consider the radical reformation of our judiciary system a condition precedent to all true measures of social reform.

The other political planks in the Socialist platform aim to establish a closer connection between the people and their chosen representatives and to extend the direct participation of the citizens in the government.
But the Socialists do not overestimate the importance of political reforms. Politics is not government, it is only the machinery of government. Tools in themselves, no matter how ingenious and apt, are entirely devoid of value unless applied to the production of socially useful commodities. Universal adult suffrage, direct legislation and control of public officials are the tools of democracy. They are of the highest importance and value if used for the enactment of measures to improve the everyday lives of the people and to increase their general happiness. They are purely ornamental otherwise.

The Socialists are vitally interested in all measures calculated to enhance the material welfare and to raise the intellectual level of the workers. They believe that the hope of transforming modern capitalist society into a Socialist commonwealth rests primarily on the workers, and they realize that this gigantic historical task cannot be accomplished by a class of physical and mental weaklings, but that it requires the organized and persevering efforts of large masses of men and women physically, mentally and morally fit to assume the reins of government. The Socialist efforts to raise the standard of the workers’ lives are therefore not based on mere humanitarian or sentimental motives. They are an organic part of the practical work of Socialism, an indispensable condition of the progress and ultimate success of the movement.

The most important of such measures from a Socialist point of view are those dealing with the shortening of the labor time and with the system of “social insurance” of the workers.

They are formulated in the Socialist platform in the following language:

“Congress should enact effective laws to abolish child labor, to fix minimum wages, based on an ascertained cost of a decent standard of life, to protect migratory and unemployed workers from oppression, to abolish detective and strike-breaking agencies and to establish a shorter
work-day in keeping with increased industrial productivity.

"The business of insurance should be taken over by the government, and should be extended to include insurance against accident, sickness, invalidity, old age and unemployment, without contribution on the part of the worker."

A shorter workday would tend to solve at least partly the problem of unemployment and at the same time and for the same reason to increase the average wage. It would give to the worker more time to live, think and enjoy, and would broaden his political, social and spiritual interests. It would also contribute largely to the curtailment of the evil of child labor. Government insurance of the workers in cases of unemployment, accidents, sickness, invalidity and old age would tend to remove that most dreadful feature of the life of the modern wage-worker—the uncertainty of existence, the fear of the morrow. Under present conditions the unfortunate worker who has been maimed or has gradually lost his youth, health and strength in the service of his fellowmen is mercilessly cast aside and allowed to starve and perish by degrees. Under a system of government insurance, society would take care of the victims and veterans of the large life-sustaining army of workers as it now provides for the victims and veterans of death-dealing warfares. The measure is not a Socialist Utopia, for systems of social insurance along the lines indicated, in more or less perfect form, are in actual operation in almost all advanced modern countries except the United States.

While seeking to secure all needed measures of immediate political and industrial reform, the Socialists also endeavor to extend the sphere of the social and economic functions of the government.

The Socialist platform proclaims that:

"All business vitally essential for the existence and welfare of the people, such as railroads, express service,
steamship lines, telegraphs, mines, oil wells, power plants, elevators, packing houses, cold storage plants, and all industries operating on a national scale, should be taken over by the nation.

“All publicly owned industries should be administered jointly by the government and the representatives of the workers, not for revenue or profit, but with the sole object of securing just compensation and humane condition of employment for the workers and efficient and reasonable service to the public.

“All banks should be acquired by the government, and incorporated in a unified public banking system.”

The distinguishing feature of the planks is not so much the demands for public or national ownership of the industries as the plan for the democratic working-class management.

The Socialists entertain no illusions as to the benefits of governmentally owned industries *per se*. Government ownership of certain industries has often been introduced not for the purpose of benefiting the people but in order to provide revenue for the government or to facilitate its military operations.

In such cases government ownership may tend to strengthen rather than loosen the grip of capitalism on the people, and its effect may be decidedly reactionary. Similarly government ownership is often advocated by middle-class “reform” parties for the main purpose of decreasing the taxes of property owners and reducing the rates of freight, transportation and communication for the smaller business men.

The Socialist demand for public ownership of industries of a public or quasi-public nature, springs from different motives and contemplates a different system than the similar demands of other parties. The Socialists advocate government ownership primarily for the purpose of eliminating private profits from the operation of public utilities, and conferring the benefits of such industries on the employees and consumers. Their de-
mand for national or municipal ownership of industries is always qualified by a provision for the democratic administration of such industries and for the application of the profits to the increase of the employees' wages and the improvement of the service. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that when the Socialist platform declares in favor of government ownership of certain industries, the Socialist Party at the same time nominates candidates for public office pledged to carry out these measures in the spirit of that platform. In other words, what the Socialists advocate is not government ownership under purely capitalist administration, but collective ownership under a government controlled or at least strongly influenced by political representatives of the working class.

The measures so far discussed do not exhaust the practical "demands" of the Socialist Party. For while the party is primarily concerned with the relief of the workers, its endeavors do not end there. The Socialists are deeply interested in all measures of social progress and national welfare.

The National platform of the Socialist Party is supplemented by State and Municipal platforms, which are always concrete applications of the same general principles to the narrower spheres of their respective functions and jurisdictions, and together they constitute a logical, consistent and comprehensive program of social progress. And it is in that consistency and comprehensiveness that the strength of the Socialist platform lies.

In its National Convention of 1920 the Socialist Party made another radical departure from the established practices of American political parties by adopting a "Declaration of Principles" along with its platform. The Declaration is a concise but tolerably complete statement of the philosophy, general methods and ultimate aims of the Socialist movement, of which the political campaign platform is only a partial and specific application.
CHAPTER VI

Socialist Achievements

In this chapter we shall endeavor to sum up the concrete achievements of the modern Socialist movement. The task presupposes a definite test by which the practical results of Socialist activities may be ascertained and measured. What is the test?

The aim of Socialism is to reorganize modern society by abolishing private ownership and operation of business and introducing a system of socialized industries. This program extends to the whole civilized world. It may be partly realized in different places at different times, but in each case it requires the entire machinery of a complete and autonomous political government for a substantial realization.

Neither a city administration nor a state government is capable of reorganizing the important national industries on a basis of collective ownership. A Socialist commonwealth can be established only through the cooperation of all departments of the national, state, and local governments. The Socialists must be in full political control of the country before they can begin to reorganize industries upon a basis of social ownership and operation, and the full accomplishment of the task requires a considerable period of time even under the most favorable conditions. The institution of privately owned industries is the product of a century-long growth; it is exceedingly involved and ramified and deeply interwoven with the entire fabric of modern capitalist civilization.
It cannot be abolished by a sweeping decree without causing grave industrial dislocation and plunging the country into a condition at least temporary economic chaos. The socialization of each industry must be undertaken planfully with full regard to its special problems and conditions including its relations to other industries.

Prior to the war the Socialist movement had nowhere developed a political importance beyond that of a strong minority party. It did not control the government of a single country. The war with the resultant collapse of the bourgeois governments in several countries of Europe has suddenly advanced the Socialist movement in those countries to a position of political leadership. That leadership has as yet been of very short duration and has been exercised under conditions extremely unfavorable to radical and effective economic reform.

The only country in which the Socialists have been in full control of the government for an appreciable period of time is Russia, whose efforts and achievements will be treated separately in the concluding chapter of this booklet.

In Germany the revolution of November, 1918, placed the Socialists in temporary control of the government. The first revolutionary cabinet of the former Empire consisted of six Social Democrats, of whom three represented the moderate "Majority" party and three the more radical "Independent" Socialists.

Provisional governments under Socialist leadership were also set up in the component states of Germany, and the first president of the German republic as well as its first Chancellor (prime minister) were members of the Social Democratic party.

Under normal conditions Germany was better prepared for the work of Socialist reconstruction than any other country of Europe. Its system of highly organized and centralized factory production lent itself to socialization with comparative ease. The industrial population largely
exceeded the number of rural dwellers. It was on the whole homogeneous and compact, with a majority of skilled and intelligent wage workers, well organized politically and industrially. The organization of German Social Democracy had a political record of half a century of experience and growth. Prior to the war the party had polled upward of 4,250,000 votes and elected 111 members to the Reichstag. It was supported by a powerful trade-union movement and a vast chain of workingmen's co-operative societies.

The Socialist growth in Germany had been regular and steady, and the policy of the movement was based on a program of planful and systematic socialization of the industries to be undertaken after securing control of government through the process of normal political growth.

But history has willed otherwise. Political control came to the Socialists suddenly and catastrophically. Four years of all-consuming warfare and the sudden and disastrous break-down of its vast military machine had left the country in a state of utter disorganization, demoralization, suffering and discouragement. The severe armistice terms followed by the still more stringent peace terms, which the victorious Allies imposed upon her seemed to deprive Germany of all hope of economic recuperation for at least a full generation, while reducing her politically to the condition of a vassal state.

The classes primarily responsible for the national disaster, the royalty and junkerdom, the military clique and the profiteering capitalists, abandoned the wreck of state to the working classes. It was not a winning fight that had placed the Socialists in control, it was a victory by default, the sort of victory which Napoleon suffered, when his exhausted army occupied Moscow, deserted by the population and destroyed by conflagration.

The task of reorganizing the industries of Germany along Socialist lines was thus rendered extremely difficult by the prevailing external conditions. The difficul-
ties were considerably aggravated by the internal conditions of the Socialist movement. Except for a very short space of time immediately following the revolution, the German Socialists were never in full control of the government. In the Constituent Assembly of 1919 they had only 47% of the total representation; in the Reichstag elections of 1920 they obtained 42% of votes cast and deputies elected. Furthermore the Socialist forces of Germany after the war, far from representing a solid and unified front to their opponents, were badly divided in their own ranks. The acute differences which had arisen among them during the latter part of the war had survived in different form after the war. The "Majority" Socialists, who had supported the militaristic and imperialistic government in the war, favored the policy of postponing concrete and thoroughgoing measures of socialization until the expected restoration of more normal social and industrial conditions; the "Independents," who had opposed the government in the latter part of the war, advocated immediate and drastic efforts for the socialization of all important German industries as the most effective way of rebuilding the country's shattered economic life. The Majority Socialists favored co-operation with capitalists and middle-class elements in the government; the Independents insisted upon a purely Socialistic labor administration. And side by side with the two leading Socialist parties sprang up a group of more extreme Socialists, known as Sparticidcs and later as Communists, who adopted the methods of the Russian Bolsheviki, and whose lively activities introduced a further element of complication in the Socialist movement of Germany.

The differences within the Socialist ranks soon matured into open rupture. The Independents withdrew from the cabinet, and the Majority Socialists formed a coalition government with the more progressive parties of the German bourgeoisie.

In these adverse conditions little has so far been ac-
complished in the direction of socialization of the German industries.

The National Assembly, on March 23, 1919, enacted a General Socialization Law, which among other measures, authorized the National government "To provide, by means of legislation and on payment of suitable compensation, for the transfer to the community of all such industrial enterprises as are adapted for the purpose, more particularly those concerned with the exploitation of mineral resources and with the utilization of natural energy, and to regulate in cases of urgent necessity the transfer to the community of the production and distribution of economic commodities."

The only industries which have so far been at least partly socialized are those of coal mining and potash production, which operate under an involved systems of restricted private ownership with public management.

The conservative policy of the Majority Socialists has created a steadily growing opposition among the working classes, who are rapidly turning to the Independents. While in the elections to the Constituent Assembly, held in January 1919, the Independent Socialists polled only 2,188,305 votes as compared with 11,112,450 votes cast for the Majority Socialists, the Reichstag elections of 1920 showed 4,809,862 votes for the Independents as against 5,152,137 for the Majority Socialists. The indications are that the radical Socialists will gain power in Germany within the near future, and that the work of socializing the country will be undertaken along larger and more thoroughgoing lines.

In Austria the situation is on the whole not dissimilar to that of Germany. There too the Social Democratic Party is at the head though not in absolute control of the government, and while the Socialist movement is less divided in its own ranks than that of Germany, the industrial conditions of the country are, if possible, even more desperate than those of its German neighbor.
Still Austria has made somewhat more substantial advances on the road towards the socialization of its industries than Germany. The General Socialization Law passed by the National Assembly on March 4, 1919, is a comprehensive enabling act, which authorizes the state, the provinces and the municipalities "to expropriate suitable industries and commercial establishments in favor of the state," provides for their operation on the principle of democratic management with special reference to labor representation upon the administrative boards, and directs the creation of a special State commission for socialization.

Under the provisions of this law the Austrian government has already adopted definite measures of socialization for the industries of coal and electricity, while similar measures for other important industries are in preparation. The process of socialization in Austria is encountering an additional and unforeseen complication arising from the fact that foreign capitalists, mostly English and French, have recently acquired control of many important industrial and banking concerns, and any attempt to expropriate such concerns may meet with opposition on the part of foreign governments. The experience of Austria thus proves that complete socialization can only be achieved on international scope.

Sweden has recently formed an all-Socialist cabinet, and Hjalmar Branting, the Socialist Prime Minister, has announced a program of gradual socialization of the industries based upon the principle of compensation to be paid to the present capitalist owners. Czecko-Slovakia has also a semi-Socialist government, but the short career of the young republic has been so fully and tensely absorbed with immediate political, military and international exigencies that it found no opportunity to attack its internal economic problems on a large and comprehensive scale.

But the direct efforts towards socializing the industries, which have been undertaken in these countries after
the war are by no means the sole measure of practical achievements of the Socialist movement. The Socialist movement is international in scope and operation. Its ultimate aim is to transform the entire economic system of the modern world, and the true test of its success is therefore, not so much whether Socialism has already been realized in parts or spots, but whether the movement as a whole has made a substantial advance in the task of creating social and political conditions favorable to the general introduction of the Socialist Commonwealth.

A familiar page from the history of the United States will serve to illustrate the point.

The organized anti-slavery movement of this country dates back to the last quarter of the eighteenth century, when abolition societies were formed in Pennsylvania, New York, Maryland, Connecticut, Virginia and New Jersey. The agitation assumed a more practical and direct aspect under the leadership of Garrison, about 1830, and thenceforth continued with growing intensity for a period of about thirty-five years. The abolitionists may be said to have gained control of the political machinery of the country with the first election of Lincoln in November, 1860. The Emancipation Proclamation was issued on January 1st, 1863. The political power of the anti-slavery forces became absolute upon the final surrender of the Confederate Army on April 9th, 1865, and the institution of slavery was definitely and completely banished from the entire territory of the United States by an amendment to the Constitution on the 18th of December of the same year.

Assume, now, the condition of the abolitionist movement about the middle of the last century and let us suppose that its followers are catechized on the subject of concrete achievements.

"Your movement is more than half a century old, and you have had about twenty years of organized and direct work. What practical results have you accom-
plished; what portion of the negro slaves in the South have you succeeded in freeing?"

We may imagine a question like this addressed to Wendell Phillips by an unbiased inquirer with a "prac-
tical turn of mind" and repeated with derision by the
"safe, sane and conservative" pro-slavery advocate.

And we may as readily imagine Phillips' answer:

"No, we have not yet emancipated the Southern ne-
groes or any portion of them, but we have made some
big strides towards that goal. Since the beginning of
the abolition movement we have gained some notable po-
litical victories, such as the Missouri Compromise and
the admission of California as a free state. But we have
gained vastly more in educating the public mind and
arousing the public conscience to the realization of the
evils of slavery, and in the creation and growth of a
strong organized force to battle for the abolition of that
evil. Less than fifteen years ago the abolitionists were
decried by the press and church as enemies of society,
criminals, heretics and free-lovers, and all good people
held them in horror; to-day, large sections of the en-
lightened public understand that our aim is pure and
good and they turn a sympathetic ear to us.

"Ten years ago we formed the Liberty Party and
poll ed but 7,059 votes in the whole country; two years
ago our Free-Soil Party received almost three hundred
thousand votes.

"We have overcome many obstacles in the path of our
movement and have created many conditions favorable
to the ultimate triumph of our cause. These are the con-
crete and practical achievements of our agitation."

It takes but little imagination to translate the assumed
colloquy into modern terms and to apply the abolitionist
argument to the present-day Socialist movement.

The concrete and conscious efforts to pave the way for
the introduction of a Socialist régime may be summarized under the following three main heads:

1. The enactment of such social reforms as tend to facilitate the transition from capitalism to Socialism.

2. The creation of a sympathetic attitude among the workers and some other classes of the people towards the Socialist aim and program.

3. The organization of a body of persons, sufficiently numerous, intelligent and trained to accomplish the practical task of social transformation.

The extent to which these tasks have been accomplished determines the measure of practical success of the Socialist propaganda.

Under the head of "socialistic" reforms we must include all modern legislation, directly or indirectly inspired by Socialist activities, and having for its object the betterment of the economic condition of the workers or the increase of their social and political strength. But few national reforms of this description are directly traceable to Socialist initiative in this or in any other country. It must be borne in mind that Socialism is, on the whole, a very recent factor in the politics of modern nations, and that before the war they formed a minority in all the legislative bodies of the world, in which they were represented. But with all these handicaps, the Socialist work in national law-giving bodies before the war was not devoid of direct and important results.

The Social Democratic Party of Germany boasted of a large number of reform measures, principally in the field of workingmen's state insurance, factory laws and taxation, which had been enacted through its direct initiative. In France the Socialist deputies had secured the passage of laws reducing the hours of labor of government employees, extending the powers of municipal administration and improving the system of state accident insurance and old-age pensions. In Denmark the Socialist representatives in Parliament had caused the adoption of
a system by which the labor unions received government subsidies for their unemployed members. In Austria, Sweden and Norway, the Socialist parties had been largely instrumental in extending the popular suffrage, and in Italy, Belgium and Switzerland, they had succeeded in forcing the adoption of substantial reform measures of various characters.

In practically all of these countries the measures of factory legislation and social and political reform have been vastly extended and improved after the war under the pressure of the Socialist and labor forces.

But more important than the achievements in the domain of national legislation have been the practical results of local Socialist politics. This is quite natural. When the Socialists constituted only small minorities in the national councils of the world, they had been exercising full control of many cities and towns in most modern countries for a number of years.

In Germany, France and Italy the Socialist municipalities count by the hundreds.

Austria, Belgium, Holland and the Scandinavian countries likewise contain large numbers of cities, towns and villages fully controlled by the Socialists, and thousands of municipal councils in Europe have Socialist representation of varying degrees of strength. Even in the United States, in which the political career of Socialism is practically in its infancy, the Socialist Party has at different times been in control of cities and towns of importance.

In the cities in which the Socialists have been in power they have introduced such reform measures as were feasible within the restricted scope and powers of municipal governments. The reforms do not constitute Socialism or even an earnest of Socialism, but they are measures based on the recognition of the social obligations of the community towards the citizens, the new spirit in politics for which Socialism is largely responsible.
In the conventional political conception a municipal corporation is first of all a business concern, instituted and maintained for the purpose of administering the corporate property of the city. Hence the slogan of all municipal reform movements of the middle class is invariably "a clean, honest, business-like administration." The Socialists, on the other hand, emphasize the social functions of the municipality; the education, health, and social welfare of its inhabitants.

A typical Socialist city begins its reforms with the child, the bearer of the community's future. A Socialist municipality almost invariably takes care of its working women during the period of confinement by providing free maternity hospitals with proper medical attendance. When the mother is ready to return to work, the city continues to exercise a watchful and tender oversight of the child. Free municipal day nurseries, kindergartens, primary schools and schools for higher industries succeed each other in the task of rearing the child into healthful and enlightened manhood or womanhood. In most cases the city provides for its needy children not only free instruction but also medical care, and even food and clothing. Seaside colonies and summer outings for all poor school children are common features in connection with the public school systems in Socialist cities.

Nor do the educational activities of Socialist municipalities end with the child. The cultivation of fine arts and the dissemination of popular science among the adult workers, through the medium of municipal theatres, free concerts, reading-rooms and public lectures are quite usual in Socialist city administration.

Next to the all-important subject of education, the Socialists bestow their greatest care on the problems of public health.

Whenever a city under Socialist control contains slums or abnormally congested districts, the administration seeks to relieve the condition by the building of municipal dwelling-houses and by increasing the number of
parks and playgrounds. Municipal bath-houses, disinfecting plants, hospitals and dispensaries are established wherever practicable, and physicians and nurses are placed at the service of the poor free of charge.

The Socialist city administrations everywhere have sought to enlarge the scope of public assistance to the needy members of the community and to remove the sting of charity from such assistance. The poor are the victims of our social system. They have been wronged by society and the community owes them an honorable reparation. Hence the support given by the Socialist municipalities is more in the nature of pensions than alms. Municipal bakeries, kitchens and groceries, selling their products at cost, or giving them away, are favorite institutions in Socialist city administrations.

The Socialist municipalities also seek to be model employers and invariably reduce the hours of work and increase the wages of the municipal employees.

These, then, are some of the “direct” political achievements of Socialism. They constitute a distinct social advance, although they are by no means revolutionary in character. More significant than the direct results are the numerous measures of social legislation which have within the last generation been enacted by the law-giving bodies of almost all civilized countries, as the indirect but nevertheless legitimate results of the Socialist propaganda.

Such measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines. They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally they acquire the force of popular demands. At this stage the “progressive” and sometimes even the “conservative” statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measure. The Vox Populi means votes on election day, and the shrewd leaders of the old parties are quite willing to
make an occasional concession to "social justice" in order to maintain or to gain political power.

Another motive for the enactment of socialistic measures is frequently found in the desire to palliate or destroy the effectiveness of the Socialist propaganda.

When the Socialist movement in any country assumes such dimensions as to become menacing to the dominant classes, the latter frequently conceive the idea of checking its growth by making concessions to the "discontented" masses, and "thus stealing the Socialist thunder."

Thus Prince Bismarck, when he first introduced into the German Diet his broad program of social reform, including the revolutionary principles of government insurance of the workers against sickness, accidents, invalidity and old age, frankly avowed that the primary object of the measure was to avert a popular revolution. The same considerations hold good for all other countries, and the growth of the Socialist movement is invariably accompanied by an era of legislative social reform.

Experience has demonstrated that the efforts to forestall or check the growth of Socialism by legislative concessions, never succeed. The concessions are necessarily half-hearted, and while the reform measures thus enacted are often substantial advances in the path of social progress, they always fall far short of the radical demands as originally formulated by the Socialist. The ruling classes cannot be expected to lay down all or even the most substantial of their privileges by voluntary legislative enactments. Whatever concessions they make to the workers merely touch the surface of the evils of capitalist exploitation. The mainspring of these evils is bound to remain intact, and popular suffering and social injustice are bound to continue so long as the basis of the present social system, the private ownership of industries, persists.

The concrete reforms which the organized Socialist movement has thus indirectly gained and is still con-
stantly gaining by its mere existence and growth, are probably more numerous and substantial than the actual achievements of all so-called "practical" reform movements combined.

Still more significant for the prospects of the movement are the effects of the Socialist propaganda upon the contemporary public mind. In almost all countries of Europe the Socialist movement has experienced three distinct phases of development. The first is one of general ridicule, which manifests itself in grotesque caricaturing of its aims and character. This phase is invariably succeeded by an era of fierce attacks and denunciations from all established organs of public expression; as a rule accompanied by rigid government persecution. This era represents the attempt to stamp out Socialism by brutal force—the vain attempt which has met every historical movement for a new order, and which has always served to vitalize, cement and strengthen such movements.

When the Socialist movement has survived both ridicule and persecution, and has demonstrated its determination and capacity to stay and to grow, it enters upon the third stage of its existence, that of being "respected." By this expression it is not intended to convey the idea that the Socialist movement ever has reached the point of becoming acceptable or even sufferable to the privileged classes. It will never reach that point so long as it retains its principal and most vital object—the abolition of all class privileges.

The ruling classes are probably more hostile to the Socialists now than they were during the earlier and weaker stages of the movement. But it is the hatred of an enemy facing a formidable adversary, a hatred mingled with respect, and often counseling concessions rather than courting war.

And side by side with the privileged classes, great in power, but few in numbers, there are the large and somewhat vague strata of society, generally styled the "mid-
dle" class, and the still larger and more definite classes of wage workers of all types.

The middle classes, who reap but slight benefits from the present order, and are not bound to it by ties of privilege and wealth, begin to see in the promises of Socialism a possible solution of their ever-growing economic problems. They develop a more serious and sympathetic understanding for the humanitarian ideals of the new social creed, and many of their number finish by embracing it unreservedly.

The working classes are the most direct beneficiaries of the proposed Socialist system. As far as they are concerned, an understanding of the Socialist doctrine is practically equivalent to its acceptance. That understanding has been brought home to millions of them within the last three or four decades of Socialist propaganda, and millions of them have enlisted under the banner of international Socialism.

But the most vital and direct test of the practical results of the Socialist activities is their effect on the Socialist organizations. Preparatory reform measures and a favorable state of the public mind create the necessary atmosphere and environment for the introduction of a new and radical social order, but the concrete task of ushering in such an order must be accomplished by an organized force, and the larger and better organized that force, the sooner will the change come and the more thorough and lasting will it be.

By the middle of the last century Socialism was confined to a small group of individuals and represented nothing more than an academic school of unpopular social philosophy. To-day the Socialist movement has become a recognized factor in the public life of practically every modern nation.

In 1867 the total number of Socialist votes in the world was only about 30,000. Prior to the war the Socialist vote of the world was a little in excess of 10,000,-000. In 1920 the Socialist parties of Germany alone cast
10,400,000 votes for members of the Reichstag, while under the larger popular participation in the National Assembly elections of 1919, the combined vote of the two major Socialist parties exceeded 13,300,000.

In Italy the Socialist party in 1913 had polled 883,000 votes and elected 44 deputies. In the parliamentary elections of 1919 its vote rose to 3,000,000 in round figures, and the number of its elected deputies increased to 159. In the post-war parliamentary elections of France the Socialist vote grew from 1,400,000 to 1,750,000 in the face of a fierce coalition opposition of practically all bourgeois parties. In Czecko-Slovakia the first general elections resulted in a vote of 2,878,548 as against a combined vote of 2,966,503 cast for all other parties.

In the elections to the Lower Austrian Diet of 1919 the Socialists won 64 seats as against 56 seats for the representatives of all other political parties. In the first elections to the Polish Seym the Socialists, although many of them abstained from voting, returned 80 deputies. In Finland the Socialist party polled a clear majority of all votes cast in the parliamentary election of 1916, and won 103 out of a total of 200 seats in the Finnish Diet. The first Socialist Government in the world thus created was impeded and obstructed by the Finnish bourgeoisie aided by the government of Russia, under the Kerenski régime as well as under the czar, and the Socialists of Finland were subsequently subjected to a systematic campaign of wholesale slaughter and extermination carried on by the ruthless "White Guards" of Finland with the alternate aid of German militarists and Allied imperialists. Still they rallied to their standards more than forty per cent of the whole vote of the country. In the Scandinavian countries as well as in the countries of the Balkan peninsula, in Switzerland, Holland and in Spain the Socialist parties more than doubled their votes after the war. The semi-Socialist Labor Party of Great Britain cast 2,878,548 votes in the parliamentary elections of 1918, and has shown an increased political strength in every subsequent bye-elec-
tion. The total Socialist vote of Europe, outside of Russia, may at this time be conservatively estimated at about 30,000,000, an increase of 200 per cent over the pre-war vote. A considerable part of this tremendous increase may be ascribed to the liberalized system of suffrage, which was inaugurated in practically every country of Europe during and after the war, but the bulk of it undoubtedly represents solid growth of the political strength of International Socialism.

Owing to the peculiar system of voting under the Soviet régime of Russia and to the absence of published election statistics it is almost impossible to estimate the voting strength of Russian Socialism in concrete figures. The dominant Socialist organization, the Communist Party, is said to have about 600,000 enrolled members. The party is supported by the great majority of Russian citizens by direct vote in the Soviet elections, or at least by acquiescent acceptance of its political rule, and the adherents and supporters of other Socialist organizations, such as the Social Democratic Minority party (Mensheviks) and the party of the Social Revolutionists must also be taken into account in any estimate of the total political strength of Russian Socialism.

In Australia and New Zealand the labor parties, largely permeated by Socialist influences, are dominating political parties in their countries. In South Africa and in South America the Socialist movement has gained a firm foothold.

In the United States the Socialist movement has also established itself as a definite political factor. In the twenty years of its existence the Socialist Party has successfully withstood all the vicissitudes, which invariably beset the path of a "third" political party in American politics and has survived the fierce wave of reaction and persecution engendered by the abnormal war atmosphere of recent years.

At the present writing all indications point to a steady development and large growth of the movement within the immediate future.
The process of concentrating American industries in the hands of powerful financial concerns has been vastly accelerated by the war. The trusts, monopolies and gigantic industrial combinations are coming to be the ruling factors in the life of the nation, industrial, political and spiritual, and the masses of the people are sinking into a condition of ever greater dependence. The number of propertyless wage-earners is on the increase; with the steadily soaring cost of living their material existence grows more precarious, and the spirit of dissatisfaction and revolt is developing among them. The relations between the classes of producers and the employing classes are marked by intense, though not always conscious, class-antagonism and by overt class struggle.

Within the last few years the organized workers of the United States have been assailed with unusual severity by the organized capitalists, the government, the state and national legislatures, and the courts. These concerted attacks have served to demonstrate to many workers that the present methods and forms of organization of American labor are lacking in efficiency. Organized workers are beginning to revise their ways of warfare. The numerous "outlaw" strikes of recent years are definite symptoms of spontaneous revolt against the too conservative economic policies of the American Federation of Labor, while the formation of the rudimentary Farmer-Labor Party is an expression of a growing dissatisfaction with its stultifying and sterile political attitude.

A few more intense industrial struggles, a few more adverse court decisions, a few more political disappointments, and the organized workers of the United States will be forced into a solid industrial and political class organization, working in close harmony and co-operation with the Socialist movement in the same way as their comrades in all other advanced countries of the world.

The Socialist movement is solid because it is not a sporadic creation, but the result of a process of steady
regular and legitimate growth. It is reliable because it is composed of men and women who have enlisted in the cause voluntarily and are attached to it by indestructible ties of conviction and hope. It is well trained and disciplined by the mutual training and self-imposed discipline which alone can be counted on in an emergency. The Socialist organization is supported by all other armies of organized labor. The trade-unionists of the world, and the co-operative movement numbering millions of workers and representing huge material wealth, are, with few exceptions, solidly lined up behind the Socialist movement, acting in accord with it on questions of great public importance.

It is this world-wide organized force, this growing international army of the Socialist warfare, which constitutes the most concrete and most promising achievement of the Socialist propaganda.
CHAPTER VII

The Russian "Experiment"

The experiences and experiments of Russia are commonly invoked as a final test of the practical working of Socialism by friend and foe alike, and both are prone to overlook the abnormal conditions under which the Soviet government was born and has been maintained.

There was hardly a country in Europe less prepared for a Socialist order than was Russia towards the end of 1917, when the liberal bourgeois régime of Kerensky gave way to the Socialist Soviet Republic.

The country was lacking in every condition, economic, political and intellectual, which Socialists had therefore considered indispensable to the triumph of their cause.

In industrial development it was far behind all of Western Europe. It was preëminently an agricultural country with a bare beginning of modern factory production.

The wage workers, who everywhere constitute the bulk and bulwark of the Socialist movement represented a very small portion of the population. The great majority of the Russian people, 80% or more, consisted of small peasant proprietors, mostly illiterate. The large masses were practically devoid of political training and education, as they had only twelve years of a régime of sham political democracy to offset the effects of century-long autocratic absolutism. The economic as well as the political organizations of labor were in a rudimentary condition at best.

These normal and "natural" handicaps were badly aggravated by the disastrous social and economic effects
of the war and subsequently by the aggressive hostility of domestic and foreign counter-revolutionary forces.

The ravages of the world war bore more heavily on Russia than on any other belligerent nation. During the three years of its active war participation Russia mobilized about 15,000,000 men, all taken from its farms, factories and other spheres of normal industrial activities. 5,000,000 of these were killed, disabled or captured. When the military collapse came Russia found herself with an army of 10,000,000 men on all its fronts, ill clad and inadequately provisioned, hundreds of miles away from their homes and violently dislocated from their accustomed lives and pursuits. During three years the entire energy of the nation was practically absorbed by the insatiable demands of the gigantic warfare. Most of the life-sustaining industries of normal peace time were ruined. The transportation system, which for a country of the colossal dimensions of Russia had always been woefully inadequate, broke down completely under the heavy strain of war activities.

Russia's war debt, internal and external, mounted into fabulous figures; its paper currency was deflated almost to the point of worthlessness.

The long reign of czarist incompetence and corruption and the weak and short-lived administration of Lvoff and Kerensky had left to the young Socialist Soviet government a fatal legacy of paralyzed production, transportation and exchange; of economic disorganization and social dissolution, of famine and epidemics, of one hundred and fifty million men, women and children in a state of helplessness, despair and chaos.

Even if Russia had been allowed to center all the resources and energies of the country on the effort of repairing its shattered economic and social foundations, the task would have been desperately difficult. But the Socialist government of Russia was not permitted any breathing space of peace. From first to last it was forced to combat an unremittent series of determined onslaughts on the part of all imperialistic governments of the world.
When Russia, exhausted by the war and deserted by her allies, was compelled to sue for peace, the Prussian war lords forced upon her terms which were deliberately designed to cripple the already ruined country beyond all hope of redemption.

Not satisfied with the imposition of heavy money indemnities and other onerous terms the Brest-Litovsk treaty cut off from Soviet Russia her most important industrial and grain-producing territories as well as her most valuable outlets to the sea.

During the months immediately following the signing of the infamous treaty the belligerent governments of the Allied and Central Powers vied with each other in open and secret efforts to harass and eventually to destroy the Russian Socialist Soviet Republic.

When the German military machine collapsed the capitalist governments of the Allied countries had the field all to themselves, and they made a most ruthless use of their opportunities.

Not daring to declare open war upon Russia for fear of revolt on the part of their own war-weary peoples, they engaged in an unofficial, indirect and perfidious warfare against her by inciting, financing, arming and equipping incessant counter-revolutionary risings within her territory. The Czecho-Slovak forces on the Volga River, the Cossack General Denikin in the South, the usurper Kolchack in Siberia, the adventurers Yudenitch and Bermondt in the Northwest, the comic-opera government of Tchaykowski in the North, the Czarist generals Alexieff and Krasnov, were in turn or simultaneously encouraged and aided in their futile efforts to dislodge the Soviet government.

Nor were the efforts of the Allied statesmen limited to the policy of fomenting civil war in Russia. A line of "buffer states" all along Russia's Western front was created with the double design of cutting her off from direct touch with Western Europe and fomenting wars between her and the states thus newly created and for
the greater part carved out from her former territory. It is an open secret that the wars of Finland, Esthonia and Poland were largely instigated and financed by foreign powers. The "cordon sanitaire" ingeniously devised by the Allied statesmen was intended as a cordon of strangulation.

The incessant armed attacks against Soviet Russia forced the latter to organize and maintain a large and ever growing army of defense. The young Socialist republic was thus deprived of some of its most effective and reliable productive forces at a time when they were most needed; the crippled transportation facilities and scanty resources of the country were largely absorbed by the requirements of the soldiers on the battle fields, while the military problem of self-preservation greatly hampered all systematic attempts to solve the permanent social and economic problems of the country.

But the final and most desperate measure to crush the struggling government of the Russian workers and peasants, was the so-called peace-time blockade, an unprecedented device, by which the allied capitalist governments of the world barred all external trade and communication with Russia. Under the strict enforcement of the measure not a plough or a nail, not an ounce of food or medicine was allowed to penetrate from the outside. The self-righteous spokesmen of modern Christianity and civilization were determined to break the rebellious nation that had dared to challenge the capitalist rule, even if hundreds of thousands of men, women and children perished in the humane process.

If the practical accomplishments of Russia are viewed in the light of these tremendous handicaps, it must be conceded that they furnish conclusive proof of an extraordinary vitality inherent in the Socialist ideal.

For the short, stormy and difficult career of the Soviet Republic is by no means devoid of concrete and important achievements in all vital fields of public life and social existence.
In the domain of agriculture, which employs the great bulk of the population, and is the life nerve of the economic fabric of the nation, radical and lasting improvements have been introduced.

For the first time since the emancipation from serfdom the Russian peasants have enough land. Almost the first act of the Soviet government was to turn over to the peasantry over 60,000,000 acres of land, and more been added since. The Soviet scheme of land distribution now in operation is to give each peasant family as much land as it can cultivate without hired help and to redistribute it periodically to meet the changed family conditions. The government makes special efforts to encourage the system of collective ownership and co-operative cultivation of large farm properties and there are at this time several thousand well organized communes for collective farming as well as about 1500 nationalized "state domains." The aim of the Soviet government is to gradually transform the system of individual farming into one of collective cultivation on more scientific and efficient lines, and this aim is sought to be accomplished by means of a large and systematic campaign of persuasion and instruction as well as by the object lesson of numerous model farms maintained by the government.

The great forestry system of Russia is fully nationalized.

But far more radical changes than in agriculture have been accomplished in the industrial order of Russia. Fully ninety per cent of the more important plants, including practically all works in mining, metal and textile industries, have been socialized. They are managed by national regional and shop committees which are composed of workmen, technical experts and government representatives and work in close co-operation with each other. Practically all workers of Russia are organized in "professional alliances" or industrial unions, and these organizations enjoy official government standing. In matters of wages, hours of labor, factory inspection and social insurance they exercise legislative and executive
functions, subject only to the approval and control of the supreme government organs, in which they are also largely represented.

Eight hours is the normal workday for adult male workers in non-hazardous occupations. In the more dangerous industries and in all clerical occupations a six-hour workday prevails. Workers between the ages of 16 and 18 years work six hours followed by a two-hour period of study. All workers are entitled to a consecutive rest of 42 hours in each week and to a month's vacation with full pay every year.

The scale of wages which varies with the character and grade of work as well as with the local cost of living, is readjusted from time to time by agreement between the labor unions and the Commissariat of labor.

Workers are given employment by the appropriate government agencies, and are insured against unemployment as well as against accidents, sickness, invalidity and old age. The system of workers' insurance, which also includes maternity insurance, is non-contributory as far as the workers are concerned. The vast funds required for its operation are furnished by a grant equal to 25% of the total pay roll in nationalized industries and by similar levy upon private employers.

An elaborate system of factory inspection has been evolved which takes care of safety and sanitation in the works and of the enforcement of established labor standards.

Soviet Russia has also to a large extent nationalized the system of food distribution. It has established a government monopoly in food articles of prime importance, such as bread, meats, salted fish, salt, sugar and tea, which is administered by the Commissariat of Food Control, a huge country-wide organization with about two hundred thousand employees. The Commissariat takes from the peasants their surplus of bread stuffs after every harvest and gives them in exchange money or machinery and manufactured commodities.
But even greater accomplishments than in the field of production and distribution have been achieved by the Socialist government of Russia in the all-important sphere of public education. It goes without saying that such wide spread illiteracy as prevailed for centuries in the vast domains of the czars could not be wiped out by three years of even the most intense educational activities, but Russia under Soviet rule has within that short span of time made marvelous progress in the direction of diffusing knowledge and culture among the entire population, rural as well as urban, and has laid the foundations for a new generation of educated and enlightened citizenship. The greatest care is bestowed upon the physical and intellectual rearing of the child. To the child goes the best of available food, to the school the most comfortable and pleasant building.

The Soviet government not only appropriates large sums of money for school purposes, but seeks to stimulate the interest of the people, particularly the rural population, in the general educational movement. As a result thousands of new village schools have sprung up, mostly established by the government but often organized by the peasants themselves. In these schools scientific farming methods and other practical matters are taught in addition to the usual elementary subjects. For workers courses in technical subjects have been added to the curriculum.

Theatres, operas and concerts have been improved and extended and opened to the workers, who receive free admission tickets planfully distributed by workers' committees. The art galleries and museums of czarist Russia have not only been preserved intact, but have been largely increased from private collections and thrown open to the public. The Russian people, so long held in forced and calculated ignorance, are developing an acute thirst of knowledge, and the Soviet government is making elaborate plans for the mass publication of cheap editions of the best works of the world literature.
Next to industry and education the Soviets have given special attention to the subject of public health. Medicine has been largely socialized. A number of new hospitals have been established, and the doctors are virtually public officers in the service of the government. Every citizen has the right to free medical treatment.

All these socialized institutions are, of course, working imperfectly as yet. In the first months of sudden and colossal economic and social change production fell off disastrously, transportation suffered badly and the town population was brought near the edge of starvation. But the succeeding period of Communist rule has been characterized by substantial and progressive improvement in the entire field of national economy. The output of industrial plants has been steadily increasing; the transport system, while still badly crippled, satisfies the vital needs of the country and the food supply distributed by the government provides for more than half of the essential needs of the urban population.

In the extraordinarily difficult conditions under which the Soviet government has been operating, it has often been compelled to deviate from the principles and ideals of pure Social Democracy. Notable instances of such deviations are the organization and maintenance of a strong army; the restriction of the franchise to the producing members of the community; the suppression of some of the opposition press; the institution of summary revolutionary tribunals; the establishment of varying food rations in towns in accordance with the occupations of the consumer, and the introduction of compulsory labor. But these are temporary measures dictated by the emergencies of the fierce fight for self-preservation into which the Soviet republic has been driven. With the restoration of peace with foreign countries and tranquillity at home the necessity of repression will disappear, the vast material and moral resources now diverted to military purposes, will be set free to serve the social and economic needs of the nation, the new industrial and cultural institutions devised by Soviet Rus-
sia will be given the first real opportunity of full de-
velopment.

The Soviet system of Russia is still in the experimental
stage. It is not perfect. It may not be final. Its ini-
tiators and supporters have undoubtedly committed
many blunders and some excesses. They could not do
otherwise unless they were superhuman. But the posi-
tive achievements of the first Socialist republic already
outweigh its deficiencies and errors by a clear and heavy
balance.

The Soviet government has saved Russia from anarchy
and dissolution. In these years of universal misery and
suffering it has provided for the great bulk of the Rus-
sian people more tolerable and livable conditions than
those that prevail in the war-stricken countries in East-
ern and Central Europe under Capitalists régime.

It has secured a greater measure of stability and order
for the short period of its existence than any radical
revolutionary government known in history.

It has definitely destroyed the sinister powers of po-
itical and economic absolutism in Russia and has in-
spired the working world with ideals of a higher and
more humane civilization.

It has vindicated the claims of international Socialism
as a living and driving force.

Whether Russia will survive as an organization of
Communist Soviets or whether it will modify its form of
government and methods of operation along other So-
cialist lines, the lesson of its first struggles and achieve-
ments will never be effaced from the pages of modern
history.
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