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1—Foreword

That tremendous changes are taking place in the world can no longer be denied by even the most unthinking observer.

Forms of industrial organization bitterly opposed for several decades have become accepted facts. Governmental policies in relation to industry which aroused the united opposition of the owners of industry are being applied with little or no friction. Our conceptions of the services which the government should render to the people are becoming more inclusive.

The change in our viewpoint in regard to industrial development is illustrated in our attitude toward the great industrial organizations we call trusts.

For two decades the trust question was one of the momentous questions of our political life.

The passage of the Sherman anti-trust law in 1890 marked the beginning of the period of opposition, which extended down to the presidential campaign of 1912, during which Mr. Wilson advocated a "trust-busting" program.

Today "trust-busting" is no longer an issue. The trusts have become an accepted fact. Cases begun during the heat of the anti-trust campaign and still pending in the courts are prosecuted with little interest or enthusiasm and no doubt will be ultimately dropped.

Coincident with the dying out of the anti-trust fervor a new conception of the government's responsibility for industry has developed.

The tendency toward government control and even government ownership becomes constantly more pronounced.
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In the cities, where the government is closer to the lives and needs of the people, the same tendencies and forces are manifesting themselves. There is an ever-increasing demand for greater service on the part of the city government and an ever-widening sphere of activity.

All these tendencies and developments, which were evident and in progress before the great war began, have been emphasized and become more marked since August of 1914.

Innovations in government activities which would have aroused bitter controversies ten or even five years ago, are being adopted with hardly any comment.

Our viewpoint has changed—is still changing rapidly, and social evolution, usually a slow and painful process, is proceeding by leaps and bounds.

Is all this mere chance?

Are we in the grip of blind forces about which we can understand nothing and is the mutation, change and development in our industrial life and social conceptions without definite direction?

Are we the plaything of fate which is bringing into the world a new chaos for us to struggle in?

Are we drifting without knowing whither we are going?

Or, is it possible for us to grasp the significance of these changes and to forecast the broad outline of the new social order toward which we are moving?

Is there a science of society which enables us through study and analysis to understand the social forces at work and to work in harmony with those social forces?
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The Socialists say there is and that Socialism is that science of society.

The opponents of Socialism seem unable to grasp the broader meaning of Socialism.

They see the Socialists holding conventions, nominating candidates, framing platforms and entering into election contests and therefore consider the Socialist party as a mere political organization, expressing the ideas and whims of certain individuals, just as THEY look upon the Republican and Democratic parties.

This view was expressed by the editor of one of the metropolitan dailies in comparing the Socialist party to the Greenback party and the People's party.

The Socialists had made great gains. They had increased their vote tremendously and elected their representatives to many political offices. The editor in question said this was nothing of importance. Third parties had appeared in American political life before, had their day and disappeared. Just as the Greenback party and the People's party had gained a certain amount of prestige and power, so the Socialist party would gain certain strength and then disappear as these third parties of the past have disappeared.

This is still the view of the ignorant opponents to Socialism. The average politician, newspaper editor and business man think that Socialism is a temporary thing, a nuisance of the moment, which will soon drop out of sight and leave them to their undisturbed enjoyment of pelf and power.

It requires only a glance at one phase of the Socialist movement to destroy this illusion.

The Socialist movement is international.

—5—
ARE WE GROWING TOWARD SOCIALISM?

It does not only exist in the United States, but in Germany, Russia, Italy, France, Austria, England and the other countries of Europe. There is a Socialist movement in China, Japan, Australia, New Zealand and the countries of South America. Our neighbors, Canada and Mexico, have Socialist parties.

The Socialist movement exists everywhere where the capitalist system is in existence. In every country of the world where a certain phase of industrial development has come into existence it has brought with it the Socialist movement.

In all these countries the Socialists are fighting for an identical, ultimate goal. They stand united in their struggle to achieve a certain form of social and industrial organization.

This fact alone should serve to distinguish the Socialist party from all other political movements and to show that it has a different basis than the ephemeral third party political movements in this country during the last century.

To show why Socialism is called the science of society and by the application of this science to show that the changes in our industrial and social life are not part of a jumble of unrelated happenings, but a definite evolution and growth toward a new stage of society, and what that society must be, will be the purpose of the chapters to follow.
2—Social Evolution of the Past

To the man or woman who believes that the present organization of society has always existed the suggestion that a new and different social order may supplant it, naturally seems preposterous.

For such persons our social organization has been cast in a certain mold and has remained unchanged and will remain unchangable for all time. For them there is no hope. Things have always been so and will always be so, is their fatalistic formula.

In order to grasp the full significance of the industrial development of our time we must have as a background for our judgment a knowledge of the social evolution of the past.

Once we understand that the relations which men have entered into in gaining the means of subsistence have changed and altered through the ages, that social systems have come and gone, that these social systems have had their beginnings, that they have grown into full flower and declined and decayed, we are then in a position to interpret the social development of our own time.

The human race, during the period it has existed upon the earth, has lived under four great social systems, which are called primitive communism, slavery, feudalism and capitalism.

Each of these are marked by distinct relations between individuals in gaining their livelihood and each system of relationship in gaining a livelihood gave birth to a form of government, a code of ethics, and general social customs in harmony with it.

Our knowledge of the past, gained through the re-
searches of scientists, tells us that primitive communism was the earliest social system which existed among men.

If we count the time that there has been a race of men upon the earth as a hundred thousand years, four-fifths of that time or nearly eighty thousand years has been lived by man under the social arrangement known as communism.

Communism existed among the American Indians when this continent was discovered. Vestiges of it still remain among the backward races of the earth. We are therefore in a position to know its chief features.

There was no private property in the means of subsistence during this early period of life of the human race. "The earth and the fullness thereof" belonged to all mankind.

The tribe of men which occupied a certain area used that territory in common. The fields, the forests, the hunting grounds were open to all alike. No one was denied the right to secure and use what nature had provided. There were no bounds set by ownership, no right to exact rent or payment for use of what others needed in order to live.

It was not only, however, the right to use what nature provided that marked this stage of human development. The things secured were likewise common property and used in common.

The game secured from the hunt, and at a later period the food secured through cultivation, was the common property of the gens (the gens was the unit of social organization among our ancestors.) One family did not starve while another in the same gens feast-
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ed. The units in the gens shared hardships and plenty alike. They suffered when there was scarcity and feasted when there was plenty.

There were no classes in this early communistic society and therefore no class government. Men were equal. The American Indians elected their own war chiefs and their sachems, or rulers, in time of peace. They met in councils and decided their course of action by the vote of the majority. Even the despised squaw had a voice and a vote in the council. The war chief and the sachem could be deposed by a vote of the gens.

We may well ask what it was that brought to an end this idealistic organization of society, which served mankind for so many ages, and brought into the world tyranny, oppression and class conflicts which have been dominant in the history of mankind since the time of this ancient communism?

We find the answer in the development of the means of gaining a subsistence. Strange as it may seem, it was man's progress in gaining control over his food supply, his ability to produce a greater amount of the necessities of life, that brought to an end this primitive communism and led to the division of the human race into opposing classes, which has existed ever since.

So long as a human being could produce only enough for his own subsistence through his efforts, there was no basis for slavery. An enslaved man who consumed all that he produced was of no use to his master. Slavery did not come into existence until it was profitable.

Cannibalism was universal among our savage an-
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cestors. The prisoners taken in wars between contending tribes became part of the food supply of the victors.

It was only after man had improved his productive powers sufficiently so that the individual could produce more than he consumed that slavery came into existence.

This time came with the development of the art of cultivating cereals and domesticating animals.

Incidentally this development of man's productive powers led to a more settled habitation, which was another factor in making slavery possible. Among a roving band the attention required to prevent slaves from escaping would in itself have made slavery impossible.

When this new mode of production came into existence the prisoners taken in the wars between the tribes were no longer killed and eaten, but were set to work to produce wealth for their masters.

With the development of productive ability there developed also the idea of private property, and naturally the war chief, chosen for his prowess in battle, would capture the greatest number of prisoners and thus gain the means of amassing wealth for himself. The great chief became the ruler, the king and the lesser leaders, part of the ruling class of the tribe.

From this beginning there grew up the great slave states of antiquity—Assyria, Persia, Athens and Rome. This society based upon production through slaves could not exist permanently.

No society, to paraphrase the words of Abraham Lincoln, can remain in existence permanently, which is
part slave and part free.
Men have never willingly accepted the yoke of slavery.
They have always fought for freedom. In a society in which an enslaved class exists there will always be a class conflict.
The historians of Athens tell us of an uprising of the slaves in the silver mines of Attica, owned by Athens, four centuries before the beginning of the present era, and Rome was shaken again and again by slave rebellions.
This struggle between the rulers and slaves ended "in the common ruin of the contending classes," for when the northern tribes descended upon Rome, divided against itself, it could not withstand their onslaught. With the end of the power of the Roman Empire there went out of existence the social system upon which it was based.
It is true that slavery existed in this country until after the middle of the last century but this was merely a case of social atavism. Slavery as a social system ended with the breaking up of the Roman Empire.
For a time after the downfall of Rome the social organization of Europe was marked by a return to the communistic principles which dominated the social institutions of early mankind. Communistic villages grew up everywhere on that continent. The people lived in villages, protected by stockades, tilling the land about the village. The food thus secured was the common store. Their government was a democracy.
To protect themselves against the roving bands of warriors, which were to be found in all parts of Eur-
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ope, they chose a military chief, whose duty it was to protect the village against these marauders.

From this kernel developed the new class society—feudalism.

The military leader, first the servant of the community, granted a share in the product of the community in payment for his services, soon gained greater power and took as his right what had been previously freely given.

He arrogated to himself the power of a ruler and exacted as his due an ever greater part of the product of the workers. He developed from the servant of the community into the divinely appointed feudal overlord. The tillers of the soil, the workers, became serfs, who were bought and sold with the land. The new class society was in full bloom. Feudalism had blossomed forth, to rule Europe for a thousand years.

The reign of feudalism was marked by repeated uprisings of the serfs. The insurrection under Wat Tyler in England in the 14th century, the Peasant War in Southern Germany in the early part of the 16th century, were efforts of the serfs to throw their feudal oppressors from their backs. It was not, however, until a new class developed within the feudal system that the power of feudalism was seriously threatened.

The trading class, the first capitalists, grew up within the feudal system. Before the discovery of America this class had gained some measure of power. The era of commercial development which came with the discovery of the Western Hemisphere soon put it in a position to challenge the power of the feudal rulers of society.
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At about the same time a new mode of production began to develop. Machinery came into use. Workers were needed in the factories which were being established.

Capitalism could not develop fully under feudalism. The serfs were attached to the land. They could not leave it. The new system of factory production required a large body of free laborers. The feudal rulers were apt to consider the traders their legitimate prey. They used their control of the state to advance their own interests at the expense of the interests of the capitalists.

The struggle between the feudal rulers and growing capitalist class lasted for six centuries. It manifested itself as early as the thirteenth century in the struggle of the free cities of the Hanseatic League against the feudal lords. The commercial class ended feudal rule in England in the middle of the sixteenth century. In France the end of feudalism was marked by the Reign of Terror in 1793. In Germany feudalism was partially beaten in 1848 and in Russia it met its Waterloo only yesterday.

The picture here drawn of the past life of man is merely a rough sketch. It should, however, be sufficient to show that man has not lived under a fixed and permanent social system, but that, on the contrary, there has been constant growth and development. With the knowledge that man's social relations have been under four well defined systems of social organization, we are prepared for an examination of the capitalist system, to determine whether it is something permanent and unchangeable, as the apologists for things as
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they are seem to believe, or whether it is also growing and developing and preparing the way for a new social order.
3—The Evolution of Production

The improvement of the steam engine, which brought it into general use as a generator of power for manufacture, was accomplished by James Watt in 1782. The spinning and weaving machinery which revolutionized the manufacture of textiles, was invented by Hargreave, Arkwright and Crompton between 1764 and 1780.

These inventions mark the beginning of a new era of capitalist development.

The commercial class which carried on the early struggles against the feudal system was not, to any great extent, engaged in the manufacture of goods for sale. Production for sale developed very slowly. Manufacture was in its infancy and trading was the chief function of the commercial class.

It was after the perfection of the steam engine by Watt, which marked the beginning of the age of machine production, that the manufacture of goods for sale became the principle function of the capitalist.

We have seen in a previous chapter that it was changes in man's way of getting a living, new methods of producing wealth, that brought into existence a new social order.

It is in the changes of industry since the development of machine production that we will find the signs pointing to the development of the new social order which is to succeed capitalism.

Prior to the general introduction of machinery individual production was the rule in industry.

The weaver, before the invention of the steam engine and the power loom, worked in his own home. He
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secured his supply of yarn from his employer, turned it into cloth by his own fireside and delivered the finished material to the owner.

The shoemaker, the blacksmith, the tailor, with their assistants, carried on the work of production in their own shops.

The shoemaker: received his order from his customer, purchased his materials, turned them into shoes and handed the finished product to his customer. He produced a complete commodity which he sold direct to his customer.

Similarly the tailor produced complete commodities for direct sale to his customers.

When a number of workers were brought together in a shop or factory they usually worked with their employer. They produced completed articles, beginning with the raw material and putting the finished product on the market.

Production in these early days of capitalism, it will be thus seen, was individual in its character. It was individual labor, individual skill that counted in producing goods. The division of labor had not developed to any great extent.

The introduction of machinery changed all this. It developed a new mode of production.

Contrast the weaver in the days when weaving was still individual work, when the weaver secured the yarn from his employer and turned it into cloth in his own home, using a machine which he owned, to the workers in the great cloth producing industry of today!
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The weaver of the days gone by has disappeared. The great, ingenious power machines have taken his place. In place of working in his own home he works in a great mill employing thousands of workers. He is a machine attendant, overseeing one operation of the work of producing cloth. In many instances women and children have replaced the expert workers and they are mere cogs in the industrial machine.

The same is true of other lines of production. The shoemaker who made shoes is gone. A shoe factory has supplanted him.

The workers in the shoe factory do not individually produce shoes. They perform single operations in the work of producing shoes. They cut leather into certain shapes, they sew certain seams, they sew on buttons and make buttonholes. The work of making a pair of shoes has been divided into many separate operations, each performed by a different worker.

The manufacture of clothing has developed similarly.

An examination of the processes of production in a great clothing factory, from the time the work of production was begun until the finished product was shipped to the distributor, would show many hundreds of men and women each performing separate operations in the process of production.

Such an examination would show the planning office, in which the operations are charted and the materials requisitioned, the stockkeepers who supply the materials, the markers who lay up the cloth on the tables and mark out the design of the garments with
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the help of patterns, the machine cutters, who cut the cloth, the blockers who stamp out certain parts, the label sewers and pin ticketers, who mark the various parts for identification, the assemblers, the basters, the machine operators, finishers, buttonhole makers, button sewers, pressers and examiners, and a variety of other workers, each performing a part of the work of producing a complete garment.

Each worker contributes a small part of the work of producing the completed whole. Their product is no longer individual. It is a co-operative, collective product.

What is true of the work of producing shoes or clothing is true of industry in general. The entire process of the work of production has developed from an individual to collective work.

In every line of production hundreds, sometimes thousands of workers co-operate in producing goods. They work together, each performing a part of the work of bringing the complete product into existence.

Capitalism has developed from individual production to collective, co-operative production.

It is the development of the machinery of production that has wrought this mighty change in the manner of producing wealth.

Machinery is not as flexible as human beings. Most machines are built to perform one kind of work only. It requires many kinds of machines to perform the various operations necessary in the manufacture of a coat or a pair of shoes.

Each machine requires an attendant, whose part in
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the work of production is limited, by the fact that the machine performs only a certain operation.

The many kinds of machines necessary to the work of production had to be kept working in order to make their use profitable and this required production on a large scale. Thus the introduction of machinery made necessary the change from small scale production to the production of goods in great volume.

The development of machine production has therefore not only brought collective production into existence—that is, many workers co-operating in producing wealth—but it has also brought into existence great industrial organizations for production on a large scale.

The great industrial organizations of our time, the trusts, are not the product of chance, but the logical result of the evolution of the machinery of production.

The individual or organization which proposes to "bust the trusts" is making as absurd a proposal as he who demands "sun stand still."

The work of production has not only become a collective process within the individual industrial units themselves, but the same interdependence exists between various industrial units.

If a single worker contributing to the work of production does his or her work badly the whole process becomes disorganized and the product may be worthless.

Similarly if the mines shut down for a definite period and coal cannot be obtained, or the transportation of goods is stopped by an interruption of railroad service, or the supply of raw material is not delivered,
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there is friction and the entire industrial process may stop.

The whole business of production has become a collective, co-operative process, interrelated and interdependent.

Thus the changes in the capitalist mode of production, which begun one hundred and fifty years ago and which have been particularly rapid during the past twenty-five years, have transformed the entire structure of capitalism and established basic conditions which are part of the necessary conditions for the establishment of Socialism.

Socialism requires co-operation in the production of wealth. That has come through the evolution of machinery under capitalism.

Socialism requires the integration of industry in larger industrial units. That has also come as the result of the development of the machinery of production under capitalism.

The evolution of capitalism has already produced the basic conditions necessary in industry for the development of the new social order which is to succeed it—SOCIALISM.
4—The New Social Conscience

“In the social production which men carry on they enter into definite relations that are indispensable and independent of their will; these relations of production correspond to a definite stage of development of their material powers of production. The sum total of these relations of production constitute the economic structure of society—the real foundation, on which rise legal and political superstructures and to which correspond definite forms of social consciousness. The mode of production in material life determines the general character of social, political and spiritual processes of life. It is not the consciousness of men that determines their existence, but, on the contrary, their social existence determines their consciousness. At a certain stage of their development, the material forces of production in society come in conflict with the existing relations of production, or—what is but a legal expression for the same thing—with the property relations within which they have been at work before. From forms of development of the forces of production these relations turn into fetters. Then comes the period of social revolution. With the change of the economic foundation the entire immense superstructure is more or less rapidly transformed.”—From the preface of “A Contribution to the Critique of Political Economy.”

In these words Karl Marx, who laid the theoretical foundation of the modern Socialist movement, summed up the principles underlying social evolution.
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We have seen that the mode of production has developed from the individual production of the early days of capitalism to the collective production of the present day.

If the theory above enunciated is correct a new social consciousness, corresponding with the new mode of production, should have developed during the same period.

Has this new viewpoint come into existence? Is our social consciousness, our mental outlook, today different from that which existed when production was still individual in its character?

The political history of the last one hundred years will give us a definite answer to this question.

A hundred years ago the generally accepted theory in regard to the relation of governments to industry was typified in the words “laisser faire,” (let alone). Non-interference with industry was considered a virtue. That government was best which interfered the least with individual freedom of action.

It will readily be seen that this is the reflex of the mode of production. Production was still individual and it brought into existence a political economy which laid stress on individual freedom in industry.

The capitalists were left alone to work out their own salvation. There were no laws regulating the manner in which they should run their business. The suggestion that government might step in and tell the owners of industry whom they might employ, how the machinery of production should be safeguarded and how many hours the workers should be employed,
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would have seemed to them a shocking perversion of the duty of the government.

It was during this period of unchecked individualism that the horrors of child labor were greatest in England.

Children of the most tender ages, from the poor houses, were farmed out to the cotton manufacturers. In their mad greed for quick profits they worked these children for from fourteen to sixteen hours per day and compelled them to live under such conditions that they died by the thousands.

The supply of the children of the poor seemed inexhaustible. There were no laws to safeguard their lives. Individualism was rampant in industry. The result was that the children died like flies.

When the suggestion was first made that the government should pass laws to safeguard the lives of these children it aroused the bitter opposition of the entire capitalist class of England. They protested that the management of industry was not the business of the government. They said that if the government began to interfere with business in such a manner, business would be strangled and the entire industrial system would collapse.

Although the evidence to prove the brutal treatment of the children, the long hours they were compelled to work, the unsanitary conditions under which they lived, was at hand, it was only through one of the hardest struggles in English political history that the first child labor laws were passed in that country.

This incident from the industrial history of Eng-
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land shows how deeply rooted the theory of non-interference with industry was in the political economy of the past.

Since that time the theory of "laisser faire" has got so badly battered that it is no longer recognizable.

While the capitalist class still fights against laws regulating its business, the principle that the government has the right to legislate for the control of industry is firmly established.

In the constitution of the state of Ohio, adopted in 1912, we find the provision that "Laws may be passed fixing and regulating the hours of labor, establishing a minimum wage and providing for the comfort, health, safety and general welfare of all employees; and no other provision of this constitution shall impair or limit this power.

Legislation such as described in this paragraph is general throughout this country and in every other capitalistically developed country.

Not only has society established its right to interfere with the business of the capitalist in these respects, but it regulates every phase of industry.

The fixing of rates which railroads may charge for freight and passenger transportation is one example showing how far we have developed from the old ideas of the right of the government to interfere in industry.

Regulation in regard to industry expressed itself in child labor laws, laws regulating the hours of labor for men and women, providing for safeguarding of machinery, workmen's compensation, railway rate regu-
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...lation, anti-trust and in laws affecting industry in scores of other ways, before the great war began.

Since the war began the rights of the private owners of industry have been invaded to even a greater extent. In place of the doctrine of "laisser-faire," we have the principles established that the private owners of industry have no rights which the government need respect.

This new social consciousness is the product of the change in the mode of production.

Just as individual production gave birth to ideas of political economy which sanctioned unchecked individualism in industry, so there has grown out of the collective production, which has since developed, the demand for social control of industry.

Capitalism has developed collectivism in industry. Many individuals are compelled to co-operate and work together in carrying on production. The social consciousness which demands collective control of industry, expressing itself at present through legislation by the government, is the natural product of this new mode of production.

This new social consciousness is not the product of the present moment. It existed before the war began and was expressed in the many laws regulating industry. The needs of the government since the beginning of the war, have merely resulted in more rapid development of principles already established.

The Socialist movement itself is the product of this new social consciousness. It expresses in more advanced and definite form the ideal toward which, in spite of...
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the resistance of the capitalist class, society is advancing.

Since industry has become collective the workers who are carrying on the work of production are demanding in greater and greater number, that the ownership and management of industry should also be collective.

In voicing this demand the Socialists are working in harmony with the new social consciousness growing out of the mode of production, which will ultimately bring about the establishment of Socialism.
5—The Growth of Collectivism

During the early days of capitalism the functions of governments were few in number.

Their activities were limited to making and executing laws, collecting taxes, coining money to serve as medium of exchange, and maintaining an army and navy.

Later there was added to these limited duties the work of conducting the business of the post office department.

The responsibilities of municipal governments were equally light. A police department to keep order, provisions for street lighting, sanitation and the maintenance of highways, and the work of the city government was complete.

Collective institutions, national and local, were very few in number even as late as a half century ago.

With the growth of collective production and the social consciousness corresponding thereto, the activities of the governments, both city and national, have grown remarkably. Governmental industry has replaced private industry in many fields and there is a constant pressure for a further advance on the part of the governments in acquiring ownership of and managing industry.

This new phase of governmental activity has been particularly marked in the cities. One of the results of the new form of industry which machine production brought into existence, was the growth of large industrial centres. Great masses of workers were
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brought together to live in limited areas. With the growth of the cities the problems of supplying water, lighting, transportation and sanitation became increasingly important.

At first these matters were left almost entirely in the hands of private business organizations, but the tendency toward collective action soon became manifest and has grown constantly.

In the year 1800 there were 16 water works in this country and of these 15 were in private hands. In 1899, about 100 years later, there were 3,326 water works, of which nearly two-thirds, (actually 63 per cent.), were municipally owned and operated.

No instance is on record in which a plant once publicly owned has gone back into private hands, but private plants are becoming public property in increasing numbers.

Municipally owned gas and electric light plants are numerous. Two cities in the United States own part of their street railway systems.

Many other fields have been invaded by municipal governments. Markets, asphalt paving plants, garbage reduction plants, docks, garages, heating plants, ferries, lunch rooms, dance halls, are some of the things owned and managed by city governments.

The schools, universally owned by the government, are an established form of collectivism. The scope of their activities is constantly increasing.

If we turn from this country to Europe, we find that the growth of municipal institutions has gone even further.
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In 1279 cities in Germany, of all sizes, the following municipal institutions existed in 1906:

561 water works, 440 gas plants, 201 electric light plants, 54 street railways, 426 slaughter houses and stockyards, 10 docks, 38 market halls, 370 bathing establishments, 10 warehouses and sales halls, 1 wine business, 42 stone and lime quarries, 17 breweries, 104 inns and restaurants, 15 hydropathic establishments, 2 fruit preserving factories, 2 wine cellars, 1 timber warehouse, 2 refrigerating plants, 2 mines, 2 bakeries, 4 factories, 45 brick plants, 23 mills, 2 dairies, 2 locksmitheries, 2 ropeworks, 17 dancing halls, 16 ferries, 1 livery stable and 2 fishing enterprises.

Other German cities owned banks, theatres, pawnshops, much of the land within their boundaries and workingmen's homes.

In England the cities engage in almost as great a variety of businesses. Out of 300 street railway systems operated in that country 176 are owned by municipalities. Five-sixths of the waterworks and almost as great a proportion of the gas plants are publicly owned. Two-thirds of the electric light plants are owned by the cities and slaughter houses are a common business undertaking, for city governments.

The growth of collectivism in the larger field occupied by national governments has been no less remarkable.

While the United States is by no means in the forefront of this movement, a description of the activities of the Department of Agriculture in organizing and improving production in its particular field,
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would cover many pages.

The land reclamation service of the Department of the Interior offers another example of similar activity.

The recently enacted Federal Reserve Act is a partial step toward government control of the banking system.

The parcel post is an extension of governmental functions familiar to everyone.

The government owns a printing plant and recently congress authorized the public printer to proceed with the erection of a paper mill to supply paper to this plant.

The United States and Great Britain were the only countries of any importance, which before the outbreak of the war, did not own some part of their railroad systems.

The governments of Germany, Austria, Sweden, Russia, Holland and New Zealand own and operate coal mines.

The Argentine Republic has gone into the business of producing oil.

The salt and tobacco industries are government monopolies in a number of countries.

Another field in which collectivism has developed greatly is social insurance, providing for insurance against industrial accidents, sickness, old age, invalidity and unemployment.

The collective institutions above described existed before the Great War began. Since August of 1914 the development of collectivism has gone forward at a tremendous rate. The necessities of war have compelled —30—
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the governments engaged in it, and even the governments of neutral countries, to extend their control and management of industries.

In 1915 it was estimated by Edmund Fischer, Socialist member of the German Reichstag, that 55 per cent of the people of Germany received their income from the city, state and national government.

England took control of its railroad system immediately after the declaration of war and has since put a commission in charge of mining and shipping.

In this country the government went into the merchant marine insurance business in 1914, shortly after the war started. It has since extended its control to many forms of industry. The food and fuel dictatorships are conspicuous examples of the development of this form of collectivism. Through the Emergency Fleet Corporation it is building ships and it has commandeered all available existing shipping.

The experience of the government of this country with the railroads is an illuminating example of the necessity of collective ownership and a justification of the Socialist principles.

The government is seeking efficiency in transportation service. To obtain it a war board with full power to direct the transportation system was organized. In spite of all its efforts the end sought has not been attained.

The insurmountable obstacle to improvement in the transportation system has been the selfish interests of the owners of the various companies.

The government placed on the statute books laws
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which prevented the railroads from combining in an effort to protect the shippers. Now it finds consolidation necessary to secure the greatest efficiency, but consolidated operation without consolidated ownership raises the question of how the profits are to be divided and naturally every set of private owners want all they can get.

The private interests of the companies are in conflict with the need for unified operation, through which alone the desired efficiency can be obtained. The only solution is to secure unified operation and control through government ownership, and that will undoubtedly be the outcome of the existing situation.

Will the collectivism which has developed during the war disappear when the war ends?

All the experience of the past answers emphatically no. The increase in the activity of the government during the war is not the result of a newly adopted policy, but is the quickening of a process of development which was under way when the war began. The greater needs of the hour have merely hastened the process.

The collectivism which developed before the war and since is the product of industrial evolution. Capitalism is following the line of development which is the logical outcome of the conditions of production it has evolved. The mode of production has not only made collectivism possible, but necessary in order to secure the greatest efficiency, the largest results from the existing means of production.

This collectivism, which is developing in the shape of municipal and state ownership, is not, however, So-
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With a powerful working class movement, strongly organized on the political and industrial field, developing with it, it may become the means of facilitating the establishment of Socialism. Without such a movement it may well become the basis for more extreme exploitation and oppression of the workers than that which existed in the days of capitalist competition.
6—The Danger of Industrial Feudalism

If the evolution of the machinery of production is bringing into existence collectivism in industry, the question naturally arises, why is it necessary for the working class to organize in order to establish Socialism?

The answer is, that while the evolution of production has brought about large scale production and is now bringing about a greater integration of industry through government ownership, the danger exists that the collectivism which is thus being produced may we'd the chains of industrial slavery tighter in place of bringing freedom for the working class.

There is one essential which must be added to Collectivism before it becomes Socialism. That is democracy—industrial democracy.

Collectivism is the inevitable outcome of the existing system of production. Democracy must be fought for and won through the power of the working class.

The struggle of the future will not be over the question whether the industries shall be left in the hands of the individual capitalists or taken over by the government. The issue will be whether the capitalists shall maintain their autocratic control over industry through the government and with it the exploitation and oppression of the working class, or whether the workers shall control the industries.

Should the government take over the great industries, make payment in bonds, and the capitalist class
remain in control of the government, it would mean merely that the power of the exploiting class had been increased by making the government, with its great power, the agency through which the workers were exploited.

The capitalists of this country are endeavoring to further the development of a class of workers who will become the willing slaves of such an industrial feudalism.

There are two movements under way which have this object in view. Both seek to train workers who will become mere adjuncts to the machinery of production.

This effort of the shrewder capitalists is manifesting itself in the field of vocational education and so called scientific management.

Both these movements have some good things to offer, but lurking beneath the surface is the attempt to throttle any revolutionary movement of the working class, by training the workers to be willing slaves.

Vocational education is a desirable thing when not carried on at the expense of the broader education of children. If in addition to a general education the child learns to perform some kind of work well, that is a gain. On the other hand if the vocational knowledge is gained at the expense of general education it constitutes a menace to the future of the workers.

The working class boy or girl that in addition to learning to read and write, secures some knowledge of history, learns something of the sciences and arts and of government will not easily become an industrial slave in later life. With a broad education comes a
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broader outlook and a greater resentment of oppression.

If through vocational education the capitalists can substitute for this general education knowledge of one trade by teaching the children of the workers to become good mechanics, carpenters, printers, milliners, dressmakers, or sales girls, at the expense of giving them a broader education, then it will have accomplished much toward maintaining its rule and establishing the industrial feudalism through which it can only win its future salvation as an exploiting class.

Scientific management of a certain kind produces the same result.

That scientific management which aims at eliminating waste and inefficiency through better organization of industry, as in the handling of materials and the better arrangement of machinery, for instance, is to be welcomed. But when scientific management endeavors to substitute for the brain of the worker the brain of the efficiency engineer and to make of the work a mere automaton, performing certain motions directed by another brain, it becomes a vicious thing, which the workers must resist with all their power.

The latter kind of scientific management seeks to accomplish the same thing that vocational education at the expense of general education seeks to accomplish, to make the workers willing slaves without the spirit or imagination necessary for rebellion against their industrial overlords.

Even though this scientific management may increase the productive ability of the worker, it does so...
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at a cost too great to be paid.

Joy in any kind of work comes through the creative instinct which is imbedded deeply in the nature of every human being. It is better that the workers should retain that joy, which comes through the knowledge that his brain is directing the work he is doing and producing the results which he is attaining, no matter how blunderingly he may perform his work or how much his power of production may be reduced.

Modern machinery is so fruitful in its products that we need no longer concern ourselves seriously about our ability to produce wealth.

It is the joy of creation of which the efficiency engineer is robbing the worker in making him an automaton.

Capitalism, of course, cares nothing about the worker securing happiness from his work. It wants increased production and willing slaves, and this brand of scientific management seeks to produce those results.

It will be seen from the above that collectivism in industry does not produce the same kind of social consciousness in the working class and the capitalist class. Each interprets the new development in industry in harmony with its class interests.

The capitalists, when they recognize the inevitability of collectivism, as the keener minds now do, will endeavor to seize upon that collectivism and make it an instrument to serve their needs.

The workers, on the other hand, driven by their own interests, seek to establish democracy with collectivism. They can only achieve their own emancipation by reaching that goal. The character of production in-
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dicates the road that the workers must follow in order to free themselves from exploitation and oppression.

In the class struggle which results from the conflicting interests of the workers and the capitalists in regard to the management of industry, as well as over the division of the wealth produced, the workers are in a position of advantage because of their numbers, and because the change from privately conducted industry to collective and state owned industry, has abolished the functions of the capitalists and made them unnecessary to the conduct of industry.

Although the danger of industrial feudalism is real, the knowledge that the industrial process has placed them in a position of advantage should arouse in the workers the spirit and courage which will enable them to win the goal of industrial democracy.
7—The Struggle for Democracy

The struggle to establish control of industry by the workers requires both political and industrial organization of the workers. Both organizations are necessary for the protection of the workers and to attain their final goal.

The class interests of the worker have already produced these organizations among the most advanced sections of the working class. On the political field the Socialist party is fighting the battles of the workers and the unions are carrying on the same struggle on the industrial field.

With the growth of state and municipal ownership of industry the political movement of the workers becomes of increasing importance.

If the workers continue to play the part of dupes of the capitalist class, by supporting parties which represent the divergent interests of groups within the capitalist class, as they have been by voting for the candidates of the Republican and Democratic party and dividing on issues which were of importance to the different groups of capitalists but not to the workers, they have nothing to hope for from state ownership but more severe exploitation and oppression.

On the other hand, if they organize in a political party which represents their interests, as opposed to those of the capitalists, and exercise a strong enough pressure to threaten the capitalist class with loss of control of the government, such political pressure will bring them an improvement in their wages and working condition under state ownership and will bring a decrease in the profits which the capitalists take out of industry.
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In England, for instance, those municipal industries which were transferred from private ownership to public ownership almost universally show a decrease in the hours of labor of the workers and an increase in their wages. This situation would not exist if the workers had not exerted their political power and thus forced concessions from the municipal governments.

No such results can be hoped for if the capitalist parties are left in unchallenged control of the municipal and state governments.

The political movement of the workers is also essential to effect the transformation in industry from collective industry conducted by the capitalist class through the government to industrial democracy.

By taking control of the police and military establishment it can wrest powerful weapons out of the hands of the capitalists, and the legislative powers of the government are also of utmost importance to the working class in shaping industry in harmony with their needs.

Wherever the political movement of the workers gain control it must encourage the workers in the industries to assume a more important part in the management of the state owned industries, thus helping to establish industrial democracy.

The beginning in establishing industrial democracy is already apparent in the capitalist owned and controlled industries.

Whether consciously or not, the organized workers on the industrial field are moving toward that goal. Each time the workers dictate terms to the owners of industry and enforce those terms through their indus-
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trial organizations, they are taking a step toward industrial democracy.

When the bricklayers' union establishes an eight-hour day and compels the contractors to accept their decision, that is a beginning in industrial democracy.

When the printers tell the owners of that industry that they must live up to a certain wage scale, that is a development of industrial democracy.

When some other organizations of the workers dictates the terms on which apprentices may be engaged and legislates in regard to the sanitary conditions in a factory or in reference to the proper safeguarding of the machinery of production, and enforce their decisions through the power of the organized workers, they are establishing industrial democracy.

The unions have already made the beginning in bringing into existence control of industry by the workers, for it is only a step from setting the hours of labor or wages in an industry to telling the capitalist owners that they are no longer needed and that they can no longer draw profits from or control the management of industry.

The industrial movement of the workers must be built up and developed along side of the political movement, for both are necessary to effect the transformation of industry.

The pressure of this industrial movement is already great—so great that the capitalists themselves are organizing the workers within various industries and giving them some small share in the management.

According to a recent survey several hundred indus-
tries have taken this step. They have organized committees, senates and house of representatives and similar bodies and these bodies have been empowered to voice the workers' demands in carrying on the management.

The purpose of such organization is, of course, to forestall or weaken the independent organization of the workers outside of the industry. They purpose to substitute for workingclass organizations controlled by the workers and freely voicing their demands, organizations under the thumb of the capitalists.

The history of the struggle between the feudal lords and the capitalist class seeking to establish parliamentary government, gives rise to the hope that these capitalist controlled organizations will, in time, assert their independence. This struggle of the capitalists for political power furnishes a parallel situation.

In England and France the capitalists came into power through successful revolutions during the success of which they cut off the head of their king. The execution of Charles the First of England Louis the Sixteenth in France was emblematic of the end of the reign of feudalism in both countries.

In Germany and Russia, on the other hand, the capitalists' struggle for power was not successful. The pressure the capitalists brought to bear, however, was strong enough to force the feudal rulers of those countries to grant a parliament, but without the power of the parliaments established through successful revolutions.

The tendency of such bodies, however, is to assume
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greater power. The Russian Duma of 1905 lead to the Russian Revolution of 1917. We may well hope that the German Reichstag, as time passes, will succeed in establishing parliamentary government in that country, as it is even now demanding.

In the case of the industrial organizations in question the tendency to assume greater power is already apparent.

In one instance such a body developed from the discussion of petty problems of welfare work to the extent that it boldly legislated a ten per cent increase in wages for the workers, reduced the hours of labor from fifty to forty-eight per week and established vacations, with full pay after a certain period, for factory workers.

We may well hope that these organizations will assume greater and greater power, as they realize their strength, and play a large part in establishing the future industrial democracy.

The main lines of the future struggle between the workers and the capitalists thus becomes clear. The capitalists, when they realize inevitability of state-owned industry, will endeavor to make the state the instrument through which they will exploit the workers, by maintaining their control of the government. To wrest control of the government out of the hands of the capitalist class is the function of the political organization of the working class, while at the same time the industrial organization strives to establish greater control by the workers within the industries.

The power of the organized working class is irresistible. Once the working class is thoroughly organized politically and industrially and makes joint attack upon
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the capitalists' power to exploit and oppress the workers, the end of exploitation and the triumph of industrial democracy is assured.

This end, however, cannot be attained by hoping for it. It can only be attained if the workers learn the need of organizing their power and acting upon that knowledge by affiliating with the political and industrial organizations of their class.

The doors that lead into the Socialist party and the unions are wide open for those workers who are ready to give their strength toward winning the greatest goal for which mankind has striven—a society in which oppression and exploitation will be ended forever.
8—Who Are the Dreamers

The apologists for things as they are have nothing but contempt for Socialist science. Those who sit in editorial sanctums are fond of writing editorials with such headings as “Another Socialist Dream Shattered” and “A Hopeless Dream,” all of which insinuate that the Socialist analysis of the laws of social evolution.

“Are all but stories, which awoke from Sleep,
They told their comrades, and to Sleep returned.”

An appeal to the facts warrant the Socialists returning a Roland for an Oliver and charging the capitalists and their spokesmen with being dreamers, who, satisfied with existing things, because they are able to prey upon the great mass of mankind, whom they condemn to lives of misery and privation, desire no change in the existing social order.

“Nothing is permanent but change,” science declares the universal law of nature. Suns, stars, planets, life in all its forms from amoeba to man, the institutions of man, governments, religions, ethics, all have been subject to the general law of change and have each presented many phases of development during the ages they have existed.

Our solar system, having its beginning in a nebula floating in space, which condensed under the action of the law of gravitation; the earth thrown off from the sun or original nebula, passing through various stages of hardening and cooling, have been changing and evolving through eons of time.

Life itself, beginning with the first unicellular animalculae and gradually ascending through myriads of species to man, has presented protean aspects.

And man? Has he remained untouched since half human, half ape he descended from the arboreal homes
of his ancestors?

Glancing over the panorama which scientific research spreads before us, we see a creature we can hardly call human, without tools, except the chance club or stone, without habitation except such as nature provided, without government except the rule of the strongest, with religion, except the fear of the various phenomena of nature.

We see this man making his first feeble attempts to conquer nature. We see him beginning to fish and use fire in the preparation of his food. We see his first simple bow and arrow. We see him learning to cultivate cereals and to domesticate animals. We see him discover the metals and find him shaping better tools for himself. We see him make achievement after achievement, invention after invention, discovery after discovery, until today we can look nature in the face and say we are free. We have achieved the means of taking out of the natural storehouses of the earth the raw materials and turning them into finished products which supply all our wants and necessities.

Glancing at the period of recorded history, we trace the economic development of man from slave production to feudalism, from feudalism to capitalism. We find each system of production producing governments, ethical conceptions and religions in harmony with it. We find slave production giving birth to slave religion, feudalism to a feudalistic church and the beginning of the capitalist system synonomous with the reformation and the death of absolute government.

We find capitalism itself passing through various phases of development, from the simple employment of craftsmen to factory work, from the factory system to
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the great industries. In our own time we see the great industries combining and the growth of government ownership of industry. We see the control of the industrial life of the nation concentrated in the hands of a few men and the many dependent upon their whims for the necessities of life. We see a small class reaping the rewards of what the human race has brought into existence through centuries of achievement. We see the many struggling for a mere existence in an age in which man's conquest of nature has made it possible to supply the wants of all.

And here the capitalists and the capitalist-minded say we shall stop!

Through all the ages the institutions of man have been changing, developing and evolving. Through the struggles of the ages and achievement of the genius of the race in all times we have perfected our productive powers, but an unjust economic system heaps the rewards of the achievements of the many into the laps of the few. And these few rise up, like modern Joshuas, and command the forces which have been working through all the ages "Stand Still!"

Who are the dreamers—The Socialists who say that society will continue to evolve and that collective work will bring collective ownership and management, social production produce social distribution; or the capitalists who say: "We are reaping the rewards. Sun, stand still?"

Social evolution will continue. The goal toward which it is tending is plainly indicated in the form of modern production. The Socialist movement itself is the product of the economic forces in capitalism which makes Socialism the only road to freedom for the ex-
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exploited and oppressed class in modern society.

Socialism will not destroy and break up what capitalism has produced.

It will build upon the economic foundation prepared by the development of capitalism.

Socialism grows as the water lily grows.

At the bottom of the lakes and ponds in which the water lily grows there is deposited a muck of decaying vegetable matter. In this the water lily sets its roots. It finds the conditions which enable it to live and thrive. Out of this muck it sends up its stem through the waters which surround it, upward to the light and air and sunshine, and when it reaches the light and air and sunshine, it bursts forth into that beautiful blossom which gives us joy to behold.

The Socialist Movement sets its roots in the muck of capitalism. It finds in it the conditions which enable it to live and thrive. Today the Socialist Movement is fighting its way upward, upward against the lies, misrepresentation and the misunderstanding which surround it, upward to the light and air and sunshine. Soon it will reach the light and air and sunshine and then our civilization will burst forth into that new and beautiful blossom—Socialism.

Behind the struggle of the workers today there is the mighty force of social evolution. The fact that their ideals harmonize with the goal toward which our economic evolution is tending should nerve them for the struggle and give them the inspiration and courage to fight for the ultimate victory which will bring into the world equality of opportunity, industrial democracy and economic justice, through the establishment of the Co-operative Commonwealth.
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