

# Socialism Summed Up

By MORRIS HILLQUIT

HX  
86  
H6556  
1913

CORNELL  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY



DATE DUE

~~1966~~

~~RR 1971~~  
AUG 26 1971 M P

~~DEC 1 1971 M P~~

~~MAY 1 1981 E~~

~~JUN 1 1984~~

~~DEC 1 1985~~

GAYLORD


PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Cornell University Library  
HX86.H65 S6 1913

Socialism summed up.



3 1924 032 589 420



Cornell University  
Library

The original of this book is in  
the Cornell University Library.

There are no known copyright restrictions in  
the United States on the use of the text.

<http://www.archive.org/details/cu31924032589420>











# **SOCIALISM SUMMED UP**







**MORRIS HILLQUIT.**

# SOCIALISM SUMMED UP

BY  
**MORRIS HILLQUIT**

AUTHOR OF  
"SOCIALISM IN THEORY AND PRACTICE" AND  
"HISTORY OF SOCIALISM IN THE UNITED STATES."



NEW YORK  
THE H. K. FLY COMPANY  
PUBLISHERS

Copyright, 1912 by  
THE METROPOLITAN MAGAZINE COMPANY

---

Copyright, 1913 by  
THE H. K. FLY COMPANY

339228 B  
X



## CONTENTS

---

CHAPTER.	PAGE.
Introduction .....	7
I. The Causes that Make for Socialism....	9
II. The Socialist Aim .....	24
III. The Trend of Social Development.....	34
IV. The Methods of Socialism.....	44
V. The Political Program .....	59
VI. The Accomplishments of the Movement..	76
VII. Socialist Movement in the United States..	95





## ILLUSTRATIONS

---

Morris Hillquit .....	<i>Frontispiece</i>
	PAGE
Society, under Capitalism, crushed between Industrial Combination and Competition....	20
Socialists believe in the abolition of the Senate and the veto power of the President.....	64
Socialists would curb the Court's power of injunction .....	65
Socialists would begin their reforms with the child, the bearer of the nation's future....	83
Socialism is the legitimate child of Capitalism and the latter cannot help begetting the former .....	99



## INTRODUCTION.

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

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

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

A movement of such magnitude and universality

## *INTRODUCTION*

could not spring up without a cause, or continue without a mission. To scoff at it is futile. To ignore it is folly. It must be faced. It should be understood.

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

# Socialism Summed Up

## CHAPTER I.

### THE CAUSES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM.

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

The Socialist movement was called into life by economic conditions which have sprung up within very recent periods. Its program is an attempted solution of the problems inherent in these conditions.

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

As an illustration, let us take the economic condition of the United States in the early days of the republic. The main industry of the country was agriculture, and land was plentiful and accessible to all. The mechanical arts and crafts were practiced on a

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

But within the last generations a silent revolution has taken place in our methods of producing and distributing wealth. The simple tool of the old-time mechanic has gradually evolved into the modern machine of wonderful complexness and gigantic dimensions, propelled by steam or electricity, and oftentimes doing the work of hundreds of human hands. The modest workshop of our grandfathers has grown into the immense modern factory under whose roof hundreds, sometimes thousands of workers are congregated for joint labor. Mass production, division of

labor and specialization of functions have largely superseded individual effort, general efficiency and acquired skill in industry. The impersonal "market" has replaced the specific "customer." Production has become social in character, methods and object.

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

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

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

cedes, the fruit always retreats, and Tantalus is left to starve amid plenty.

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

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



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

It is not contended that the entire population is definitely divided into the two classes mentioned. There are, of course, the more or less indefinite and

undefinable economic groups, generally designated as the "middle classes," with all shades of special interests, but the main factors in modern industrial life are clearly represented by the two most pronounced types or classes—the capitalists and the wage-earners, the latter comprising all grades of hired manual and mental workers.

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

There is war between employer and employee.

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

boycotts and occasional dynamite explosions, and on the other hand lockouts, black lists, injunctions and jails.

There is war between employer and employee.

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

There is war between worker and worker.

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

The automatic, almost self-operating machine makes child and woman labor possible and profitable, and the children and wives of the workers are drafted into the field of industry in competition with their fathers and husbands. The more women and children are at work in the factories, the rarer become the

opportunities for men to find work and the lower become their wages. Child and woman labor mean lower wages for man. Low wages for men mean more child and woman labor, and so the workers move forever in a vicious circle of misery and privation.

There is war between producer and user.

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

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

The system of competition has not been without merit. It has organized industry, stimulated invention and increased human productivity a hundredfold.

It has created vast wealth and evolved higher standards of life. It has broken down the barriers between countries and united all modern nations into one world-wide family of almost identical culture and civilization. It has played a most important and useful part in the history of human growth.

But sharing the fate of all other industrial systems, competition finally reaches a stage when its mission is accomplished, and its usefulness is outlived. Competition, which in its youth and vigor is "the life of trade," becomes in old age a plague and a nuisance. In the long run it demoralizes the industrial life of the nation and exhausts and ruins the competitors themselves. At that point competition begins to yield, gradually but surely, to a new industrial form—combination. Then arises the modern business corporations, followed by trade agreements and pools, and finally by the trusts and monopolies.

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

The trusts are a powerful factor in the industrial life of the nation, and they modify the social condi-

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

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

The trusts are the most important and sometimes the sole employers of labor in their industries. Hence they have practically absolute power to dictate the terms of employment of their workers. Most trusti-

## CAUSES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM 19

fied industries are characterized by long hours, miserable wages and general ill-treatment of the employees.

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

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

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

It has divided the people into classes with antagonistic economic interests and has bred class struggles and class hatred.

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

It has cast out of the active industrial life of the nation millions of willing and able workers and has driven them into shiftlessness, vice and crime.

It has brought uncertainty and misery to all classes of the people, and happiness to none.

The wage-worker is not alone the only one to suffer from the consequences of capitalistic mismanagement.

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

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

The farmer is dominated, controlled and exploited by the power of capitalism just as much as the other producing classes. By means of mortgages, railroad freight rates, elevator and storage charges and prices of monopolistically produced farm implements and machinery, the capitalists manage to appropriate the





The small manufacturer,  
under Capitalism, crushed  
between Industrial Com-  
bination and Competition.



lion's share of his labor as effectively, though not quite as directly, as that of the hired factory hand.

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

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

The operation of industries as a social function

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

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

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

Poverty, as such, is of course also not a new and specifically capitalistic phenomenon. The poor have always been with us. But the poverty of former eras was a necessary evil due to the simple fact that man had not yet learned to produce a sufficient supply of necessities by means of proper tools. Modern poverty is entirely artificial and wholly unnecessary. The marvelous growth of the productivity of labor within the last generations has enabled mankind for the first time in history to produce enough to satisfy all rea-

*CAUSES THAT MAKE FOR SOCIALISM* 23

sonable needs of all reasonable human beings. The mass-poverty of to-day is due solely to irrational and faulty industrial organization.

## CHAPTER II.

### THE SOCIALIST AIM.

**T**HE Socialists demand that the principal industries of the nation, the business of providing the necessaries of life, be conducted by the community for the benefit of its members.

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

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

Socialism would substitute the prevailing method of

private enterprise for individual profit by a system of social production for collective use.

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

As democracy means political self-government, so Socialism calls for industrial self-government.

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

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

Individual Socialists may differ in their general social conceptions. They may come to the Socialist ideal by various roads. They may disagree with each other on questions of methods. But they are all in accord on the main object of the movement. The common complaint about the "numerous varieties of Socialism" springs from a superficial knowledge of the Socialist philosophy. As a matter of fact, no

political party has ever advanced a social program as definite, consistent and uniform as that of international Socialism.

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

It is safe to assert that no other movement has ever been so grossly and persistently misinterpreted. A closer analysis of the program as here formulated will help to dispel some of the most common misconceptions.

As has been stated, Socialism demands the collective ownership of the instruments of wealth production. This demand is often translated by the critics of the movement into the unceremonious formula: "Socialism stands for a division of wealth." The chancellor of one of our metropolitan universities 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 commendable qualities, the professor related the following conversation between himself and his majesty (I quote from memory): "What progress is Socialism making in your country?" in-



quired the American savant. "Oh, it is growing some," observed the king, "but it is not a serious menace. Socialism is bound to fail because of the utter silliness of its program. Suppose we should to-day divide the wealth of Norway equally among all inhabitants. An hour after the process a new baby is born. What then? Should we proceed to a new redistribution, or should the baby be left entirely destitute?" Both his majesty and our chancellor agreed that Socialism put the baby, and the baby put Socialism into a most awkward predicament. By one simple hypothesis two great minds had once more destroyed a Socialist ghost of their own creation to the entire satisfaction of themselves.

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

They view with placid indifference the private ownership of dwelling houses and gowns, automobiles and yachts. They do not even covet the innocent individual tool, and do not reach out an avaricious hand for the artist's paint brush or the housewife's needle or sewing machine. What they object to is the individual ownership of *social* instruments of work, the sources or implements of general wealth, operated by the masses, producing goods for the "market," and

indispensable to the life and well-being of society as a whole.

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

And similarly unfounded is the widespread notion that Socialism stands for equal reward of all labor. Socialism is opposed to the practice of allowing the idlers to appropriate part of the workers' product in the shape of profits. It demands that the total social product, after due allowance for social needs, go uncurtailed to all persons participating in the process of production by manual or mental labor. But it does not contemplate an equal distribution of the product among the individual workers. Socialism admits of reasonable variations in the scale of compensation based on the conventional distinctions of effort, skill and ability. The oft-expressed fear that a Socialist system of production would destroy personal ambition and deprive the individual of an incentive to put forth his best efforts, is based on a confusion between the crude communism which preaches community of

goods and equality of reward, and Socialism which has not the remotest kinship with it.

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

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

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

Public ownership does not necessarily mean government ownership, and government ownership does not imply centralized administration. In the practical application of the Socialist scheme of industrial organization, it is quite conceivable that certain industries would be operated by the national government. Railroad systems, telegraph and telephone lines are inherently national in their functions, and many other industries are already organized on a country-wide scale and adjusted to centralized operations. To the latter class belong all great trustified industries. On the other hand, other important industries are purely local in their character, and can best be administered by local governmental agencies. Street railways, water and gas works for instance, must logically come within the purview of municipal governments, and numerous smaller industries may be conducted by local co-operative groups under appropriate rules and regulations. It is even conceivable that some callings may be continued to be exercised in a purely individual way under a Socialist régime. There is no reason why the state should interfere with the individual pursuits of arts and handicraft or with the farmer personally cultivating his farm. What Socialism opposes is industrial exploitation of one man by an-

other; what it advocates is social and democratic production rationally organized and conducted.

A very illuminating analogy of such a scheme of organization is offered by the political framework of the government of the United States. Our laws are made and administered by "the government," but does that mean that the political administration of the country in all its divisions and subdivisions is lodged in the hands of one central authority? By no means. We have our federal statutes, our state laws, municipal ordinances and rules and regulations of subordinate local bodies, such as health boards, fire and police departments, etc. Each class of laws operates within its own proper sphere, and is administered by executive bodies or individuals elected or appointed and classified and graded according to their functions and places in the general administrative scheme. The political functions of the country are not exercised by a power above the people and independent of them, nor are they regulated in all particulars and at all times by the direct action of all the people. Our government is neither a bureaucracy nor a system of mob rule. In its purest form it is a rational democracy, which allows its affairs to be administered by appropriate general and local agencies, deriving their powers from the people and exercising them in conformity with their will. Our official government furthermore is supplemented by a number of voluntary "quasi-official" institutions, philanthropic, educational, political, etc., whose powers and functions are

as a rule regulated by law. We do not allow such voluntary institutions to exercise vital political powers affecting the rights of the citizens, but we do not interfere with their self-imposed social tasks so long as they only concern those who choose to come within the sphere of their operations. The Socialists demand that our industrial affairs be reorganized on practically the same general principles as our political system.

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

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

Socialized industries would exclude all large private business interests, and thus strike at the very root

of professional politics for private gain and the main fountain-head of wholesale graft and corruption.

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

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

## CHAPTER III.

### THE TREND OF SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT.

**I**N the Socialist conception economic systems and political institutions are not immutable forms. They are products of gradual growth and subject to incessant change. The present system of industry has not been consciously planned and devised by cunning capitalist minds. It has evolved from an older economic order by a series of imperceptible changes, accumulating steadily and irresistibly through several centuries. The feudal régime, which preceded the modern or capitalist order, had its economic root in agriculture, and was characterized by serfdom of labor and the rule of the land-owning nobles. Slowly and gradually commerce and manufacture grew up alongside of the predominant industry of agriculture. The discovery of America and of a sea route to the Indies and the introduction and perfection of the mariner's compass gave a tremendous impetus to navigation and trading, and trading stimulated manufacture. The growth of commerce and manufacture engendered a general search for labor-saving devices, and led to the era of epoch-making industrial inventions. The latter half of the eighteenth century witnessed



the appearance of the first great mechanical devices in industry. Hargreave's spinning-jenny, Arkwright's mill, Cartwright's power-loom, Watts' engine and Whitney's cotton gin were all invented within the brief period of 1704-1792, and railways were in operation within the first quarter of the last century. These inventions in turn served to unfold trade and manufacture in ever-accelerating measure. Factories were built and lured the farm laborers. Cities were founded and attracted the rural population. Merchants and manufacturers amassed fortunes, and with material wealth came social recognition and political power. Towards the beginning of the eighteenth century commerce and manufacture had grown to be serious rivals to agriculture. The traders and manufacturers, the incipient modern capitalists, engaged in a contest for political supremacy with the landed nobility. Towards the end of the century the great social conflict was fought out. Agriculture receded to the background, yielding the command of the economic world-forces to manufacture, commerce and finance. Feudalism was dethroned by triumphant capitalism. Government passed from the lord of the manor to the autocrat of the factory, shop and counting-room, from the aristocracy of birth to the aristocracy of the purse. With the passing of the old economic régime, its political counterpart, the feudal form of government, was discarded, and a new political dress, adjusted to the strong and growing limbs and the free and rapid movements of the new economic body, was devised.

The countless miniature kingdoms and principalities were consolidated into large nations following the transformation of the small workshops for local trade into big factories for the national market. Autocratic monarchies were supplanted by constitutional kingdoms or republics, as the absolute rule of the feudal lord in his domain yielded to the business contract in the new economic order. Courts and court cliques were succeeded by parliaments and chosen representatives, as the hereditary noble was replaced by the "self-made" man of affairs. The "will of the king," the basis of the feudal political order, was displaced by the controlling political principle of "popular liberty," reflecting the triumph of free competition in industry over the crystallized, localized forms of medieval agriculture and the absolute rule of the feudal lord over his manor.

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

Socialism, as an economic and political principle,

had begun to grow within the very heart of capitalist society generations ago, and to-day it has already attained to a respectable size.

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

It is not difficult to discern the Socialist germs in present society.

The capitalist order was in its inception based almost entirely on the principles of individual effort in production and unrestricted competition in the management of industries. The individualistic *laissez faire* doctrine which was proclaimed by the founders of the "classical" school of economics, was but the academic reflection of the convictions, sentiment and, it may be added, interests of the capitalist class in its bloom. This doctrine, which holds that all industrial needs and relations are adjusted automatically by the free play of the forces of supply and demand, without interference or regulation, has gained such universal currency that it dominates the average mind

even to-day. The orthodox lecturer or text-book writer on political economy is still earnestly discussing the merits of individual enterprise as against collective action and the advantages of competition over combination. He stubbornly refuses to notice that the mute forces of economic development, unconcerned by his learned theories and abstractions, have nullified the very basis of his argument, and are rapidly destroying individual effort and competition in industry. It always has been the privilege of our men of learning to live on the thoughts and facts of past ages.

The modern factories, mines, railroads and other great industrial enterprises are co-operative institutions in their work and methods of production. Perfected machinery and division of labor have entirely obliterated the individuality of the worker's product. The individual worker in modern, up-to-date industries does not produce consumable commodities or render usable service. He creates particles and performs fractional operations, useless and meaningless by themselves, and acquiring value and significance only in conjunction with other fractional products created by their fellow workers. Production has developed into a distinctly social process—the collective efforts of the workers sustain our modern industries—their individual efforts, standing alone, count for nothing. And similarly with the principle of competition in the management of industries. The entire trend of modern economic development has been away from competition and towards combination. The true

meaning of the great trust movement of the last generation is just this simple fact, that competition has become inadequate and incompatible with the modern large-scale industry, and must yield to combination. Probably one half of our staple commodities are to-day produced and marketed without competition, and it is only a question of a short time when combination will become the absolute rule in industry.

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

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

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

These conceptions of the functions of the state and legislation probably had some justification in the early phases of our era, when the social contrasts were not very marked, and the opportunities were abundant for all men.

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

When in 1802 Sir Robert Peel introduced in the British Parliament the first bill for the regulation of the labor of apprenticed children, it was denounced as revolutionary, and dire disasters were predicted from its adoption. The measure was called forth by the inhuman conditions in the English cotton mills to

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

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

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

The United States is the only civilized country in the world which does not provide through government channels for its aged or disabled workers, and it also has the distinction of being the only republic on the face of the globe which calmly allowed five individuals to annul its income tax system inaugurated by Congress and approved by the people. But even American conservatism is visibly beginning to surrender to the irresistible forces of universal social pro-



gress. Almost all the industrial states of the Union are introducing or planning at least some crude forms of workmen's compensation or state labor insurance, and most states have established progressive income and inheritance tax laws. In other domains of social legislation the United States does not lag much behind the countries of Europe. We have our labor laws, inadequate as they are, our anti-combination acts, interstate commerce commission, public service commissions and state control and regulation in numerous industries.

These political measures and institutions are no more to be considered as an earnest of the Socialist state than the factories and trusts as partial realizations of the Socialist economic system, but like them they are of immense symptomatic importance.

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

## CHAPTER IV.

### THE METHODS OF SOCIALISM.

**T**HE Socialist conception of industrial and political evolution as sketched in the preceding chapter, has been variously characterized by critics of the movement as a "Philosophy of Fatalism" or as "Political Calvinism." The mistake underlying this criticism is the notion that the Socialists expect the final realization of their social ideal to come about automatically through the unconscious workings of the inherent forces of social development. As a matter of fact, the Socialists are very far from harboring any such illusion. They hold that no system can be radically changed until it is ripe for the transformation, and they consider the degree of development of every country of prime importance in determining whether it offers fertile ground for the success of Socialism. But they realize that the mere maturity of a country for the Socialist régime will not produce Socialism without conscious, planned and deliberate action on the part of such portion of the people as have the desire, power and sagacity to accomplish the concrete task of the socialization of the industries and the reorganization of our government to that end. If we

attempt to grow oranges, we must first make sure that we have selected the proper soil and climate, but the soil and climate will not produce oranges unless we sow the seed and tend, care for, and aid the plant during all stages of its growth. Or to take an historic illustration. The ruling classes of to-day, the capitalists, could not and did not gain political supremacy until they had attained economic ascendancy, but when that point was reached their actual political victories were brought about by the propaganda of their writers and speakers, the French Encyclopædists, the English Rationalists, Utilitarians, etc., by the work of their leaders and statesmen, and above all, by the organizations of their class and its supporters.

The introduction of the Socialist régime depends on two main conditions:

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

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

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

Whether the Socialist order is to be ushered in by a revolutionary decree, or by a series of legislative enactments or executive proclamations, it can be established and maintained only by the people in control of the country. In other words, Socialism, like any other national political program, can be realized only

when its adherents, sympathizers and supporters, are numerous enough to wrest the machinery of government from their opponents, and to use it for the realization of their program. The only previous time in the history of the United States that the country could boast of a political party with a social program was when the Republican Party was first organized for the abolition of slavery, and that program was not realized until the party was strong enough to win a national election. The Civil War does not alter this cardinal fact. It simply meant that the minority was not ready to give up without a fight, but if the abolitionists had not been in control of the government there would obviously be no provocation for the fight and no chance for the victory.

Experience has demonstrated that as soon as the Socialist Party develops menacing political strength, all non-Socialist parties combine against it. Milwaukee is not the only illustration of this tendency. The same practice has been followed in all countries of Europe in which the Socialist movement is an important political factor, and will in time undoubtedly become the accepted rule in the United States. To be victorious, the Socialists will, therefore, in all likelihood require an absolute majority of the voters and the population. Not necessarily an absolute majority of trained Socialist thinkers and workers, but a majority of persons generally ready to cast their fortunes with the Socialist movement.

The first task of the Socialist movement is thus to

increase the number of Socialists, to convert the people to the Socialist creed. Socialism is primarily a movement of education and propaganda. The Socialist propaganda does not originate from a mere desire to spread the truth—for the benefit of the unconverted, as the Christian propaganda is inspired by a general ethical zeal to save the souls of the heathen. The Socialist propaganda is the very life-nerve of the movement. Upon its success or failure depends the destiny of Socialism. The educational and propagandist activities dominate all other forms of organized Socialist work, and none but the closest observers can appreciate the gigantic accomplishments of the movement in this field.

In the recent Presidential campaign, the National Campaign Committee of the Socialist Party printed and circulated thirteen millions of pamphlets. The pamphlets as a rule consisted of sixteen pages and dealt with the most vital and timely social problems from a Socialist point of view. The numerous state and local organizations of the party at the same time printed and distributed at least an equal number of pamphlets or leaflets, and thus no less than twenty-five million pieces of Socialist literature were given to the people of this country to read and study within the three months preceding the election of 1912. But the Socialist propaganda is by no means limited to campaigns. The dissemination of Socialist literature goes on steadily and systematically, though on a smaller scale, every day of the year, and it is not con-

fined to pamphleteering. The Socialist Party in this country is supported by numerous periodical publications: daily and weekly newspapers and monthly magazines. Every language of any importance spoken in this country, about thirty in all, is represented in the Socialist press. Some of the Socialist publications count their circulation by hundreds of thousands, and all of them are primarily given to propaganda. Unlike the ordinary press, their political creed is not a mere incident to them—it is the entire object and reason for their existence. They are published to preach Socialism; every other consideration is subordinated to that purpose.

And side by side with the propaganda of the printed word goes the equally effective oral propaganda. The Socialist Party has 130,000 dues-paying members, and almost every one of these is an ardent propagandist. If he is not blessed with the gift of public oratory, he talks Socialism at his home, in his shop, in his union, in his club or saloon. Thousands of meetings are held every year in all parts of the country—public demonstrations, campaign meetings, debates or lectures, and all of them deal with the one paramount topic—Socialism. In the winter of 1911-1912 the National Executive Committee of the Socialist Party established a "Socialist Lecture Lyceum Bureau," and more than two thousand lectures were delivered under its auspices during the initial season of that institution.

And with all that it must be borne in mind that

the Socialist movement is only beginning to gain a foothold in this country. Its educational and propaganda work is tame compared with the accomplishment of the older and stronger Socialist movements in the countries of Europe. The work of Socialist education all over the world is probably the most active intellectual factor operating in modern society.

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

led by the capitalists, although a number of nobles, inspired by the new spirit of "liberty and democracy," made common cause with the enemies of their own class.

Nor are the Socialist activities confined to the work of propaganda. Modern Socialists do not expect the Socialist order to be introduced by one sudden and great political cataclysm, nor do they expect it to be established by a rabble made desperate by misery and starvation. The Socialists expect that the co-operative commonwealth will be planfully built by an intelligent and disciplined working class, thoroughly organized, well trained, and fully qualified to assume the reins of government and the management of the industries. Next to the education of the workers in the philosophy of Socialism, the prime task of the Socialist movement is, therefore, their political and economic organization. The Socialist movement of each country presents itself primarily as a political party, the party of the working class. Like all other political parties, the Socialist Party nominates candidates and strives to win elections and to pass legislative measures, but unlike other parties it attributes but slight importance to such temporary political victories. The deeper objects of Socialist politics are: (1) To make propaganda for the cause of Socialism, for which political campaigns always offer favorable opportunities. (2) To acquaint the workers with the concrete political problems of the country and to educate them in practical politics. (3) To gain repre-



sentation in the legislatures and in municipal administrations in order to secure true reforms for the workers, to train them in the art of statesmanship and to afford them larger opportunities for propaganda. (4) To wean the workers from the influence of the old parties, to develop their political independence and class consciousness and to organize them for the final practical task of the Socialist movement—the winning of the government by the workers.

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

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

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

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

and each of them gains strength and efficacy from the support of the others.

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

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

Within the last few years there has developed in the United States a group of persons who advocate the addition of certain alleged new and more direct and effective weapons to the arsenal of the Socialist warfare. The general strike and resort to drastic and violent methods in labor struggles are the favorite measures thus advocated. They go by the somewhat vague designation of "direct action," "sabotage," etc., and their advocates style themselves "syndicalists" or "direct actionists." They are small in number, but exceedingly active, and the sensational

press of the country is giving them a generous amount of benevolent attention.

The movement is not serious and will not change the character of American Socialism. It is an expression of impatience and despair, which is quite natural, though not justifiable, in the period of youth and weakness of the Socialist movement. When Socialism grows strong and enters upon a career of true struggles and accomplishments, the syndicalist notions are bound to disappear. In Germany, Austria, Belgium and the Scandinavian countries syndicalism is an unknown quantity, but it flourishes in the countries in which the Socialist movement is least organized and stable, Italy and France. In fact, American syndicalism has been bodily imported from France with its entire undigested and untranslated terminology.

Guerrilla methods of warfare, chicanery and violence have no legitimate place in the methods of modern Socialism. They are at variance with the most fundamental conceptions of the movement.

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 visions of a small group of it. A country can be educated, led and transformed into Socialism, but it can not be

driven, lured or 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 fire-crackers make the Fourth of July.

It is sometimes helpful to elucidate an abstract principle by a concrete and simple example. The manner in which the present order is to change into Socialism

may be illustrated by the familiar process of chicken-hatching.

A normal chicken egg will be converted into a live chicken if kept twenty-one days in a temperature of  $98\frac{1}{2}$  degrees.

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

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

standing the deceiving appearance of the egg-shell.

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

The breaking of the shell becomes a useful and liberating act only when the chicken is fully developed within it. When that point is reached, the chicken

itself takes care of the shell. The hen has nothing to do with that part of the performance. It is her business to sit on the egg the full period of time required for hatching, to supply the proper heat and not to shirk her task for any period of time. Should the hen become impatient or get into her feathery head a syndicalist notion to "hasten the process," and should she attempt to break the shell before the time, she would only destroy the embryonic life of the chicken.

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



## CHAPTER V.

### THE POLITICAL PROGRAM.

**I**F 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 will probably not present themselves always and everywhere in the identical

form and sequence. Accidental occurrences and local conditions may force different issues to the front at different times and places. To determine in advance the exact succession of proposed Socialist reforms would be an idle undertaking. The test of practicality 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.

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

The political platforms of the old parties are built largely on the same plan as a menu à la carte in an opulent restaurant. They are framed to meet all tastes and to satisfy all appetites. Their object is to "catch votes"—all kinds of votes, and each of their "planks" is designed to appeal to a special class of voters. The manufacturers and the workers, the railroads and the farmers, the producers and consumers, the foreign-born citizens and the negroes of the South in turn receive promises, pledges or compliments. The platforms are mainly adjusted to the minor "issues" of the hour and usually fight shy of the more vital and permanent social problems of the nation. The planks are often inconsistent and meaningless, and are never cemented by a cohesive social philosophy. There is hardly a pledge in the platform of

the Republican Party that could not find legitimate lodgment in that of the Democratic Party and vice versa. Very often it is a race between the two old parties for the most popular issue, and sometimes both endorse the same popular demands with varying degrees of emphasis. It would be a vain task to attempt to distinguish the social philosophy of the Bryan platform of 1908 from that of the Roosevelt platform of 1904, or that of the Parker platform of 1904 from the Taft platform of 1912.

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

pose and a statement of the steps by which it is expected to be realized. So long as that purpose remains unaccomplished and so long as the party adheres to its main aim, principles and methods, so long must the substance of its platform remain intact.

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

The main currents of such reform movements proceed along two lines. The first of these is directed against the personal unfitness or corruption of individual office-holders or politicians. To this class of reforms belong all sporadic movements of the good citizens to "turn the rascals out of office," which furnish the periodical political excitements in local elections. The recent enthusiasm for the Commission Form of Government in cities, for the Short Ballot in local, state and national elections, and all similar movements, are only practical applications, in different forms, of the same "good-men" theory in politics. They all proceed from the assumption that "good" officials make a "good" government. They believe that our present system of voting for a confusing

mass of candidates for important and trivial offices at every annual election, precludes the possibility of an intelligent choice of public officials, and they recommend a curtailment of the list of elective officers and the lengthening of their official terms as an efficient method of getting the best men.

The Socialists attach but slight importance to these "good government" movements. They hold that the paramount factor in politics is measures, not men—class interests, not personal qualities.

The Republican and the Democratic parties and every reform party organized by "respectable" citizens are alike founded on the present order of society, and consciously or unconsciously they stand for the preservation of that order and for the domination of wealth. They are managed and financed by the possessing classes and their political officials spring from these classes or are dependent on them for their careers. Whether they are personally good, bad or indifferent, honest or dishonest, capable or incompetent, they are tied to the capitalist class by environment, training, instinct and interest. Experience has demonstrated time and time again that "good government" is powerless even to check simple crime and corruption in politics for any considerable length of time. It is ludicrously ineffectual as an instrument for the betterment of the lot of the toilers.

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

The more important movements of political reform are those concerned with the permanent improvement of political methods and institutions. These movements have for their object the extension of the suffrage to classes still excluded from it, or they aim to increase the political power of the people and to strengthen their control over their chosen representatives.

The National Platform of the Socialist Party, adopted at Indianapolis in 1912, contains the following political planks or "demands":

UNRESTRICTED AND EQUAL SUFFRAGE FOR MEN AND WOMEN.

THE ADOPTION OF THE INITIATIVE, REFERENDUM AND RECALL AND OF PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION.

THE ABOLITION OF THE SENATE AND THE VETO POWER OF THE PRESIDENT.

THE ELECTION OF THE PRESIDENT AND VICE-PRESIDENT BY THE DIRECT VOTE OF THE PEOPLE.

THE ABOLITION OF THE POWER USURPED BY THE SUPREME COURT OF THE UNITED STATES TO PASS UPON THE CONSTITUTIONALITY OF LEGISLATION ENACTED BY CONGRESS.


NATIONAL LAWS TO BE REPEALED ONLY BY ACT OF CONGRESS, OR BY A REFERENDUM VOTE OF THE MAJORITY OF THE VOTERS.

THE EXTENSION OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNMENT TO ALL UNITED STATES TERRITORY.

THE IMMEDIATE CURBING OF THE POWERS OF



Socialists believe in the abolition of the Senate and the veto power of the President.





THE COURTS TO ISSUE INJUNCTIONS IN LABOR DISPUTES.

THE FREE ADMINISTRATION OF JUSTICE.

THE CALLING OF A CONVENTION FOR THE REVISION OF THE CONSTITUTION OF THE UNITED STATES.

All these measures are essential, but in practice the Socialists lay particular stress on three of these demands: Woman Suffrage, Proportional Representation and Restriction of the Powers of the Courts.


The Socialist Party was the first political party in any country to declare unequivocally for the full and equal right of all adults of both sexes to vote in popular elections and to hold public office, and it has fully established the principle of political sex equality within its own organizations. Women constitute a substantial part of the active membership of the Socialist Party and they are always largely and ably represented on its lecture platforms and in its executive councils and conventions.

The principle of Proportional Representation is a vital article of the Socialist political faith on grounds of expediency as well as principle. The Socialist Party is a minority party and a class party. As a minority party it is practically deprived of representation under the prevailing system of election by legislative districts of single constituencies. In the elections of 1912 the total number of votes cast for all parties was about 15,000,000. Of these the Socialist Party received in the neighborhood of 900,000, or about

6 per cent. On this basis the party was entitled to 26 out of 435 members of the House of Representatives. It did not elect one. Assuming that the Socialist vote is evenly distributed all over the country, which is very largely the case, we may conceive of a situation where, with a political strength equal to one-fourth or even a full third of the voting power of the country, it may remain without representation or voice in Congress. And the situation is similar with reference to our state legislatures and city councils.

The objection most frequently raised to the system of proportional representation is, that it would tend to enhance the importance of political organizations as against the personality of the individual candidates. But in the eyes of the Socialists this is rather an argument in favor of the measure than against it. For the Socialists consider their party first of all as the political instrument of the working-class struggles. The Socialist Party as such formulates the political demands of the movement, conducts the campaigns for their enactment, and is accountable to the workers for the results of its policies. The candidates of the party are merely its agents, agents with restricted powers and specific mandates.

The principle of proportional representation is directly opposed to the philosophy underlying the growing movement for direct or popular primaries within the organizations of the old parties. The Republican and Democratic parties are not separated by class lines. As between themselves they have no distinct



**Socialists would curb the Court's power of injunction**



missions or functions. Their separate organizations only tend to develop political "rings" and "bosses" for the appropriation and distribution of political plunder. Hence the desire of the respectable citizens to abolish party organizations and conventions and to place the nomination of candidates, practically the sole function of the old political parties, in the hands of the voters. To the militant Socialists a movement to eliminate their party organization would appeal with the same force and conviction as a proposal to suspend military order and discipline would appeal to an army in battle.

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

The great modern problems can be solved peacefully and rationally only by a people free to shape its own destinies, and to model and remodel its institutions without the arbitrary interference of a few old men nourished by the musty legal wisdom of the dead

past. The Socialists therefore consider the radical reformation of our judiciary system a condition precedent to all true measures of social reform.

The political planks in the Socialist platform aim to establish a closer connection between the people and their chosen representatives and to extend the direct participation of the citizens in the government. But the Socialists do not overestimate the importance of political reforms. Politics is not government, it is only the machinery of government. Tools in themselves, and be they ever so ingenious and apt, are entirely devoid of value unless applied to the production of socially useful commodities. Universal adult suffrage, direct legislation and control of public officials are the tools of democracy. They are of the highest importance and value if used for the enactment of measures to improve the every-day lives of the people and to increase their general happiness. They are purely ornamental otherwise.

The Socialists are vitally interested in all measures calculated to enhance the material welfare and to raise the intellectual level of the workers. They believe that the task of transforming modern capitalist society into a Socialist commonwealth rests primarily on the workers, and they realize that this gigantic historical task cannot be accomplished by a class of physical and mental weaklings, but that it requires the organized and persevering efforts of large masses of men and women physically, mentally and morally fit to assume the reins of government. The Socialist

efforts to raise the standard of the workers' lives are therefore not based on mere humanitarian or sentimental motives. They are an organic part of the practical work of Socialism, an indispensable condition of the progress and ultimate success of the movement. The platform of the Socialist Party contains the following comprehensive "demand" under this head:

"The conservation of human resources, particularly of the lives and well-being of the workers and their families:

"1. By shortening the workday in keeping with the increased productiveness of machinery.

"2. By securing to every worker a rest period of not less than a day and a half in each week.

"3. By securing a more effective inspection of workshops, factories and mines.

"4. By forbidding the employment of children under 16 years of age.

"5. By the co-operative organization of industries in federal penitentiaries and workshops for the benefit of convicts and their dependents.

"6. By forbidding the interstate transportation of the products of child-labor, of convict-labor and of all uninspected factories and mines.

"7. By abolishing the profit system in government work, and substituting either the direct hire of labor or the awarding of contracts to co-operative groups of workers.

"8. By establishing minimum wage scales.

“9. By abolishing official charity and substituting a non-contributory system of old-age pensions, a general system of insurance by the state of all its members against unemployment and invalidism and a system of compulsory insurance by employers of their workers, without cost to the latter, against industrial diseases, accidents and death.”

The most important of these measures from a Socialist point of view are those dealing with the shortening of the labor time and with the system of “social insurance” of the workers. A shorter workday would tend to solve at least partly the problem of unemployment and at the same time and for the same reason to increase the average wage. It would give to the worker more time to live, think and enjoy, and would broaden his political, social and spiritual interests. It would also contribute largely to the curtailment of the evil of child labor. Government insurance of the workers in cases of unemployment, accidents, sickness, invalidity and old age would tend to remove that most dreadful feature of the life of the modern wage-worker—the uncertainty of existence, the fear of the morrow. Under present conditions the unfortunate worker who has been maimed or has gradually lost his youth, health and strength in the service of his fellow-men is mercilessly cast aside and allowed to starve and perish by degrees. Under a system of government insurance, society would take care of the victims and veterans of the large life-sustaining army of workers as it now pro-



vides for the victims and veterans of death-dealing warfares. The measure is not a Socialist Utopia, for systems of social insurance along the lines indicated, in more or less perfect form, are in actual operation in almost all advanced modern countries except the United States.

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

The Socialist platform demands:

"1. The collective ownership and democratic management of railroads, wire and wireless telegraphs and telephones, express services, steamboat lines and all other social means of transportation and communication and of all large-scale industries.

"2. The immediate acquirement by the municipalities, the states or the federal government of all grain elevators, stock yards, storage warehouses and other distributing agencies, in order to reduce the present extortionate cost of living.

"3. The extension of the public domain to include mines, quarries, oil wells, forests and water-power.

"4. The further conservation and development of natural resources for the use and benefit of all the people:

"a. By scientific forestation and timber protection.

"b. By the reclamation of arid and swamp tracts.

"c. By the storage of flood waters and the utilization of water-power.

"*d.* By the stoppage of the present extravagant waste of the soil and of the products of mines and oil wells.

"*e.* By the development of highway and waterway systems.

"5. The collective ownership of land wherever practicable, and, in cases where such ownership is impracticable, the appropriation by taxation of the annual rental value of all land held for speculation.

"6. The collective ownership and democratic management of the banking and currency system.

"7. The immediate government relief of the unemployed by the extension of all useful public works. All persons employed on such works to be engaged directly by the government under a workday of not more than eight hours and not less than the prevailing union wages. The government also to establish employment bureaus; to lend money to states and municipalities without interest for the purpose of carrying on public works, and to take such other measures within its power as will lessen the widespread misery of the workers caused by the misrule of the capitalist class.

"8. The adoption of a graduated income tax, the increase of the rate of the present corporation tax and the extension of inheritance taxes, graduated in proportion to the nearness of kin—the proceeds of these taxes to be employed in the socialization of industry."

Of all the planks of the Socialist platform, those

just quoted would naturally seem most closely allied to the ultimate aim and social ideal of the Socialists. As a matter of fact, they are not. The Socialists entertain no illusions as to the benefits of governmentally owned industries under the present régime. Government ownership is often introduced not as a democratic measure for the benefit of the people, but as a fiscal measure to provide revenue for the government or to facilitate its military operations. In such cases government ownership may tend to strengthen rather than to loosen the grip of capitalist governments on the people, and its effect may be decidedly reactionary. Similarly government ownership is often advocated by middle-class "reform" parties for the main purpose of decreasing the taxes of property owners and reducing the rates of freight, transportation and communication for the smaller business men.

The Socialist demand for government ownership of industries of a public or quasi-public nature, springs from different motives and contemplates a different system than the similar demands of other parties. The Socialists advocate government ownership primarily for the purpose of eliminating private profits from the operation of public utilities, and conferring the benefits of such industries on the employees and consumers. Their demand for national or municipal ownership of industries is always qualified by a provision for the democratic administration of such industries and for the application of the profits to the increase

of the employees' wages and the improvement of the service. Furthermore, it must be borne in mind that when the Socialist platform declares in favor of government ownership of certain industries, the Socialist Party at the same time nominates candidates for public office pledged to carry out these measures in the spirit of that platform. In other words, what the Socialists advocate is not government ownership under purely capitalist administration, but collective ownership under a government controlled or at least strongly influenced by political representatives of the working class.

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

Thus the Socialist platform contains planks in favor of the absolute freedom of press, speech and assemblage; the enactment of further measures for general education and particularly for vocational education in useful pursuits; the enactment of additional measures for the conservation of the public health and the creation of an independent Bureau of Health.

The National platform of the Socialist Party is supplemented by State and Municipal platforms, which are always concrete applications of the same general principles to the narrower spheres of their respective functions and jurisdictions, and together

they constitute a logical, consistent and comprehensive program of social progress. And it is just in that consistency and comprehensiveness that the strength of the Socialist platform lies. The separate practical measures advocated by the Socialists are often trivial in comparison with the lofty ultimate aim of the movement. Some of them may even occasionally be found duplicated in the platforms of other political parties. Not one of them, standing alone, has a distinctive Socialist character. But taken in its entirety, the Socialist platform presents a striking and radical departure from the platforms of all other political parties, and bears the unmistakable imprint of the Socialist thought and endeavors.

## CHAPTER VI.

### THE ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF THE MOVEMENT.

**I**N this chapter we will endeavor to sum up the record of concrete achievements of the modern Socialist movement. The task presupposes a definite test by which the practical results of the Socialist propaganda may be ascertained and measured. What is that test?

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

Neither a city administration nor a state government is capable of reorganizing the important national industries on a basis of collective ownership. A Socialist commonwealth can be established only through the co-operation of all departments of the national and state governments. In other words, the Socialists must be in full political control of the country before any part of their ultimate social ideal can be materialized.

It is singular how the non-Socialists and anti-Socialists alike fail to grasp this simple proposition. "Has Socialism ever been tried?" naïvely inquire the former, and "Socialism has failed wherever it has been put to a practical test," gravely assert the latter.

As a matter of fact, Socialism has never been "tried" and has never "failed," just as little as the twenty-first century has been "tried" or has "failed." Socialism represents an order of society which is expected to evolve from the present order. It is an anticipated future phase of modern civilization, just as "capitalism" and "feudalism" represent the present and the past stages of that civilization.

Social systems cannot be had "on trial" or "on approval" like a pair of gloves, to be retained or rejected, depending on the satisfaction which they give or fail to give to the prospective user. Less advanced organizations of society grow into more advanced organizations when time and conditions are ripe for the change, just as youth grows into adolescence—without preliminary "samples" or "trials."

The test of the practical achievements of the Socialist movement is therefore not, whether Socialism has already been realized in parts or in spots, but whether the movement has made a substantial advance in the task of creating social and political conditions favorable to the introduction of the Socialist commonwealth.

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

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

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

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

We may imagine a question like this addressed to Wendell Phillips by an unbiased inquirer with a "prac-



tical turn of mind" and repeated with derision by the "safe, sane and conservative" pro-slavery advocate.

And we can hear Phillips' smiling answer:

"No, we have not yet emancipated the Southern negroes or any portion of them. When the hour shall come to abolish slavery, we will abolish it all, and in the meantime we have made a few big strides towards that goal. Since the beginning of the abolition movement we have gained some notable political victories, such as the Missouri Compromise and the admission of California as a free state. But we have gained vastly more in educating the public mind and arousing the public conscience to the realization of the evils of slavery, and the creation and growth of a strong organized force to battle for the abolition of that evil. Less than fifteen years ago the abolitionists were decried by the press and church as enemies of society, criminals, heretics and free-lovers, and all good people held them in horror; to-day, large sections of the enlightened public begin to feel that our aim is pure and good and they turn a sympathetic ear to us. Thirteen years ago Elijah P. Lovejoy was mobbed and killed for denouncing the brutal burning of a negro slave, and William Lloyd Garrison was dragged by a rope, half naked, through the streets of Boston; to-day the leaders of our movement can freely write and speak their thoughts. Respectable publications will report their utterances without distorting them, and well-behaved audiences will listen to them attentively and thoughtfully.

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

“We have overcome many obstacles in the path of our movement and have created many conditions favorable to the ultimate triumph of our cause. These are the concrete and practical achievements of our agitation.”

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

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

1. The enactment of such social reforms as tend to facilitate the transition from capitalism to Socialism.
2. The creation of a sympathetic public attitude towards the Socialist aim and program.
3. The organization of a body of persons, sufficiently numerous, intelligent and trained to accomplish the practical task of social transformation.

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

Under the head of “socialistic” reforms we must include all modern legislation, directly or indirectly inspired by Socialist activities, and having for its ob-

ject the betterment of the economic condition of the workers or the increase of their social and political strength. But few national reforms of this description are directly traceable to Socialist initiative in this or in any other country. It must be borne in mind that Socialism is, on the whole, a very recent factor in the politics of modern nations. In Germany, the Social Democratic Party has been represented in Parliament about forty-five years, but in all other countries the first appearance of Socialism on the political arena does not date back more than twenty or twenty-five years. In the United States the Socialist representation in Congress is limited to the one term of Victor L. Berger (1911-1913). While the Socialists have representation in almost every Parliament of Europe, and in many instances form strong groups in them, they nevertheless are in the minority in each case. In most European Parliaments a fixed and rather large number of seconders is required before a proposed measure can be considered by the house. The Socialist parliamentary groups in these countries have until recent years rarely been strong enough to comply with such requirements, and their practical activities were thus of necessity limited to the support or opposition of measures introduced by the government or by other parties. But with all these handicaps, the Socialist work in national law-giving bodies is not devoid of direct and important results. The Social Democratic Party of Germany boasts of a large number of reform measures, principally in the field

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

But more important than the achievements in the domain of national legislation have been the practical results of local Socialist politics. This is quite natural. While the Socialists so far constitute only small minorities in the national councils of the world, they have already succeeded in securing full control of numerous cities and towns in all modern countries. In Germany, France and Italy the Socialist municipalities count by the hundreds. Austria, Belgium, Holland and the Scandinavian countries likewise contain large numbers of cities, towns and villages fully controlled by the Socialists, and no less than two thousand municipal councils in Europe have Socialist representation of varying degrees of strength. Even in



Socialists would begin their reforms with the child, the bearer of the nation's future.



the United States, in which the political career of Socialism is practically in its infancy, the Socialist Party is in control of more than fifty cities and towns, and has elected about one thousand public officials to local offices.

In the cities in which the Socialists have been in power they have introduced such reform measures as were feasible within the restricted scope and powers of municipal governments. The reforms do not constitute Socialism or even an earnest of Socialism, but they are measures based on the recognition of the social obligations of the community towards the citizen, the new spirit in politics for which Socialism is largely responsible.

In the conventional political conception a municipal corporation is first of all a business concern, instituted and maintained for the purpose of administering the corporate property of the city. Hence the slogan of all municipal reform movements of the middle class is invariably "a clean, honest, business-like administration." The Socialists, on the other hand, emphasize the social functions of the municipality; the education, health and social welfare of its inhabitants.

A typical Socialist city begins its reforms with the child, the bearer of the community's future. A Socialist municipality almost invariably takes care of its working women during the period of confinement by providing free maternity hospitals with proper medical attendance. When the mother is ready to return

to work, the city continues to exercise a watchful and tender oversight of the child. Free municipal day nurseries, kindergartens, primary schools and schools for higher industries succeed each other in the task of rearing the child into healthful and enlightened manhood or womanhood. In most cases the city provides for its needy children not only free instruction, but also medical care, and even food and clothing. Seaside colonies and summer outings for all poor school children are common features in connection with the public school systems in Socialist cities.

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

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

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



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

The Socialist municipalities seek to be model employers and invariably reduce the hours of work and increase the wages of the municipal employees. With all this, they are rarely extravagant in their expenditures, and their finances are, as a rule, in better order than those of the capitalist-governed cities. The increased expenditures which the many new activities involve are made up by economies in the administration of business, elimination of graft, and by forcing the wealthy citizens to pay their just shares of the taxes. The general spirit of social service and civic betterment, which is beginning to pervade the administration of cities in all progressive countries of the world, is largely due to the Socialist example. Even in the United States, Milwaukee, Schenectady and Berkeley have established standards of municipal administration, which are rapidly beginning to force other cities into the path of social progress.

These, then, are the most conspicuous of the "direct" political achievements of Socialism. They constitute a distinct social advance, although they are not revolutionary or epoch-making in character. Far more significant than the direct results are the numerous measures of social legislation which have within the last generation been enacted by the law-giving bodies of almost all civilized countries, as the indirect but nevertheless legitimate results of the Socialist propaganda.

Such measures of social reform are, as a rule, originally formulated by the Socialist parties on radical and thoroughgoing lines. They become the object of a persistent and widespread propaganda, and finally they acquire the force of popular demands. At this stage the "progressive" and sometimes even the "conservative" statesmen of the dominant political parties begin to realize the political significance of the proposed measure. The *Vox Populi* means votes on election day, and the shrewd leaders of the old parties are quite willing to make an occasional concession to "social justice" in order to maintain or to gain political power. A classical example of such statesmanship may be found in the very recent political history of our country. The father and leader of the new Progressive Party is on record with one of the most violent and abusive diatribes against Socialism ever perpetrated in American journalism. By the vagaries of the political chess game he suddenly found himself deprived of the support of the power-

ful political organization which he had but recently controlled. A new party and a new political movement had to be formed in order to preserve for him a measure of political power. Since it could not be a party of the old-type stalwart politicians, it had to be a party of the people, opposed to the rule of bossism and privilege, advocating popular measures and preaching the gospel of social progress. The Progressive Party accordingly ransacked all progressive movements of the time, and from each it took the most popular planks. And the vast majority of such planks was naturally found in the platform of the most radical political organization, the Socialist Party. The platform of the Progressive Party teems with "principles" and "issues" inspired by the Socialist program.

Whether the Progressive Party will some time hold the reins of government of the country, or whether it will ultimately dissolve into its constituent incongruous elements and vanish, as so many American reform movements have done in the past, its career is sure to leave a definite imprint on the political life of the nation. The radical slogans and watchwords which it has cast into the broad masses of the people are sure to create a social flame beyond the power of any politician to extinguish. The measures of "social justice" with which the Progressives are toying are taken in earnest by millions of citizens. Hereafter they will be inevitable "issues" in our political campaigns. Other political parties will be driven

to adopt some of them, and finally they will force their way to the statute books of the country.

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

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

Thus Prince Bismarck, when he first introduced into the German Diet his broad program of social reform, including the revolutionary principles of government insurance of the workers against sickness, accidents, invalidity and old age, frankly avowed that the primary object of the measure was to avert a popular revolution. The same considerations hold good for all other countries, and the appearance of the Socialist movement is invariably accompanied by an era of legislative social reform. In England the advent of the semi-socialist Labor Party in Parliament was followed by the old-age pension system, the trade-dispute act and by the more recent comprehensive social reforms of Lloyd George. The United States has for decades been the most backward country in the domain of social legislation, but the last few years have developed a strong tendency for radical social reform, and naturally the Socialist move-

ment in America has begun to acquire political significance at about the same time.

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

When one social evil is cured or partly cured, the Socialists advance to the next and more vital problem. They never run short of demands for reform measures, and they can formulate them more rapidly and copiously than the other political parties can "steal" them. The Socialists do not copyright their platform planks. They are well contented to have them plagiarized and disseminated.

The true task of Socialism, the work of rebuilding the economic and political structure of modern society on the lines of the ultimate Socialist program, will

begin only when the Socialists have acquired full political control of the government, and in the meantime they are contented with the rôle of torch-bearers of the new civilization, always formulating larger social claims, always forcing the next step in social progress. The concrete reforms which the organized Socialist movement has thus indirectly gained and is still constantly gaining by its mere existence and growth, are probably more numerous and substantial than the actual achievements of all so-called "practical" reform movements combined.

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

When the Socialist movement has survived both ridicule and persecution, and has demonstrated its determination and capacity to stay and to grow, it enters upon the third stage of its existence, that of

being "respected." By this expression it is not intended to convey the idea that the Socialist movement ever has reached the point of becoming acceptable or even sufferable to the privileged classes. It will never reach that point so long as it retains its principal and most vital object—the abolition of all class privileges.

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

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

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

The working classes are the most direct beneficiaries of the proposed Socialist system. As far as they are concerned, an understanding of the Socialist doctrine is practically equivalent to its acceptance. That

understanding has been brought home to millions of them within the last two or three decades of Socialist propaganda, and millions of them have enlisted under the banner of international Socialism.

Socialism has become one of the great world-powers of modern times. In the most advanced countries of Europe the governments shape their policies with special reference to the probable effect on the Socialist movement. Chancellor von Bülow has publicly admitted that fact for Germany; and France, England and Italy have repeatedly made efforts to induce the Socialist parties to assume active participation in the government by offering cabinet positions to their representatives. One of the most interesting episodes serving to demonstrate the political strength of the international Socialist movement occurred but a short time ago, at the outbreak of the Italian-Turkish war, when the prime minister of Turkey officially submitted a memorial to the International Socialist Bureau at Brussels, complaining of the arbitrary and barbarous procedure by which the Italian government forced the war, and asking for the intervention of the Socialists in behalf of his outraged country. As a matter of fact, the Socialist movement has prevented more than one threatened war within the last decade. It is one of the most powerful modern factors for peace between the nations of Europe.

But the most vital and direct test of the practical results of the Socialist activities is their effect on the Socialist organizations. Preparatory reform meas-



ures and a favorable state of the public mind create the necessary atmosphere and environment for the introduction of a new and radical social order, but the concrete task of ushering in such an order must be accomplished by an organized force, and the larger and better organized that force, the sooner will the change come and the more thorough and lasting will it be.

By the middle of the last century Socialism was confined to a small group of individuals and represented nothing more than an abstract school of unpopular social philosophy. To-day the Socialist movement has become a recognized factor in the public life of at least twenty-six modern nations. In 1867 the total number of Socialist votes in the world was about 30,000. To-day it exceeds ten million. The Socialist movement is thoroughly organized, more so than any other movement in our days or in the past. In each country the Socialists constitute a party, based on dues-paying, active and permanent membership. All Socialist parties of the world are in turn leagued together as one great organization. Every three years they assemble in international congress for joint deliberation and action, and they maintain at all times an International Socialist Bureau, composed of representatives of all national Socialist parties, meeting in periodical sessions, and transacting business through the medium of a local executive committee and a permanent secretary. The International Organization of Socialism can to-day

mobilize a larger force than any government in the world.

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

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

## CHAPTER VII.

### SOCIALIST MOVEMENT IN THE UNITED STATES.

**F**OR many years American statesmen and social philosophers watched the growing tide of Socialism on the other side of the Atlantic Ocean with serene detachment. "Socialism," they diagnosed, "is a specific European product. It will never take root in American soil." And for a long time the belief seemed to be justified.

The early forms of European Socialism, the humanitarian and romantic movements of the beginning and the middle of the nineteenth century had found a lively echo in the United States. Most of Robert Owen's practical experiments in communism were tried out on American soil, and his primitive doctrines of Utopian Socialism gained large currency in this country during the period between 1825 and 1830.

The "Icarian" communities of Étienne Cabet, though originating in France, lived through their adventurous and pathetic history in Texas, Illinois and Missouri. The Fourierist creed had such brilliant sponsors in the United States as Albert Brisbane,

Horace Greeley, Charles A. Dana, Parke Godwin, William Channing and John S. Dwight. It produced the famous Brook Farm and the North American Phalanx besides about forty less known social experiments in different parts of the country.

But these movements left no lasting impression on the life and thought of the American people. They died out before the era of large-scale capitalistic production.

Socialism as a political working-class movement originated in Europe towards the last quarter of the nineteenth century, and developed marvelous strength and vitality during the following two decades. But in the United States it had little more than a nominal existence during that period.

The vast majority of its adherents were foreign-born workingmen, principally Germans, who had brought their social philosophy with them from their native lands, and were making heroic endeavors to acclimatize the movement in the country of their adoption. Their efforts were practically barren of results. The United States lacked the most essential requirements for the development of a Socialist movement of the modern type.

Socialism presupposes an advanced and concentrated state of industry, a powerful class of capitalists dominating the economic and political destinies of the country, a large army of industrial wage-workers in a precarious condition of existence, and a clear-cut and conscious economic conflict between these classes.

In the United States these conditions developed only within very recent years. A generation ago agriculture was still the main industry of the country, while manufacture was conducted on a comparatively small scale. The general prosperity following the Civil War and the remainder of "free land" in the West operated to retard the class struggles in America and to create a condition of relative industrial peace.

But during the latter half of the nineteenth century American industries awoke with a start and with the rapidity characteristic of all new-world progress they soon outdistanced their European rivals. Enormous factories and mills arose all through the East and Middle West, and the United States increased its manufactured products from about one billion dollars to more than thirteen billions per year, thus surging from fourth to first rank among the manufacturing nations of the world. During the same period the different sections of the country were brought into organic touch with each other and with the rest of the world by a veritable network of railroads and a wonderful system of steamboats. The number of railroad miles in operation rose from about 9,000 in 1850 to almost 200,000 in 1900. The improvement in the number, size and speed of transatlantic steamboats kept pace with that of the railroads. The means of communication grew as rapidly as those of transportation. The postoffices in the country jumped from about 28,000 in 1860 to more than 75,000 in

1900, and the annual telegraph messages increased from 5,000,000 to 80,000,000 during the same period.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century the United States had become a distinctly industrial and "capitalistic" country. Over 40 per cent. of its inhabitants were engaged in manufacture, trade and transportation, and agriculture receded to second place. One-third of all the people had congregated in large cities as against one-eighth in 1850. Corporations became the dominant factors in industry and finally evolved the highest form of capitalist organization—the trusts. Large fortunes were quickly made and a generation of millionaires and multi-millionaires was born. Towards the middle of the last century America could boast of only fifty millionaires with an aggregate fortune of about eighty million dollars. At the close of the century the number of American millionaires of all degrees exceeded twenty thousand, their total wealth mounted to thirty billion dollars and represented almost a full half of the "national" wealth of the country.

The rapid growth and expansion of capitalism naturally produced its inseparable counterparts—mass-poverty, unemployment, child labor, class struggles, social unrest and general discontent. By the end of the century about 6,500,000 persons were regularly without work at some time during the year, and the standing army of jobless workers was considerably over one million. At the same time the number of



**Socialism is the legitimate  
child of Capitalism and  
the latter cannot help be-  
getting the former.**





working children, 10 to 15 years of age, exceeded 1,750,000, and that of working women over the age of 15 years was about 5,000,000. The closing twenty years of the nineteenth century witnessed about 24,000 recorded labor struggles, involving a total of almost 7,000,000 workers.

Thus the modern industrial conditions of the old world were transplanted and intensified in the United States, and with them the fatal legacy of economic problems and evils. Here as there the baneful system inevitably called forth organized resistance on the part of its victims. The movement of resistance was represented on the economic field by the labor unions. In the political field it was bound to find expression in Socialism, just as the similar conditions in the countries of Europe had found such expression. Socialism is the legitimate child of capitalism, and at a certain stage of its development the latter cannot help begetting the former.

The dawn of the present century found a considerable Socialist and semi-Socialist sentiment among several sections of the American population, and also the rudiments of a Socialist political organization. The latter were represented by two separate factions of the "Socialist Labor Party," the old-time organization of the Socialists in America, the "Social Democratic Party," which had then been recently organized, and several minor Socialist organizations. Dissensions and antagonism, so characteristic of the formative stages of the Socialist movement in every

country, were the principal feature of the American Socialist organizations until the middle of 1901, when all organizations with one exception (that of the more irreconcilable faction of the Socialist Labor Party) united. The formal unification was accomplished at a joint national convention, which was held in Indianapolis on July 29, 1901, and which created the present *Socialist Party*.

The growth of the Socialist Party during the twelve years of its existence is best demonstrated by its political gains.

In the Presidential election of 1900, and before the formal unification of the party, its constituent organizations polled a vote of about 100,000. This vote was materially increased in the spring and fall elections of the following year, but owing to the local character of these elections the vote was never fully reported.

In the Congressional elections of 1902, however, the Socialist vote, to the surprise of all, reached very closely the quarter-million mark.

In the Presidential campaign of 1904, the political conditions of the country were exceedingly favorable for Socialism. The two great political parties both made their campaign on conservative platforms, and the People's Party had been discredited by its former alliance with the Democrats, and disorganized and divided in its ranks. The Socialist Party, therefore, was practically the only representative of radicalism in politics, and in a position to muster its full legiti-

mate force. The party was thoroughly alive to its opportunities, and carried on a campaign which for intensity, extension and effectiveness excelled all previous efforts of the Socialists in this country. The vote polled for the party's candidate for President, Eugene V. Debs, was 402,321.

In the elections of 1906, the vote of the Socialist Party was reduced to 330,158 (the figures are based on the highest vote in every state), and the local elections of 1907 showed no material change in the Socialist vote.

The political situation of 1908 was inauspicious for the Socialist Party. All political parties made special bids for the "labor vote" and were profuse in their promises of radical social reforms. The Republican Party was pledged to continue the "radical policies" of President Roosevelt. The Democratic Party revived the slogans of the old-time middle-class reforms and reinstated the prophet of that brand of politics, William J. Bryan, in the leadership of the party. The "radicalism" of the old parties was far exceeded by that of Mr. Hearst's newly formed Independence Party.

The vote cast for the Socialist ticket in that election was 421,520, a slight increase over that of 1904, the party's former high record.

The succeeding two years were years of steady activity and quiet harvest for the Socialist movement in the United States. The economic condition of the country following the crisis of 1907 and the failure

of the numerous reform movements of the middle classes, had created an atmosphere exceptionally favorable to the growth of Socialist sentiment, and the organized Socialists were not slow to take advantage of it. Their propaganda grew in intensity and dimension; their organization was greatly strengthened, and they made new converts among all classes of the population.

In the spring of 1910 the Socialist Party gained its first notable political victory in the United States by carrying the City of Milwaukee, the twelfth largest city in the country.

In the following general Congressional elections which took place in November of the same year, the Socialist Party increased its vote by about 40 per cent., passing the 600,000 mark. In these elections also the party for the first time in the history of the United States captured a seat in the House of Representatives. Mr. Victor L. Berger was elected as the Socialist representative to Congress from the Fifth District of Wisconsin.

Nor did the political tide of Socialism abate in the local elections of 1911. In that year the Socialists carried eighteen cities and towns, among them the large industrial city of Schenectady in the State of New York; New Castle in Pennsylvania; eight towns in Ohio; five in Utah, and one in Minnesota. Berkeley, California; Butte, Montana; Flint, Michigan, and several other towns had been carried for Socialism in the spring of the same year.

In the Presidential elections of 1912 the political strength of American Socialism was subjected to a most severe test. For the first time in the history of American politics the voters were confronted by a party similar in type to the "liberal" or "radical" parties of the European bourgeoisie. The National Progressive Party made its campaign on a platform of broad social and political reform. It purloined a large number of minor planks from the Socialist program and even adopted many time-honored Socialist watch-words and slogans. The new party was organized and led by Theodore Roosevelt, the most popular man in the country and probably its most skilled politician, and his picturesque fight as well as the great prestige of his recent high office, could not fail to commend his party to the radicals and reformers of the country and to large masses of the workers. It offered the logical outlet to the proverbial vote of "discontent and protest."

Under these conditions the vote of the Socialist Party was from the outset limited to thoroughgoing Socialists.

It was therefore all the more significant, when it was found that the vote cast for Eugene V. Debs on November 5, 1912, was in the neighborhood of 900,000. The Socialist Party had doubled its vote of the preceding Presidential election under the most adverse circumstances, and had proved itself an established factor in American politics.

At the present time the Socialists control between

fifty and sixty American cities or towns and have more than one thousand elected representatives in various public offices, including twenty representatives in the legislatures of eight states.

But the progress of the Socialist movement in the United States can by no means be measured by its political strength and achievements alone. The Socialist Party was organized with a membership of less than ten thousand. Towards the end of 1904 the party consisted of about 1,500 local sub-divisions with a total of about 25,000 enrolled and dues-paying members. Within the period of the following eight years the number of local organizations has risen to about 5,000, with a combined membership of approximately 120,000.

Another indication of the increasing importance of the movement in the United States is the growth of the Socialist press. In 1904 the Socialist Party was supported by about forty publications in different languages. Since then the number of strictly Socialist publications has increased to more than three hundred. The greater part of these are periodicals in the English language, five are daily newspapers, ten are monthly magazines and the rest are weeklies. Socialist periodicals are printed in German, Finnish, Slavonic, Jewish, Polish, Bohemian, Lettish, French, Italian, Danish, Hungarian, Lithuanian, Russian, Swedish, Norwegian and Croatian. The first important daily English newspaper of the Socialist Party was launched in Chicago in the fall of 1906, under

the name of *Chicago Daily Socialist*, and it was followed by the establishment of the *New York Daily Call* in New York, in May, 1908. The *Appeal to Reason*, a weekly paper, has a circulation of about half a million copies, while the *Jewish Daily Forward* sells more than 130,000 copies per day. Among the monthly Socialist magazines, one, *The Progressive Woman*, is devoted primarily to the task of carrying the gospel of Socialism to women, and *The Young Socialist* aims at educating the youth in the philosophy of Socialism. This press labors under great material difficulties, but is making steady progress.

Besides the Socialist Party there is in the United States another Socialist political organization—the Socialist Labor Party. This party represents the remainder of the irreconcilable faction of the former party of the same name. Its membership is small, and its influence is slight. Still it publishes a daily paper in English and a few weekly papers in other languages. In the last general election it united about 29,000 votes on its candidate for President.

The Socialist movement in the United States has also of late made substantial progress among the organized workers of the country. Within the last few years many American trade-unions have demonstrated a lively interest in the subject of Socialism, and have on numerous occasions declared themselves unreservedly as favoring the Socialist program, or at least its most substantial points and planks. In 1907,

sixteen national organizations of workingmen, representing a total membership of 330,800, had thus endorsed the Socialist program, and in 1909 the United Mine Workers of America, one of the strongest organizations within the American Federation of Labor, at its national convention declared itself in favor of the cardinal aim of Socialism, the socialization of all material instruments of production.

And the industrial workers are not the only class among whom Socialism has made gains of late. The movement has made deep inroads among American farmers. In the national Socialist convention of 1904, the farmers made their first appearance with five delegates, and in the conventions of 1908, 1910 and 1912 a very substantial proportion of the delegates consisted of active and typical farmers. In the late general elections several purely agricultural states polled heavier Socialist votes than some of the states noted for factory industries.

And even the so-called intellectual classes of American society, the professionals and middle-class business men, are gradually drawn into the expanding circle of the Socialist movement. The American schools and colleges, as well as the press and churches, are honeycombed with Socialists or Socialist sympathizers. In the fall of 1905, several well-known radicals issued a call for the organization of a society "for the purpose of promoting an intelligent interest in Socialism among college men and women, graduate and undergraduate, through the formation



of study clubs in the colleges and universities, and the encouraging of all legitimate endeavors to awaken an interest in Socialism among the educated men and women of the country." On September 12, 1905, a number of people met in the city of New York in response to the call and organized the "Intercollegiate Socialist Society." During the short period of its existence, the society has distributed a large quantity of Socialist literature among college students and teachers, and its members have delivered a number of lectures on Socialism before college students. Socialist "study chapters" connected with the Intercollegiate Socialist Society have been organized in about fifty universities and colleges.

The Socialist movement has become fully acclimatized on American soil. According to a recent census, over 71 per cent. of the members of the Socialist Party are native citizens of the United States. The Socialist movement is to-day at least as much "American" as any other social or political movement in the country.

And still American Socialism is only in the making. All indications point to a steady development and large growth of the movement within the immediate future.

The industries of the country are rapidly concentrating in the hands of an ever-diminishing number of powerful financial concerns. The trusts, monopolies and gigantic industrial combinations are coming to be the ruling factors in the life of the nation, in-

dustrial, political and spiritual, and the masses of the people are sinking into a condition of ever greater dependence. The number of propertyless wage-earners is on the increase; their material existence is growing more precarious, and the spirit of dissatisfaction and revolt is developing among them. The relations between the classes of producers and the employing classes are marked by intense, though not always conscious, class-antagonism and by overt class struggles.

Within the last few years the organized workers of the United States have been assailed with unusual severity by the organized capitalists, the government, the state and national legislatures, and particularly by the courts. These concerted attacks have served to demonstrate to many workers that the present methods and form of organization of the American trade-unions are lacking in efficiency. The trade-unions are beginning to revise their methods of warfare. They have, within the last few years, made considerable advance in the direction of greater organic and interdependent industrial organization, and they have entered the field of politics as a class. True, their steps in both directions have been uncertain, groping and even faulty, but they are nevertheless steps in the right direction. A few more intense industrial struggles, a few more adverse court decisions, a few more political disappointments, and the organized workers of the United States will be forced into a solid industrial and political class organization, working in close

harmony and co-operation with the Socialist movement.

Similarly hopeful for the progress of Socialism is the mental attitude of all other masses of the population. The phenomenal political strength developed from time to time by the sporadic reform movements is a strong indication of the popular dissatisfaction with existing conditions. These movements are, as a rule, very indefinite in their aims and superficial in their programs. They attract the masses by their general radicalism and the promise of a small measure of immediate relief. From their very nature they are bound to be ineffective and short-lived, and their disappointed adherents become peculiarly susceptible to the appeals of Socialism.

Thus the conditions for the growth of a powerful Socialist movement in this country are rapidly maturing and the rate of that growth will largely depend upon the ability of the Socialists to take advantage of these conditions and to win the confidence and support of the discontented masses and especially of the workers.

American Socialism has not as yet evolved definite and settled policies and methods, but the more recent phases of its development tend to indicate that it is beginning to solve its problems and to overcome its obstacles.

Within the short period of twelve years the Socialist Party has grown from a state of insignificance to the importance of a serious factor in the national

life of the United States. It is safe to predict that in another dozen years it will contend with the old parties for political supremacy.















No-Decision  
Returned to Shelf

SEP 23 1984

CONSERVATION 1984

