

APPEAL SOCIALIST CLASSICS

EDITED BY W. J. GHENT

No. 6

Questions and Answers





1916

APPEAL SOCIALIST CLASSICS
EDITED BY W. J. GHENT

No. 6

Questions and Answers

LIBRARY BRANCH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA
LIBRARY
LOS ANGELES CALIF.

Copyright, 1916, by Appeal to Reason

APPEAL TO REASON
Girard, Kansas



THE SERIES

The pamphlets in this series are composed, in the main, of selections from the published work of Socialist writers, mostly of the present day. In some of them, particularly "Socialist Documents" and "Socialism and Government," the writings used are mainly of collective, rather than individual authorship; while the Historical Sketch is the composition of the editor.

To the selections given, the editor has added explanatory and connecting paragraphs, welding the fragments into a coherent whole. The aim is the massing together in concise and systematic form, of what has been most clearly and pertinently said, either by individual Socialist writers or by committees speaking for the party as a whole, on all of the main phases of Socialism.

In their finished form they might, with some appropriateness, be termed mosaics: each pamphlet is an arrangement of parts from many sources according to a unitary design. Most of the separate pieces are, however, in the best sense classics: they are expressions of Socialist thought which, by general approval, have won authoritative rank. A classic, according to James Russell Lowell, is of itself "something neither ancient nor modern"; even the most recent writing may be considered classic if, for the mood it depicts or the thought it frames, it unites matter and style into an expression of approved merit.

For the choice of selections the editor is alone responsible. Doubtless for some of the subjects treated another editor would have chosen differently. The difficulty indeed has been in deciding what to omit; for the mass of Socialist literature contains much that may be rightly called classic which obviously could not have been included in these brief volumes.

The pamphlets in the series are as follows:

1. THE ELEMENTS OF SOCIALISM.
2. THE SCIENCE OF SOCIALISM.
3. SOCIALISM: A HISTORICAL SKETCH.
4. SOCIALIST DOCUMENTS.
5. SOCIALISM AND GOVERNMENT.
6. QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.
7. SOCIALISM AND ORGANIZED LABOR.
8. SOCIALISM AND THE FARMER.
9. SOCIALISM AND SOCIAL REFORM.
10. THE TACTICS OF SOCIALISM.
11. THE SOCIALIST APPEAL.
12. SOCIALISM IN VERSE.

CONTENTS

NUMBER AND TITLE	PAGE
PREFACE	4
I. THE MOVEMENT AND ITS AIMS.....	5
II. GENERAL CONDITIONS UNDER SOCIALISM.....	27
III. WOMAN, THE FAMILY AND THE HOME.....	36
IV. TASKS AND RECOMPENSE	42
V. COLLECTIVE AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.....	55
VI. MISCELLANEOUS	63

PREFACE

This pamphlet consists of a collection of answers by various writers to the questions most frequently asked about the Socialist movement, its aims and methods and the conditions expected to prevail in the Socialist commonwealth. It is based on the pamphlet, "Appeal Answers," which has had a wide circulation. A considerable part of the older material has been retained, and will be found indicated by the initials "A. A." Many of the briefer paragraphs, however, have been substituted by more comprehensive and detailed answers from a number of sources.

The matter dealing with conditions under Socialism is, it is almost needless to say, largely speculative. No one is sufficiently gifted with foresight to enable him to predict exactly how any of these things will be done. This speculation, however, is something very remote from mere guess-work. It is an application of well-considered theories and principles to a society which will own and operate its industries. If in other ages men have failed ludicrously in their prophecies regarding society, the fact has small bearing on Socialist speculations regarding the commonwealth to be: for in no other age have men had for their guidance a constructive social philosophy based upon economic tendencies.

W. J. G.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

I.

THE MOVEMENT AND ITS AIMS.

THE TWO-FOLD PURPOSE.

What does Socialism aim to do?

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

SOCIAL EVOLUTION PLUS AGITATION.

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

We mean that the invention of machinery has effected a complete social change already and that political and economic conditions must adjust themselves to this change. Socialist agitation merely instructs and helps toward this adjustment. It is the absolute need of a change, however, that is forcing both the Socialist agitation and the revolution that is already under way. Revolution is not necessarily violent in nature. Socialists are working intelligently and earnestly to keep this from becoming violent.

As already stated, a revolution in the means of making a living has already been wrought, almost imperceptibly. Compare the way the pioneers lived with modern life and you will see this. It is a fact that production under the capitalist system for profits has become world-wide, which has contributed most largely to making the demand for socialized production for the benefit of all world-wide nature.

They who urge that Socialism has no place in America, because of the fact that we have a republic here, do not understand the situation. It is because capitalism exists here, as fully developed as anywhere on earth, and that its exactions are fully as great here as anywhere, that Socialism has a place in America and will continue to grow. Granting of simple demands, such as the raising of wages, will not end the unrest. The workers will never be satisfied and never can be placated until they receive their full social product.—A. A.

ONLY ONE KIND OF SOCIALIST.

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

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

SOCIALISM INTERNATIONAL.

Isn't Socialism mainly a foreign movement?

The earlier efforts at socialization began in America. The revolutionary war was fought to socialize or popularize government. The socializing of the postoffice, of the public roads, of the public schools was all fought out in America. The proposition of Socialism—the socializing of industry—is merely an extension of the work that has been in progress in the United States for more than a century. The securing of industrial democracy—the one demand of Socialism as to method—is the legitimate outgrowth of political democracy. But the socializing thought has now become world-wide. It is foreign to no nation on earth. It belongs to America more than any other nation perhaps, because the machine and the trust are more fully developed here than anywhere else, making the need of it greater than in Europe. According to the Socialist party census of 1909 71 per cent of the members were natives of America.—A. A.

SOCIALISM HAS NEVER BEEN TRIED.

Hasn't Socialism been tried before and proved a failure?

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

STATE SOCIALISM AND STATE CAPITALISM.

What is the difference between state Socialism and the

Socialism you advocate? Does government ownership constitute state Socialism?

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

ANOTHER ANSWER.

As pointed out above, there is considerable confusion about the term "state Socialism." Rightly, the term ought to apply to that form of Socialism in which organized society as a whole in any nation—that is, the state—determines at least the main principles of the conduct of industry. In this, the historic sense of the term, it is opposed to so-called "free" Socialism, the concept of a society composed of federated autonomous groups of workers, each group supreme in its own province. In this sense, moreover, state Socialism is the Socialism contended for by every Socialist movement in the world, except a few

small and uninfluential groups mistakenly calling themselves Socialists.

But the term has come to be used largely for state capitalism—the participation in industry by governments, without the abolition of the profit system and without democratic management. State capitalism has had a remarkable growth in recent years, and especially since the outbreak of the great war. Though not Socialism in any real sense, it may prove an advanced step toward that goal, just as the growth of the trust is such a step. With all, or the greater part, of the industries in the hands of the capitalist state, the transition toward true Socialism will be immensely facilitated. The conquest of political power by the Socialists would then be the one thing needful.—*W. J. G.*

SOCIALISM AND ANARCHISM.

Isn't Socialism, after all, pretty much the same as anarchism?

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

PATERNALISM.

Is not Socialism a kind of paternalism—a doing of things for the people by a power outside themselves—and ought it not therefore to be rejected?

No, Socialism is not paternalism.

Capitalism is paternalism.

We have had paternalism for many centuries and we have it now.

Paternalism is the rule of the few. It is a man or a clique of men governing the people.

Under absolute monarchy, one man did the governing. After the lords compelled the king to divide up his authority with them, the king and the nobility did the governing. When the common people secured the right to vote, it was thought that this would put an end to paternalism.

It did put an end to political paternalism.

We now get what the majority votes for.

But we still have industrial paternalism, a paternalism of the most cruel and unjust character.

A few men own the industries of the country.

They have the masses under their control.

They can starve them to death, or freeze them to death, or work them to death.

They can dictate for the most part when they shall work, where they shall work and what incomes they shall receive.

That is paternalism gone to seed.

So long as it continues, emancipation from political paternalism is useless except as a means of accomplishing emancipation from this industrial paternalism.

By voting the Socialist ticket industrial paternalism can be abolished.

No, Socialism is not paternalism.

Socialism will complete and perfect political emancipation by introducing equal political rights for men and women, by introducing the initiative and referendum, proportional representation, the recall and home rule, by abolishing the veto power on the part of executives, by abolishing the usurped power on the part of the courts to nullify the will of the people by declaring laws unconstitutional and by making the national and state constitutions amendable at any time by majority vote, so as to do away with what has been called "the tyranny of the dead."

Socialism will accomplish industrial emancipation by abolishing industrial paternalism and introducing indus-

trial fraternalism; in other words, by abolishing private monopoly and introducing the public ownership and the popular management of the industries now used to exploit the people out of the bulk of the product of their honest toil.

In the Socialist commonwealth the people engaged in any industry will elect the managers, foremen, superintendents, etc., in that industry.

That is the rule of the many instead of the few.

When the few cease to rule and the many begin to rule, paternalism will breathe its last, and fraternalism will take its place.

When these changes are brought about by Socialism we will have both a political and an industrial government of, for and by the people. These changes will enable the people to govern themselves, both politically and industrially, for the first time since civilization began.

And when the people govern themselves, both politically and industrially, paternalism will cease and fraternalism will begin.—*John M. Work. (From "What's So and What Isn't," pp. 29-31.)*

ATTITUDE TOWARD LABOR UNIONS.

What is the attitude of the Socialist party toward the labor organizations?

The Socialist party has every reason to encourage and support the economic organizations and the struggle of the labor movement in all its forms. It does so in this country, it does so in every other country. It does so for the reason that it realizes the economic organization of labor is the main prop of the worker under the present conditions; that it serves very largely to raise the standards of the worker's life in every direction and to make it better and healthier and happier. It supports, for similar reasons, the co-operative movement of the working class, and it supports every other radical reform movement based upon actual economic needs and aiming at actual economic improvement. . . .

We do not engage in the economic struggles of the workers, except where such struggles assume a political or general aspect. We do not consider it part of our mission, function or power to interfere with the details of the economic labor organizations, in the shop or in the unions. We should consider that meddling.—*Morris Hillquit. (From testimony before Industrial Relations Commission in New York, published in "The Double Edge of Labor's Sword," pp. 27-29.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

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

CLASS AGAINST CLASS.

Has not the Socialist movement tended to divide the people into classes and to array them against one another?

No, the Socialists did not divide the people into classes. Capitalism divided the people into classes.

The Socialists have merely been honest enough to recognize this fact and act accordingly, instead of blindfolding themselves and making believe that there were no classes.

It is the mission, the logical and historic mission, of the working class to bear the brunt of the fight for the overthrow of capitalism and the introduction of Socialism.

It is its mission to do so because it is to its proximate interest to do so.

The Socialist movement is based upon this fact. It is based upon the class struggle between the working class and the capitalist class.

The term, class struggle, sounds harsh to those who have never heard it before. Gentle natures would prefer not to have any class struggle.

But we have to deal with facts instead of wishes.

The classes exist.

It is not our fault that they exist.

We wish they did not exist.

But they do exist.

And the capitalist class is constantly gnawing at the vitals of the working class.

We can't wipe the classes out of existence by closing our eyes and ignoring their existence. We can only invite disaster that way.

The only way to wipe them out of existence is by the oppressed class conquering the oppressing class at the ballot box and absorbing it.

It is to the proximate interest of the capitalist class to continue the capitalist system, so that it can keep on exploiting the working class out of the bulk of the product of its toil.

It is to the proximate interest of the working class to destroy the capitalist system and introduce Socialism, so as to abolish exploitation and secure the full product of its toil.

The interests of the two classes are, therefore, utterly antagonistic.

I repeat that the reason the brunt of the burden of abolishing capitalism and introducing Socialism is placed upon the shoulders of the working class is because it is to the proximate interest of the working class to do so. Because it is the only class that has little to lose but its chains, and has a world to gain.

This is the line of battle.

The working class against the capitalist class.

To be sure, Socialism is ultimately to the interest of everybody. But people as a rule are swayed by their proximate, not by their ultimate, interest.

As for the minor economic groups, the farmers, small business men, etc., the only sensible thing for them to do is to ally themselves with the class with which their interests are the most nearly identical, which happens to be the working class.

The class struggle will continue until we win.

Then, class distinctions will be abolished by abolishing the economic injustice which causes them.—*John M. Work.* (From "*What's So and What Isn't*," pp. 89-91.)

THE OLD, OLD QUESTION.

Does not Socialism propose, in spite of all its fine words, that the industrious shall divide up with the lazy?

No, Socialism does not stand for dividing up.

Capitalism does stand for dividing up.

Capitalism compels the industrious to divide up with the idle.

Suppose you are the average wage worker.

You work about nine hours a day.

In the first hour or two of your day's work you reproduce by your labor the amount you receive for the entire day.

In another hour or two you reproduce your proportion of the wear and tear, the running expenses, the raw material, and the wages of superintendence.

Well, then, having done this, it is time for you to take up your coat and hat and dinner pail and go home to your wife and babies.

Do you do it?

No, you don't.

What do you do?

You go ahead and work the rest of the day and add still more to the world's wealth by your labor.

Who earned that surplus?

You earned it.

Who gets it?

The capitalist gets it.

You divide up with him.

The Socialist party says that you, who earned it, shall get it.

The reason you do not get it now is because a few private individuals and corporations are permitted to own the means of production and distribution and to compel you to hand over to them the bulk of the product of your toil in exchange for an opportunity to earn a bare living.

By voting a capitalist ticket, the republican or democratic ticket, you have extended to the capitalists the privilege of exploiting you out of the lion's share of your earnings.

The Socialist party says that that portion of the means of production and distribution which when privately owned can be used by the private owners to gouge other people, shall be publicly owned and popularly managed, that exploitation shall thereby be banished from the earth, and that the workers shall thereby secure the full product of their toil.—*John M. Work. (From "What's So and What Isn't," pp. 7-9.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

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 recently spent his well-earned 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 com-

mendable 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 today 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 wealth as an instrument of social oppression and exploitation. The Socialists would socialize the tools of production, not the products.—*Morris Hillquit. (From "Socialism Summed Up," pp. 26-27.)*

CHANGING HUMAN NATURE.

Before Socialism would be practicable, wouldn't it be necessary to change human nature?

People talk about "human nature" as though it were something fixed and definite; as if there were certain quantities of various qualities and instincts in every human being, and that these never changed from age to age. The primitive savage in many lands went out to seek a wife armed with a club. He hunted the woman of his choice as he would hunt a beast, capturing and clubbing her into submission. *That was human nature, Jonathan.* The modern man in civilized countries, when he goes seeking a wife,

hunts the woman of his choice with flattery, bon-bons, flowers, opera tickets and honeyed words. Instead of a brute clubbing a woman almost to death, we see the pleading lover, cautiously and earnestly wooing his bride. And that, too, is human nature. The African savages suffering from the dread "sleeping sickness" and the poor Indian ryots suffering from bubonic plague see their fellows dying by thousands and think angry gods are punishing them. All they can hope to do is to appease the gods by gifts or by mutilating their own poor bodies. That is human nature, my friend. But a great scientist like Dr. Koch, of Berlin, goes into the African centers of pestilence and death, seeks the germ of the disease, drains swamps, purifies water, isolates the infected cases and proves himself more powerful than the poor natives' gods. And that is human nature. Outside the gates of the Chicago stockyards I have seen crowds of men fighting for work as hungry dogs fight over a bone. That was human nature. I have seen a man run down in the streets and at once there was a crowd ready to lift him up and to do anything for him that they could. It was the very opposite spirit to that shown by the brutish, snarling, cursing, fighting men at the stockyards, but it was just as much human nature.

The great law of human development, that which expresses itself in what is so vaguely termed human nature, is that man is a creature of his environment, that self-preservation is a fundamental instinct in human beings. Socialism is not an idealistic attempt to substitute some other law of life for that of self-preservation. On the contrary, it rests entirely upon that instinct of self-preservation. Here are two classes opposed to each other in modern society. One class is small but exceedingly powerful, so that, despite its disadvantage in size, it is the ruling class, controlling the larger class and exploiting it. When we ask ourselves how that is possible, how it happens that the smaller class rules the larger, we soon find that the members of the smaller class have become conscious of their

interests and the fact that these can be best promoted through organization and association. Thus conscious of their class interests, and acting together by a class instinct, they have been able to rule the world. But the workers, the class that is much stronger numerically, have been slower to recognize their class interests. Inevitably, however, they are developing a similar class sense, or instinct. Uniting in the economic struggle at first, and then, in the political struggle in order that they may further their economic interests through the channels of government, it is easy to see that only one outcome of the struggle is possible. By sheer force of numbers, the workers must win, Jonathan.

The Socialist movement, then, is not something foreign to human nature, but it is an inevitable part of the development of human society. The fundamental instinct of the human species makes the Socialist movement inevitable and irresistible. Socialism does not require a change in human nature, but human nature does require a change in society. And that change is Socialism. It is perhaps the deepest and profoundest instinct in human beings that they are forever striving to secure the largest possible material comfort, forever striving to secure more of good in return for less of ill. And in that lies the great hope of the future, Jonathan. The great Demos is learning that poverty is unnecessary; that there is plenty for all; that none need suffer want; that it is possible to suffer less and live more; to have more of good while suffering less of ill. The face of Demos is turned toward the future, toward the dawning of Socialism.—*John Spargo. (From "The Common Sense of Socialism," pp. 167-69.)*

COMPETITION WITH THE TRUST.

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

If it were possible for the workers to get enough capital to build factories such as would compete the trusts out of business, when they got through with it they would sim-

ply have another trust and would be run by capitalists themselves. The only remedy is to end the system.—A. A.

PUTTING THE TRUSTS OUT OF BUSINESS.

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

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

ACQUIRING THE INDUSTRIES.

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

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

THE PEOPLE'S POWER SUPREME.

It is claimed that though Socialists were to get into power they could not obtain possession of the railroads because European capitalists control them.

At one time thirteen colonies which now comprise sev-

eral states belonged to Great Britain, yet they were taken away from her. The people may do anything in the world they wish. The right to hold property of a productive nature, so-called, is becoming generally recognized as a license to exploit, not only in America but also all over the world. When that fact is recognized only a little more widely, transferring this property to the people will be the easiest thing in the world, because no workers are going to try to prevent it anywhere.—A. A.

CONFISCATION POSSIBLE.

Could we buy and pay for the industries off the profit made from them just as the present owners of the industries paid for them through profits without leaving the impression that Socialism was no better than the present system?

It does not follow that industries would be bought and paid for. A contingency might arise whereby they would be simply confiscated. If they are purchased, however, the people would understand that there was a difference between paying profits on industries and having nothing after it was over and paying profits that become an investment as soon as it is paid and that finally will lead to an end of profits. Capitalists seek now to confuse the people by talking of the big public debts of other countries that are purchasing industries. These countries, however, realize that that indebtedness is not like ours. There is an income there which will pay the indebtedness and then leave a commonwealth, while here the indebtedness is a dead loss.—A. A.

BLOODSHED OR PANIC UNNECESSARY.

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

Sure. If Socialism came into power by a good majority, not only the army and navy, but also the courts, would be in its hands, instead of in the hands of the capitalists.

This would make the capitalists who tried to do anything against it traitors or rebels. If they endeavored to bring a panic the machinery of production and distribution could, under such conditions, be seized by the government and the panic very easily averted.—A. A.

REVOLUTION MAY BE EITHER PEACEFUL OR VIOLENT.

The objective point of the Socialist attack is the capitalist system, not the individual capitalists. The struggles 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 ripeness of the working class are determined by the training of the men and women constituting that class, and not by the more advanced vision of a small group of it. A country can be educated, led and transformed into Socialism, but it can not be driven, lured and bulldozed into it. The Socialist conception of the world process is evolutionary, not cataclysmic. Socialism has come to build, not to destroy.

This accepted position of the modern Socialist movement is, however, not to be taken as an assurance or prediction that the Socialist victory will in all cases come about by orderly and peaceful methods, and will not be accompanied by violence. It may well happen that the classes in power here or there will refuse to yield the control of the government to the working class even after a legitimate political victory. In that case a violent conflict will necessarily 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 ferocious 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 firecrackers make the Fourth of July.—*Morris Hillquit*. (From "Socialism Summed Up," pp. 54-55.)

THE "COUNTING OUT" CONTINGENCY.

Suppose the Socialist candidate for president should get the most votes throughout the nation, as well as a majority of the electoral colleges, and in spite of this fact a board of electors should count in one of the old party candidates, what would the Socialist party do? If you took it into court and the judges decided against you, what would you do then?

This is trying to cross the bridge a long time before you get to it. The APPEAL can no more say what the whole people of the United States would do than you can. What would you feel like doing? It seems to us, though, of course, this is not and cannot be authoritative, that the people would not submit, and being in the majority would soon let the scoundrels know who has the most power—and the scoundrels respect power even if they don't anything else.—A. A.

A VICTORIOUS PEOPLE WOULD REFUSE TO BE STARVED.

How would the workers be cared for from the first Tuesday in November, when the Socialists capture the government, until the fourth of March, when they would take charge of the offices?

By the time Socialism is adopted at the polls there will necessarily be a general understanding of its purposes and also an acquiescence in its program. If the officials in power in the interval between election and inauguration should take it into their heads to try to starve the whole people, they would speedily learn that it is the people who are the government, and that they themselves are merely agents of the people. They would be brushed aside and immediate possession of the machinery of production and distribution

would be taken. But the change probably will come so gradually that the masters will be pretty well tamed before they are brought to give up all their power.—A. A.

WHAT THE SOCIALISTS WOULD DO FIRST.

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 wrong 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 will it be the culmination of a long series of political and industrial reforms of a socialistic nature. These reforms will 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 units. The measures probably will 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 program comprehensive enough to meet all important social problems of the day. They do.—*Morris Hillquit. (From "Socialism Summed Up," pp. 59-60.)*

THROWING ONE'S VOTE AWAY.

In voting for Socialism, which at best is a remote goal,

instead of voting for some immediately attainable reform, am I not throwing my vote away?

No, you do not throw away your vote when you vote the Socialist ticket.

You throw away your vote when you vote a capitalist ticket, the republican or democratic ticket.

The man who votes against his own interest is the one who throws away his vote. If you vote the republican or democratic ticket, you vote against your own interest.

The republican and democratic parties stand for the continuation of the present system, which robs you. They are run in the interest of the capitalist class.

If you vote the republican or democratic ticket you help to strengthen and perpetuate the rule of your enemies, so that they can continue to rob you.

Your ballot is a strong and heavy club.

If you vote the republican or democratic ticket you hand that club over to the capitalist class, saying, "Please smash me over the head with that!"

And they smash you, all right.

If you vote the Socialist ticket, even though it does not win, you strengthen and build up the party which is destined to emancipate you.

The only way you can avoid throwing away you vote is by voting the Socialist ticket.

The only way in which you can make your vote hasten the day of your deliverance is by voting the Socialist ticket.

To vote any other ticket is to vote to make your chains thicker.

Socialism is not a far-off dream. If you have that erroneous notion in your head the sooner you get it out the better.

Socialism is the next step.

This is demonstrated by the great and constant increase in the Socialist vote all over the civilized world.

No, Socialism is not a far-off dream.—*John M. Work.*
(From "What's So and What Isn't," pp. 91-93.)

ANOTHER ANSWER.

The first duty of every sincere believer in Socialism is to vote for it. No matter how hopeless the contest may seem, nor how far distant the electoral triumph, the first duty is to vote for Socialism. If you believe in Socialism, my friend, even though your vote should be the only Socialist vote in your city, you could not be true to yourself and to your faith and vote any other ticket. I know that it requires courage to do this sometimes. I know that there are many who will deride the action and say that you are "wasting your vote," but no vote is ever wasted when it is cast for a principle, Jonathan. For, after all, what is a vote? Is it not an expression of the citizen's conviction concerning the sort of government he desires? How, then can his vote be thrown away if it really expresses his convictions? He is entitled to a single voice, and provided that he avails himself of his right to declare through the ballot box his conviction, no matter whether he stands alone or with ten thousand, his vote is not thrown away.

The only vote that is wasted is the vote that is cast for something other than the voter's earnest conviction, the vote of cowardice and compromise. The man who votes for what he fully believes in, even if he is the only one so voting, does not lose his vote, waste it or use it unwisely. The only use of a vote is to declare the kind of government the voter believes in. But the man who votes for something he does not want, for something less than his convictions, that man loses his vote or throws it away, even though he votes on the winning side. Get this well into you mind, friend Jonathan, for there are cities in which the Socialists would sweep everything before them and be elected to power if all the people who believe in Socialism, but refuse to vote for it on the ground that they would be throwing away their votes, would be true to themselves and vote according to their inmost convictions.

I say that we must vote for Socialism, Jonathan, because I believe that, in this country at least, the change

from capitalism must be brought about through patient and wise political action. I have no doubts that the economic organizations, the trade unions, will help, and I can even conceive the possibility of their being the chief agencies in the transformation in society. That possibility, however, seems exceedingly remote, while the possibility of effecting the change through the ballot box is undeniable. Once let the working class of America make up its mind to vote for Socialism, nothing can prevent its coming. And unless the workers are wise enough and united enough to vote together for Socialism, Jonathan, it is scarcely likely that they will be able to adopt other methods with success.—*John Spargo. (From "The Common Sense of Socialism," pp. 170-72.)*

II.

GENERAL CONDITIONS UNDER SOCIALISM.**LIMITATIONS ON LIBERTY.**

Will not Socialism impose an undue restriction upon the liberty of the individual?

The word "liberty" has undergone so many transformations of meaning and it is still used in so many contradictory senses, that there is difficulty in determining what many persons mean by it. But when what is known as an "individualist" uses the term, he usually means no more than the mere absence of governmental restraint. All the other restraints upon action and upon individual development would, according to this idea, be entirely consistent with liberty.

Such a definition is a mere negation. In this day of complex interrelations, it means nothing. The legal liberty—that is, freedom of action not qualified by governmental prohibition—the *legal liberty* to do things which economic and social conditions make wholly impossible is no liberty at all. It is freedom only in phrase. The liberty for which men now strive is a mutually exercised and mutually restrained power to achieve. In the words of the philosopher, T. H. Green, real liberty is "a positive power or capacity which each man exercises or holds through the help or security given him by his fellow men, and which he in turn helps to secure for *them*." We are free to *do* things, to *achieve* things, to *enjoy* things, only as we join with others in mutual restraint and mutual helpfulness. The ordered restraints of Socialism will endow mankind with a liberty which it has never before known.—*W. J. Ghent. (Adapted from "Socialism and Success," pp. 250-51.)*

THAT "DULL LEVEL."

Would not Socialism tend to reduce all men and all women to a dull level?

This question rests upon an entire misapprehension of

what Socialism really means. The people who make it have got firmly into their minds the idea that Socialism aims to make all men equal; to devise some plans for removing the inequalities with which they are endowed by nature. They fear that, in order to realize this ideal of equality, the strong will be held down to the level of the weak, the daring to the level of the timid, the wisest to the level of the least wise. That is their conception of the equality of which Socialists talk. And I am free to say, Jonathan, that I do not wonder that sensible men should oppose such equality as that.

Even if it were possible, through the adoption of some system of stirpiculture, to breed all human beings to a common type, so that they would all be tall or short, fat or thin, light or dark, according to choice, it would not be a very desirable ideal, would it? And if we could get everybody to think exactly the same thoughts, to admire exactly the same things, to have exactly the same mental powers and exactly the same measure of moral strength and weakness, I do not think *that* would be a very desirable ideal. The world of human beings would then be just as dull and uninspiring as a wax-work show. Imagine yourself in a city where every house was exactly like every other house in all particulars, even to its furnishings; imagine all the people being exactly the same height and weight, looking exactly alike, dressed exactly alike, eating exactly alike, going to bed and rising at the same time, thinking exactly alike and feeling exactly alike—how would you like to live in such a city, Jonathan? The city or state of Absolute Equality is only a fool's dream.

No sane man or woman wants absolute equality, friend Jonathan, for it is as undesirable as it is unimaginable. What Socialism wants is equality of opportunity merely. No Socialist wants to pull down the strong to the level of the weak, the wise to the level of the less wise. Socialism does not imply pulling anybody down. It does not imply a great plain of humanity with no mountain peaks of genius

or character. It is not opposed to natural inequalities, but only to man-made inequalities, products of man's ignorance and greed. It does not aim to pull down the highest, but to lift up the lowest; it does not want to put a load of disadvantage upon the strong and gifted, but it wants to take off the heavy burdens of disadvantage which keep others from rising. In a word, Socialism implies nothing more than giving every child born into the world equal opportunities, so that only the inequalities of Nature remain. Don't you believe in that, my friend?—*John Spargo. (From "The Common Sense of Socialism," pp. 162-63.)*

CONTINUATION OF PRESENT LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

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

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

If they thought the present divisions were best suited to their interests they would continue. If they felt that a change was desirable in order to accomplish results, the change would be made. Socialism is a method, not a system of laws.—*A. A.*

CITY AND COUNTRY.

What will become of cities under Socialism if Socialism will furnish goods to the consumer at cost? Now the cities are kept up by the profit system. What will maintain them under Socialism?

Cities are an artificial development of an imperfect distributive system. They have become as now constituted a problem and a menace. When Socialism comes into com-

plete operation it is probable that that Utopian book, entitled "A Cityless and Countryless World," will find some measure of realization. That is to say, while there will necessarily be distributing points which might be called cities, the congested sections now termed cities will disappear. At the same time, the people, going more into the country through the perfection of transportation, will lessen the isolation which now makes country life undesirable.—A. A.

BOSSISM.

Will not Socialism tend toward the establishment of a species of bossism?

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

ABOLITION OF GRAFT.

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

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

POWER LODGED WITH THE PEOPLE.

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

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

IT MIGHT, BUT IT WOULDN'T.

Could not congress under Socialism enact vicious laws that would injure the people?

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

IN CASE OF FOREIGN ATTACK.

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

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

COMMERCE NOT TO BE DESTROYED.

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

The Socialist movement has come because machinery has developed to the point where people no longer live by communities. Commerce is one of the things that has brought the Socialist movement. So far from destroying machines, Socialism will provide for their increase and use in such a way as to benefit all. It is because Socialism has

to do with the enlarged social life that it is impossible to confine it to a country, a state or a nation. It is world wide. It is bringing harmony into social relations in such a way as to accomplish the real brotherhood of man.—A. A.

PRODUCTION INCLUDES DISTRIBUTION.

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

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

NO MOTIVE FOR ADULTERATION.

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

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

STOPPING SPECULATION AND PROFIT.

What measures will be necessary to stop speculation and profit?

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

LUXURIES FOR ALL.

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

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

COMMON OWNERSHIP OF WORKS OF ART.

Since an income of even \$2,000 a year would not permit people under Socialism to pay \$25,000 for a painting or \$500 for a dress, would not business suffer because of lack of those who squander money?

Squandering money is merely dissipating the loot of those who have robbed the workers. If the wealth remained with the workers they could buy more than they do now. Pictures that are of real value ought to be owned by the whole people so that they could be seen not by a few, but by all.—A. A.

PENSIONS FOR SUPERANNUATED WORKERS.

What will be done for the old soldiers under Socialism?

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

THE MATTER OF MONEY.

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

Some kind of a medium of exchange will be necessary. Some think this should be based entirely on labor performed and hence should consist of labor checks. The one thing that must necessarily follow is that money and banking under Socialism will be government monopolies. It does not ap-

parently matter much what kind of money is used so this fact prevails. Banking being a government monopoly, all private savings will be deposited with the government which has already begun to work in the postal savings banks. Money so deposited will be immediately available for the conduct of public business, so that the question of paying for and conducting business will solve itself.—A. A.

ANOTHER ANSWER.

How is the Socialist commonwealth going to get along without money?

It is not going to get along without money.

Even if the somewhat fanciful labor check should be adopted, it would be money.

But I do not know of any good reason why the dollar should not be retained.

It goes without saying that Socialism will abolish the national banking system. The money, of whatever kind it may be, will be issued by the public.

Of course, in the Socialist commonwealth labor will be the real measure of value, and money will merely be its expression. But labor can be expressed in dollars and cents as easily as in hours and minutes.

The dollar is not the cause of our present evils. Private ownership of the industries is the cause. When the industries are transformed from private to public, the sting is taken out of the dollar. It is rendered harmless. We can make further use of it without danger.

It is not the purpose of Socialism to discard anything that is useful.

The wonderfully luminous and marvelously convenient decimal system on which the dollar is based is not a thing to be lightly cast aside.

Besides, the people are thoroughly familiar with it. The retention of the dollar and cent would go a long way toward making the transition from capitalism to Socialism smooth.

Furthermore, there will be artists, authors, lecturers, preachers, special teachers, farmers and others in the Socialist commonwealth who will not be working for the public. Our money will have to be sufficiently elastic to permit us, as individuals or private organizations, to purchase these people's wares, without vexatious red tape. The dollar seems to fill the bill better than anything else.

Anyway, we shall have money of some kind, and you will have a vote as to what kind it shall be.—*John M. Work.* (From "*What's So and What Isn't,*" pp. 115-17.)

GOVERNMENT BANKING.

The Socialist platform declares for "the collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system." Does this mean that the government shall control all the money and lend it to the people at a low interest as the Greenback and Populist parties demanded?

No. Money so loaned out would involve control of money in the interest of a few. A government monopoly of money and banking which must come under Socialism would mean that the government as the agent of the people would have it in its power to do all the business of the country and also see to exchange. Out of that would come collective monopoly of all the industries.—A. A.

THE LIQUOR BUSINESS.

Would Socialists, if in power, uphold the liquor business?

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

III.

WOMAN, THE FAMILY AND THE HOME.

MONOGAMY AND MARRIAGE.

I am told that Socialism would break up the home. Are Socialists not opposed to marriage?

With regard to the institution of legal monogamous marriage, with its qualification of divorce, there is nothing that can be called a Socialist view. On what should be the exact conditions of marriage and divorce Socialists are divided, just as are now other thinking persons. . . . Where Socialists do differ from the ordinary man, still more from the anarchist and the individualist, is in requiring from those entering on a relation which may lead to parenthood, a greater degree of scruple with regard to offspring and a greater sense of personal obligation with regard to any child that is born.

What, from the Socialist standpoint—as, indeed, from that of the statesman, of any creed or politics—is emphatically not merely a private affair is parentage. Whatever obligation may be recognized between the parties to the union, or by them to God, there is, to the Socialist, a very definite obligation to the community in which they live—giving rise to a reciprocal obligation by the community both to the child and to the mother—which has to be sanctioned by public opinion and enforced, so far as required, by positive law. This consideration of itself necessitates legal formalities, official registration and an obligatory new relationship between the parties to the union and between them and the community—in fact, what in all countries the law calls marriage.—*Sidney and Beatrice Webb. (From the New Statesman, July 5, 1913.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

Do you think that when women are politically and economically the equals of men, so that they no longer have

to marry for homes, or to stand brutal treatment because they have no other homes than the men afford; so that no woman is forced to sell her body—I ask you, when women are thus free, do you believe that the marriage system will be endangered thereby? For that is what the contention of the opponents of Socialism comes to in the last analysis, my friend. Socialism will only affect the marriage system in so far as it raises the standards of society as a whole and makes woman man's political and economic equal.—*John Spargo. (From "The Common Sense of Socialism," p. 115.)*

THE OVERWORKED WIFE.

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

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

EQUALIZING BURDENS.

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

Already the way is pointed out by things that are being done. In some places the student at school is furnished a noon-day luncheon free. In other places he is given free dental and medical service. These aids to childhood might be extended so as to make the burden more equal to the

burden of the single man. Besides, it might be considered (and should be) that the woman keeping the house and raising a family was performing a public service which would entitle her to a remuneration equal to that of her husband. If so, this would nearly equalize the income compared with that of the single man.—A. A.

THE EMPLOYMENT OF WOMEN.

Do Socialists contemplate and desire that all women, who are not actually occupied with domestic work and the care of children, should, after the period of training is passed and so long as health permits, work independently for their livelihood?

The answer is emphatically in the affirmative. To us it seems one of the most disastrous results of the present inequality of income, and the present low view of woman-kind, that young women should be brought up to a parasitic life of *ennui*, amusement and barren self-culture. Among men, even in the propertied class, it is comparatively a small section who are at present demoralized by neither performing any service to the community nor earning their daily bread. But among the women of the propertied class this state of things is the rule instead of the exception. There is no more shameful incident of our present "civilization" than the irresponsibility, the painful emptiness and the dishonorable futility of the lives of the great majority of those women of the upper and middle classes who are free from personal service in housework and the care of children. These unoccupied women, married or unmarried, are a drag on the civilization of the race, insidiously lowering by their influence, their precept and their example its sanity, its public spirit, its intelligence and even its good manners. It is these women whom we find postulating, as the tests of social distinction, the possession of property, especially inherited property; the absence of any work interfering with a life devoted to amusement; and a lavish, if not an ostenta-

tious, personal expenditure. And they are not even happy in their moral vulgarity! If the Socialist maxim of "Choose equality and flee greed" were required for no other purpose, it would be urgently needed merely to "save the souls" of those unconscious victims of a masculine capitalism, the idle women of the upper and middle classes.

Nor is this all the harm that is wrought. The motive of pecuniary self-interest corrupts all our sex relations as it does wealth production. To quote an American writer (Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, in "Women and Economics"):

We have painfully and laboriously evolved and carefully maintained among us an enormous class of non-productive consumers—a class which is half the world, and mother of the other half. We have built into the constitution of the human race the habit and desire of taking, as divorced from its natural precursor and concomitant of making. We have made for ourselves this endless array of "horse-leech's daughters, crying, Give! give!" To consume food, to consume clothes, to consume amusements, to take and take and take forever—from one man if they are virtuous, from many if they are vicious, but always to take and never think of giving anything in return except their womanhood—this is the enforced condition of the mothers of the race. What wonder that their sons go into business "for what there is in it"! What wonder that the world is full of the desire to get as much as possible and to give as little as possible! What wonder, either, that the glory and sweetness of love are but a name among us, with here and there a strange and beautiful exception, of which our admiration proves the rarity!—*Sidney and Beatrice Webb. (From the New Statesman, July 5, 1913.)*

STATE PROVISION FOR MOTHERHOOD.

If economic security is to be guaranteed to the employed women, what provision is to be made for women who choose to bear and rear children?

What women—and not Socialist women only or particularly—are every day more revolting against is what the wage earners are revolting against—namely, the loss of personal dignity and personal freedom which is inherent in dependence on the caprice of another. . . . It is on this ground that Socialists throughout the world take up the

women's cause along with that of the wage earner; and they propose the same principle for the solution of the one problem as of the other. The child-bearing woman, like the wage earner, must be set free from economic subjection, by being guaranteed by the community, in return for the public service that she is rendering, that independent income . . . which Socialists hold to be necessary conditions of freedom and self-respect. How is this to be done?

It would be idle to pretend that Socialists have any detailed plan or prevision of the future, with regard to this, the most difficult of all social problems. It looks as if the civilized world will seek a solution along one of two roads—our personal expectation is that it will go a little way along each of them, and perhaps find a way out which combines the advantages of both. There are those who advocate a strengthening of the woman's legal position in the family. It may be that, by what is essentially an "individualist" solution, the man who enters a sex union will be made legally responsible not only for the complete maintenance of the offspring, but also for providing for the mother a definite weekly income or proportion of his earnings, to which she will have as clear and as practically enforceable a legal right as the wage earner now has against his employer. Failing the receipt of that income, whether owing to the poverty of the husband or to his recalcitrance, the community itself would, of course, have to make the necessary provision for mother and child, as if the husband were dead. On the other hand, it may be found that any such serious an increase of the legal responsibilities of husbands and fathers militates so gravely against marriage and the birth of children that public opinion and parliament will go in another direction. And here we come to the second solution, one to which the continuously falling birth rate among the higher races is driving the legislatures of the world. If more children of any particular race are desired, the community must itself provide the means. The allowance for children under the income tax acts, the maternity benefit of

Mr. Lloyd-George's national insurance, the bonus of five pounds now paid to the mother on the birth of a New South Wales child, are possibly only the beginning of a movement with which Socialists have full sympathy. We believe that if women could look to the state for adequate provision for their needs at childbirth and for security of maintenance during child-rearing, all but a small proportion would prefer to devote part of their lives to the supreme service of motherhood rather than dedicate themselves to the production of material commodities or the rendering of less important services.

In whatever way the community may decide to secure economic independence of the child-bearing woman, we believe that nothing less than this independence will gain for her the personal dignity and consciousness of freedom on which perfect motherhood, no less than perfect citizenship, really depends. Far from abolishing marriage, this freeing of the family group from its remnant of servitude will raise it to a higher plane. Most Socialists, at any rate, believe that it will enhance the dignity of the marriage relation, maintain it against disruption, stop the disintegration of the family which industrialism is already producing, and increase the affectionate comradeship on which it should be based. Above all, it will provide the right home environment for the education of the child.—*Sidney and Beatrice Webb. (From the New Statesman, July 5, 1913.)*

IV.

TASKS AND RECOMPENSE.

WAGES AND THE DIVISION OF THE PRODUCT.

Does not Socialism promise to abolish wages? How, then, will the producers be recompensed for their labor or service?

Socialism does indeed promise the abolition of wages and the system under which they are paid; but it does not promise the abolition of regular payments for work done. The word "wages" has to Socialists a meaning specifically related to capitalism; wages are that fraction of the value produced by the worker which is left in his possession after the owners of the land and the machinery have taken what they can. Unfortunately, there is no word to designate what Socialists mean by the individual worker's recompense under Socialism. It might be called a quota, or a share or a labor dividend. It is, in fact, a dividend of the joint product of all labor, less the necessary cost of administration. Very likely payments will be made as wages are now paid; but though the form will be similar, the substance will be entirely different.

Socialism does indeed also promise the definite ending of the exploitation of labor; but the promise does not mean that the worker will get for his individual and immediate use the full value of the commodities he produces. The setting apart of wealth for the production of new wealth, the costs of administration, and the costs of all those social services to which civilized mankind is becoming accustomed, will subtract from this dividend. But this subtraction is *not* exploitation. In the nation's collective capital, if we may use that term for a thing so different from what we know as capital today, the workers will be equal partners; and they will be equal sharers in all those benefits which flow from the institutions and social services which

mankind will have developed. In other words, the share of the product that is today withheld from the workers by the charge which capital makes for itself is an exploitation by private persons for their own benefit; what is withheld from the workers under Socialism is in addition to the common wealth, in which every human being may be an equal sharer.—*W. J. Ghent. (From "Socialism and Success," pp. 247-48.)*

EQUALITY OF PAY.

Will there be, under Socialism, an approximation toward equal pay for all kinds and amounts of work?

It happens that some persons are confirmed in the opinion that Socialism promises security from want and equal pay to all who profess to be willing to work. With the help of our enemies, this erroneous impression has been well established in the mind of the general public. . . . To those unfamiliar with the principles of scientific Socialism, Bellamy's "Looking Backward" is an authoritative work on Socialism rather than a beautiful Utopian fancy. Now, it is pretty well known that the sense of responsibility to provide against the future supplies some of us with a much needed stimulus to the development of character and ability, and arouses us to the exercise of forethought. Notwithstanding this, our communist friends would commit the Socialist party frankly and positively to the principle of equal pay, or to the principle of communism (from each according to his ability and to each according to his need). But there is nothing in any Socialist platform or in any official declaration of the Socialist movement that can be taken to mean or to imply anything of the sort. Our platforms are invariably silent upon the subject of remuneration. The Socialist party has never proposed any other way for determining the relative pay of different kinds of labor than the way in which it is determined now by the ordinary action of supply and demand.—*Warren Atkinson. (From "Incentive Under Socialism," pp. 25-26.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

There are two radically different theories regarding recompense widely held. One is the ideal of distribution according to needs, and one is the ideal of distribution according to service. The former may be called a Communist ideal, the latter an Individualist-Socialist ideal. It is not to be denied that each ideal, and furthermore, every possible gradation between these two extremes, are held by men who call themselves, and rightly, Socialists. But there is, after all, an adjustment of these varying beliefs or ideals. Probably most Socialists the world over believe that need as a sole basis of distribution is a standard utterly impracticable among men as we now know them. So long has mankind been prompted to its tasks by the desire for individual gain that this motive is for the time ingrained; and a division of products proportioned to needs without reference to service would be rejected by every community on the planet.

But this ideal, though acknowledged to be impracticable of fulfillment in the near future, is one which is generally held to be possible of *ultimate* fulfillment. Socialists hold, then, that the matter of distribution shall be decided on the basis of what does most to insure the efficiency and well-being of society. Mankind has been trained for countless generations to look for a reward proportioned to service. It has never got a reward so proportioned, as all know, and it never will get it under competitive industry. But this hope has been implanted in it, and this standard, though everywhere violated, is for the time fixed in the human consciousness. And so this standard will most likely be continued under Socialism. But it is a standard which must undergo a constant and increasing modification by that other standard of *need*. With what face can any upholder of the present regime criticize the growing recognition of this standard? It is one which every humane man adopts in his own family; and it is one to which society itself pays greater heed year by year. The modern state, capitalistic

though it is, in many ways foreshadows the state which is to follow it. Our asylums for the blind, the deaf and dumb, the insane and for defectives; our hospitals, our schools even, are all instances of a distribution of benefits based solely on needs, and they are all of them anticipations of a state in which this principle will be carried to degrees unapprehended today.—*W. J. Ghent. (From "Socialism and Success," pp. 227-29.)*

THE DIRTY WORK.

Who will do the dirty work in the Socialist commonwealth?

You needn't worry about that; I'll do it myself.

It has been suggested that we have the republican and democratic politicians do it, because they are used to doing dirty work.

But I will relieve them of the task. I'll do it myself.

The reason I will do it is because the hours of labor will be shorter in that employment than in any other, and I will, therefore, have most of my time to read, to study and improve myself. I will have time to attend a university and study astronomy, and biology, and geology, and zoology, and chemistry, and mathematics, and language, and philosophy, and music, and art, and literature, and other attractive subjects too numerous to mention.

And I know a lot of bright fellows who will help me to do the dirty work for the same reason.

But the work won't be dirty very long.

When we post-graduate university students get out in our overalls doing the dirty work, one of my fellow workers will say, "Work, you're a student of science; you will be a disgrace to our university if you don't invent a machine to do this dirty work."

And I will reply, "You're another!"

Then we will begin to discuss the question in earnest, and we will all go home with the understanding that we are all to spend our spare time trying to figure out that machine.

We will combine our efforts.

In a few weeks the machine will be doing the work.

So, you can quit worrying about it.—*John M. Work.*
(From "*What's So and What Isn't,*" pp. 110-11.)

ANOTHER ANSWER.

When the Socialist municipal government is called upon to estimate the pay of its teamsters, suppose it decides their pay to be fifty cents per hour; and suppose that the men needed to do the work are not to be gotten for this pay. What shall be done? To draft men to do the dirty or disagreeable work would be an intolerable proceeding, as unjust as it would be impracticable. Therefore, the pay for such work would have to be increased. If there were those who objected that the work was then too highly paid, they would not have to submit to an imposition in this respect. They could have the job themselves, with the exceptional advantages it seems to them to offer. But if they want other people to do such work for them, they would have to pay them for it enough to make these others willing to do it. That they believe their efforts to be better rewarded in some other occupation is shown by their declining to do this work themselves, and this is better evidence than their sworn testimony would be that the work is not too highly paid.

On the other hand, suppose that the pay for clerks is in like manner estimated to be fifty cents per hour and that there are a great many more seeking this employment and fit for it than can be employed. Who are to be preferred for the desired employment? The price of such labor must drop say to forty cents per hour until some of those who desire to be clerks have found employment in other occupations which are more in demand. They desired this employment because they believed its advantages to be greater than their efforts could secure in other employments. This is the testimony that it was too highly paid of a large number of those who are best able to judge of this occupation

because they do the work and know by experience its effects upon their bodies and minds.

Supply and demand will compel the readjustment of the pay for agreeable work downward and of the pay for disagreeable work upward, so that the human energy consumed will be at least as well compensated in one occupation as it would be in other occupations.—*Warren Atkinson.* (From "*Incentive Under Socialism,*" pp. 12-13.)

DETERMINING THE INDIVIDUAL PRODUCT.

Who is to decide what the full social value of the wealth a man creates is? Will it be done by bosses?

No. Statisticians now can figure the average production of the worker. If a difference is desired between those skilled and those unskilled that can be ascertained through piece work just as it is in shops today.—A. A.

NO ROOM FOR SNOBBISHNESS.

I know a man who by his own hard efforts has passed through two universities. Under Socialism would it be right for him to be on an equality with the ditch digger who never made any effort to improve himself?

In one sense he could not be on an equality with the ditch digger. His education has raised him to a point where he can appreciate certain things in literature, science and history that an uneducated man cannot possibly do. However, he eats no more and no more needs shelter than the ditch digger does. Both should and would have everything that the physical and mental man demands and the labor of both should be adequate to supply them. The fact that one has prepared himself for better service would naturally advance him to the point where he would be able to serve men, perhaps in a supervising capacity. Jesus well expressed the idea when He said: "He that will be greatest of all shall be servant of all." Socialism will mean service, not servitude, and the educated man who can serve better will be the greater, because he serves society.—A. A.

COMPELLING THE LAZY TO WORK.

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

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

THE MOTIVES FOR EXERTION.

Is not the average man averse to work? Would he not rather be idle, provided a living could be assured? And with the incentive of personal need removed, would he not tend to shirk all his obligations of labor or service?

The average man is not averse to work. On the contrary, we are justified by what we know of history and sociology in assuming that all normal men have the impulse to exertion. They do, indeed, seek to avoid disagreeable work. They seek to avoid work which is socially contemned—work the performance of which places them in an inferior class. And they seek to avoid dangerous work and monotonous work and meanly paid work—work which drains them of health and joy for no adequate return. There is probably no sweated seamstress or factory spooltender, no street sweeper or sewer cleaner who would not prefer to be idle rather than to work at his or her daily task. And yet probably there are very few of these persons but would work willingly and energetically at the making of things in which they could enshrine something of their heart and soul. They have not now the opportunity. Only the more fortunate

workers, as industry is now constituted, are enabled to do the kind of work which they most wish to do or are best capable of doing. . . . With greater freedom of opportunity, with juster recompense, with an equal interest on the part of every one in the sum of production, there need be no fear that men will not work.

Under Socialism the basic motive of personal need will not be removed. He that can work and will not, shall not eat. The primary motive of personal need will always be present. But there is another motive which usually shares with it in exertion, and would always do so under freer conditions of labor. That is the joy of achievement. It has two aspects—the one of immediate satisfaction in creating something and the other of winning the regard of our fellows. There is no normal being who does not—or who would not, under reasonable conditions—take pride in the work of his head or hand. And there are but few who do not seek expression in fellow-service. Even under the present regime, when the test of a man's success is so commonly held to be the amount of money he can amass, thousands of men give over their chance of winning pecuniary rewards in order to devote themselves to a social ideal. We see this in the labor and social movements of all countries, in the revolutionary movement in Russia, the co-operative movement in England and Belgium, and often in government service. An impulse like this, appearing even under the unfavorable conditions of the present regime, could not but flower under Socialism—under a system wherein the common good would be the accepted ideal. The common man is made of the same clay as is the exceptional man; though his faculties are less intense, and his skill is less plastic, his nature is the same; and it needs only the humanizing of the conditions of his employment to cause him to give to his simple tasks like energies and impulses as those given to his exceptional men to their more complex tasks.—*W. J. Ghent.* (Adapted from "*Socialism and Success*," pp. 236-42.)

CHANGING OCCUPATIONS.

Won't it be practically impossible under Socialism for the individual to change his occupation from a task he had come to dislike to an agreeable one?

Under capitalism a great many of us are employed in occupations we cordially dislike, even if the requirements of physical and mental health do not urgently demand a change. The thought of changing our occupations from time to time from inclination, for the perfection and full rounding of our mental and physical worth, in so far outside of the bounds of a reasonable possibility in the present capitalist system that the suggestion of it provokes a smile of incredulity. When the individual falls, by good or ill fortune, into "that state of life to which it has pleased God to call him," he there remains stuck fast, clamped down, immovable, chained for life, until the monotonous cares and dreary routine of his existence warp and distort mind and body out of the freshness and adaptability of youth into the hideous deformities and lopsidedness of old age. This is what capitalism calls "developing individuality."

Socialism certainly must afford a greater flexibility of arrangement, permitting such occasional interchange of occupations as would be consistent with efficiency. Therefore the number and variety of occupations to choose from must be unlimited, assignment depending only upon the ability to meet requirements. The pay for each being automatically adjusted, through the free action of supply and demand, would offer the greatest material incentive in those occupations in which there is the greatest demand for workers. Any individual desiring the highest pay could get it only in that occupation in which he would do the most valuable work he could for the community. At the same time, any individual who chooses some occupation for the pleasure or improvement he derives from it without regard to the value of the services he renders to society, will have

equal freedom to do so if he accepts the pay which represents the value to society of the services he renders in that occupation.—Warren Atkinson. (*From "Incentive Under Socialism,"* pp. 61-62.)

REWARDING THE INVENTORS.

How should an inventor be rewarded?

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

A REMOTE POSSIBILITY.

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

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

ABILITY AND ITS REWARD.

Will not great genius and exceptional ability refuse to exert themselves under the lesser material rewards prevailing under Socialism?

In all societies, in all ages, men seek their rewards according to the current standards of valuation. The Indian youth, who is forbidden to marry or to attend the councils of the warriors until he has lifted the hair of a certain number of victims, takes his reward in scalps. His best powers of cunning and strategy, bravery and endurance, are brought out and kept employed in the tasks which promise this reward. In the age of chivalry men take their reward in their records of victories in tournaments or on the field of battle. In ages dominated by regard for learning or the arts men seek rewards in intellectual or artistic achievement.

It is only in a predominantly commercial age that men demand a proportioned reward in money. And even in such ages this standard is by no means exclusive. In this very time, when all the world seems given up to a mad scramble for material gain, the best men, the most useful men, give their lives to services that promise only a mean and scanty, if any, material reward. They are taking their larger pay in another coin. It is an unimaginative criticism of the Socialist state to assert that when great material rewards have been abolished natural ability will content itself with common tasks, refusing to exert itself in tasks of invention and direction. Nothing is so false to human nature. Ability always seeks to manifest itself, and it asks no other reward than "going" wages—that is, the kind and quantity of reward common at the time. The consciousness of achievement, the esteem of one's fellows, the pride of sharing in leadership, will draw from the men of ability a quantity and character of performance which even the hope of material gain cannot bring forth today.—*W. J. Ghent. (From "Socialism and Success," pp. 233-35.)*

THE REWARD OF A BRANDEIS.

I understand that in the co-operative commonwealth man is to have the full product of his labor, minus the cost of administration and service. If Brandeis could save the railroads \$1,000,000 a day, would he, under Socialism, be paid \$1,000,000 a day?

Neither Brandeis nor any other man can save his employer, whether it be the government or some corporation, a million dollars a day. His ideas, without an army of workers to carry them out, would be entirely valueless. That million dollars a day which might be saved through the application of this man's ideas by other men would either go to all the employes who carried them out, including Brandeis, the originator, or else to society as a whole in increased returns.—A. A.

MAIL CARRIERS WEALTH PRODUCERS.

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

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

THE SMALL MERCHANT.

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

The nation would sell things at actual cost of production and distribution. If you could compete with this and conduct your little shop you would be privileged to do so under Socialism. If you could not you might get into the

public service of distribution or if there was not room there you could get into some form of productive work that would enable you to make more than you do now, yet not make it through profits or a tribute off the people, but by your own labor.—A. A.

NO CHANCE OF EXPLOITATION.

How will manufacturing be conducted under Socialism? Would there not be an employer and would not the employe work for wages and so be exploited as badly as under the present system?

The question is very much confused. Under the present system the employer usually does not work at all. A manager who works for wages, even though they be very big wages, does not get very rich. Under Socialism the sole employer would be the people themselves. There would be managers, elected by the people, who would be remunerated, but none of them could in any way exploit the workers.—A. A.

V.

COLLECTIVE AND PRIVATE PROPERTY.**ONLY SOCIAL PROPERTY TO BE SOCIALIZED.**

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

There is just as truly limitation in socialization as there is in the tract of ground you may buy individually. By this I mean that collective ownership of the roads does not mean collective ownership of toothbrushes, and collective ownership of courthouses does not give the public a right to say what church you shall join. There is the same limitation to the Socialist proposition for the socialization of the machinery of production and distribution. It does not mean community of women and could not do so except on the assumption that women were the property of men. It does not mean an ending of private property, any more than the collective ownership of the postoffice means that you may not buy a stamp as your personal belonging. It does not mean that you cannot be a Catholic, a Methodist, an atheist or a Mohammedan, any more than collective ownership of the road deprives you of your right to individual views. Because we have tried collective ownership of roads, streets, schools and other things, it does not follow that the particular thing we now wish socialized—that is, the big industries—has ever been “tried,” though the operation of the principle in one line gives a good criterion as to how it will work in another.—*Lincoln Phifer*. (From “*The Road to Socialism*,” pp. 24-25.)

THE NATURE OF PRIVATE PROPERTY.

In what would private property, under the co-operative commonwealth, consist?

Private property under a co-operative commonwealth would consist of anything that a person desired to own and

was willing to work and pay for. It would necessarily consist of what we now call personal property and the right of exclusive occupation of buildings. Furniture, automobiles, bicycles, sets of tools—anything or sort of property except a means of production in which division of labor was utilized, and hence, laborers employed. Nor would it be at all necessary to exclude the latter by any legislative enactment. Such law would be superfluous. No need to enact that a person "shall not own and operate a railway" would exist, because such a possession would be about as valuable as a dead dog.

The machinery of production is now a medium through which labor is exploited, that is, out of which profits are made. When every laborer has the all desired opportunity to work and receives the full product as his reward, it would be impossible to profit by the labor of others, and hence impossible to profit from the operation of a railroad. Hence its private ownership would be worthless and consequently none would harbor any desire for such ownership—none would receive it as a gift.

The ownership of the right of occupancy is all the property any one would want in any building and its grounds. If you "paid down" for a house you would be paying money that should come out of a generation or two after you are dead, and you would be absolutely without insurance; because there would be no place for such a concern as an insurance company, because no profits for it.

But there is another form of private property that you would possess, of which none could rob you—the right of free access to the means whereby you must live and absolute freedom from exploitation.—*N. A. Richardson. (From "Introduction to Socialism," pp. 55-56.)*

PRIVATE ENTERPRISES.

Would private ownership of any industry be permitted under Socialism?

There would be no law required to keep men from en-

gaging in private enterprises under Socialism. Some such enterprises, such as painting pictures, writing books and other things where an equal amount of work may have various values, would probably succeed under Socialism. But the ordinary business of private nature would be ruled out from the fact that it could not compete with public enterprises paying a full social value of the product. In other words, the greatest efficiency of the new public method would make obsolete the inefficient private method.—A. A.

OWNERSHIP OF THE HOME.

I have a little home. Would you take that?

No, you would need that and could keep it, so long as you occupied it, for the cost of repairs and an annual payment that would replace the property in the number of years that equal the average life of such a structure—a fraction of what you now pay for taxes—an insurance rate below any that you have ever yet paid. Is that not fair? Is it not in accord with justice? The public would lose nothing in such a deal, and certainly you would be a winner. “But why should I not be permitted to leave it and rent it?” An attempt to rent your property would again bring you into competition with the organized commonwealth, and the rent of a dozen such homes would not provide for one member of your family. Who would be so foolish as to pay you what is now called rent, when he could get another home without any such payment? Furthermore, if you left your home and moved to another, would it not be simply equivalent to a trade? Would you lose anything?—N. A. Richardson. (*From “Introduction to Socialism,”* p. 55.)

THE MATTER OF INHERITANCE.

Would inheritance of personal property be permitted under Socialism?

Personally I think it probably would. Understand, I have no warrant to speak for the future, but under Social-

ism there would be no private ownership of industries, machinery or any other means of exploiting a fellow man. There would be private ownership only in the means of consumption and enjoyment. And society at large is not very much concerned whether you consume your unproductive savings in a year, or preserve them for ten years later, or pass them on to your children. So long as there is no possibility for the exploitation of your fellow men by the ownership of the social tool—of the instrument of labor—so long I do not see anything in the Socialist program that would prohibit the use and enjoyment of private property and its transmission to posterity.—*Morris Hillquit. (From testimony before Industrial Relations Commission in New York, published in "The Double Edge of Labor's Sword," p. 85.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

Private saving was originally only a means of protection against future calamity. It proved inadequate, because only a few were able to lay by sufficient to serve as a protection. It is because of this fact that the proposition for collective saving—for the co-operative commonwealth—came. When that becomes operative private savings will be unnecessary, seeing that the general provision assures opportunity for all at all times. While the original idea behind private saving was doubtless to safeguard the future, it has come to pass that the money saved has become the basis of private business and consequently of the exploitation of the many by the few. Socialism will end this. Though a man might be a miser until he had accumulated a few thousand dollars, he could never by his own efforts earn a million or half a million or ever a quarter of a million—he could not invest it so as to exploit others, consequently he would only have injured himself without very greatly aiding his children in his pinch and scrape methods. When public provision is made against want private provision against it will necessarily pass.—A. A.

PROVISION FOR THE "RAINY DAY."

Does Socialism provide for laying by for a "rainy day"?

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

ABOLITION OF RENT.

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

Every change in society involves a change in ethics and in the way of making a living. Yet every change in the past meant greater opportunity than that which preceded it, and so Socialism in making changes will bring more opportunity to all. Before chattel slavery was destroyed there were no doubt men who had legitimately earned the money with which they had bought slaves. That, however, made no difference. Slavery ceased to be, and their slaves were freed. Under Socialism no man could live on rentals, just as no man can now live off the labor of a chattel slave.

Nevertheless, Socialism purposes to give all opportunity to work at all times and retain the full value of their labor. As a result it will be quite possible for them to lay by sufficient to keep them in comfort and ease when they

are old. Those who have grown old, like this friend, under the capitalist system, are deserving of support in the form of pensions from the public that they have served, but they are not deserving of making a living by exploiting individuals. Under Socialism their lot would be surer and better than it could possibly be from the rent of ten small houses. Yet no one would be exploited by them. You ask what would become of the houses? If they were satisfactory the public might take them for use, or they might be sold to individuals. If they were not considered satisfactory for people to live in, as many houses of the present will not be, then better houses would be built, because the workers could afford them, and these would simply be abandoned.—A. A.

OPERATING THE FARMS.

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

While the man who cultivates a small tract of ground himself is not an exploiter and probably would be permitted to continue such cultivation under Socialism, the tendency is in another direction. Already the farm expert, who understands soil, rotation and other necessary things, is being placed in charge of many farms, while in other sections counties are employing farm advisors. It will probably be found that better results can be obtained from having large areas of land cultivated under the direction of expert managers, using the greatest and best machinery possible. This will either come under syndicate farming or co-operative farming.

The co-operative farm, under such conditions, would be very easily transferred into the socialized farm, the government, whether it be the nation, state, county or even the municipality, assuming charge of this land. It is probable that when Socialism comes both the socialized farm and the individual small farm will exist. Which will predominate

will depend, of course, on the result. If the socialized farm proves the most successful, both in giving better working conditions and larger returns to the workers, then the farmers will gradually adopt that, not through compulsion, but because they wish to do so. This is what we can see will be the final outcome of farming under Socialism.—A. A.

BENEFITS TO THE FARMER.

How would Socialism benefit the farmer?

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

THE LITTLE FARM.

I have labored all my life and accumulated ownership of a little farm. Does Socialism propose to take it away from me?

Under Socialism we could not induce you to accept the little farm. What would you do with it? Do you think you could make a living from it and compete with the gigantic machinery that a co-operative commonwealth would muster in? Even under capitalism what will it be worth to you when agricultural pursuits are Morganized, as are many of the great industries already? What avail would be your ownership today of a small coal mine, or oil well, or steel

plant, or railway, if you must operate it yourself and compete with organization? And yet coal mines, railways, etc., are run for vast profits. Under a Socialist state all would be operated at the labor cost. Would you want your little farm? Could you gain therefrom ten or twenty bushels of wheat for a four-hour day?—*N. A. Richardson. (From "Introduction to Socialism," pp. 54-55.)*

ANOTHER ANSWER.

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

VI.

MISCELLANEOUS.

USE STRONG LANGUAGE SOMETIMES.

Do not Socialists, as a rule, use needlessly intemperate language in denouncing the evils of capitalism?

It is true that Socialists sometimes use very violent language. Like all earnest and enthusiastic men who are possessed by a great and overwhelming sense of wrong and needless suffering, they sometimes use language that is terrible in its vehemence; their speech is sometimes full of bitter scorn and burning indignation. It is also true that their speech is sometimes rough and uncultured, shocking the sensitive ear, but I am sure you will agree with me that the working man or woman who, never having had the advantage of education and refined environment, feels the burden of the day that are or the inspiration of better days to come, is entitled to be heard. So I am not going to apologize for the rough and uncultured speech.

And I am not going to apologize for the violent speech. It would be better, of course, if all the advocates of Socialism could master the difficult art of stating their case strongly and without compromise, but without bitterness and without unnecessary offense to others. But it is not easy to measure speech in the denunciation of unmeasurable wrong, and some of the greatest utterances in history have been hard, bitter, vehement words torn from agonized hearts. It is true that Socialists now and then use violent language, but no Socialist—unless he is so overwrought as to be momentarily irresponsible—*advocates violence*. The great urge and passion of Socialism is for the peaceful transformation of society.

I have heard a few overwrought Socialists, all of them gentle and generous comrades, incapable of doing harm to any living creature, in bursts of tempestuous indignation

use language which seemed to incite their hearers to violence, but those who heard them understood that they were borne away by their feelings. I have never heard Socialists advocate violence toward any human beings in cold-blooded deliberation. But I *have* heard capitalists and the defenders of capitalism advocate violence toward Socialists in cold-blooded deliberation. I have seen in Socialist papers upon a few occasions violent utterances which I deplored, but never such advocacy of violence as I have read in newspapers opposed to Socialism.

Socialists are opposed to violence. They appeal to brains and not to bludgeons; they trust in ballots and not in bullets. The violence of speech with which they are charged is not the advocacy of violence, but unmeasured and impassioned denunciation of a cruel and brutal system. Not long ago I heard a clergyman denouncing Socialists for their "violent language." Poor fellow! He was quite unconscious that he was more bitter in his invective than the men he attacked. Of course Socialists use bitter and burning language—but not more bitter than was used by the great Hebrew prophets in their stern denunciations; not more bitter than was used by Martin Luther and other great leaders of the Reformation; not more bitter than was used by Garrison and the other Abolitionists. Men with vital messages cannot always use soft words.—*John Spargo*. (From "*The Common Sense of Socialism*," pp. 140-42.)

SOCIALISM AND THE NEGRO.

What will Socialism do for the negro?

Absolutely nothing. Socialism doesn't do anything for anybody. It simply provides a means by which all may be able to do things for themselves. It will make it so the negro can control his own job just as it does for everybody else and so he may secure his full social product. It will provide conditions that would insure him a voice in the government and a voice in industry.—A. A.

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



AA

001 433 407

2

