

Orthology Photography Fiction Fishing  
Christianity Art Cooking Essays  
Buddhism Freemasonry Medicine Biology  
Music Ancient Egypt Evolution  
Carpentry Physics Dance Geology  
Machinatics Fitness Shakespeare  
Cannibalism Yoga Marketing Confidence  
Immortality Biographies Poetry  
Psychology Witchcraft Electronics  
Chemistry History Law Accounting  
Philosophy Anthropology Alchemy Drama  
Quantum Mechanics Atheism Sexuality  
Mental Health Ancient History Criminal  
Entomology Poetry Language Sport  
Paleontology Neuroscience Philosophy  
Metaphysics Investment Archaeology

# Forgotten Books

— [www.forgottenbooks.com](http://www.forgottenbooks.com) —

Copyright © 2016 FB &c Ltd.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted in any form or by any means, including photocopying, recording, or other electronic or mechanical methods, without the prior written permission of the publisher, except in the case of brief quotations embodied in critical reviews and certain other noncommercial uses permitted by copyright law.

DATE DUE

MAR 3 1947

MAY 15 1947

*mu* 1 1949 4 18

MAY 14 1949 H

MAY 8 1950

~~NQV 15 1963~~ B U

University Library

the average man;



030 332 377



# **SOCIALISM AND THE AVERAGE MAN**

**A PRESENTATION IN POPULAR FORM OF THE NATURE  
OF SOCIALISM; THE FALLACIES INHERENT IN CERTAIN  
OF THE MORE GENERAL AND FUNDAMENTAL DOCTRINES  
OF SOCIALISM; THE DISINGENUOUSNESS OF THE PROPAGANDA  
IN FAVOR OF SOCIALISM; AND THE FUTILITY  
AND IMPRACTICABILITY OF CERTAIN TYPICAL SCHEMES  
THAT HAVE TAKEN SHAPE UNDER THE NAME OF  
SOCIALISM**

**BY**

**WILLIAM HOWARD DOUGHTY, JR.  
A.B., LL.B.**

**PROFESSOR IN GOVERNMENT, WILLIAMS COLLEGE**



**G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS  
NEW YORK AND LONDON  
The Knickerbocker Press  
1922**

A518558

Copyright, 1922  
by  
William Howard Doughty, Jr.

---

Made in the United States of America



**To**  
**MY WIFE**



## PREFACE

“There is, and can be, no authoritative statement of Socialism.” Such a pronouncement, coming as it does from Mr. J. Bruce Glasier, a Socialist of more than forty years standing, and appearing in the Preface to his book, *The Meaning of Socialism*, Thomas Seltzer, 1920, is highly significant. It abundantly confirms the judgment of any one who has talked with those calling themselves Socialists, or read the works of leaders in the Movement, or studied the propaganda in its support. And yet there never was a time when Socialism was so widely discussed. The very fact that it is undefined and undefinable makes possible the grouping under its standard of those holding widely divergent and often conflicting views on governmental and political questions. It is not uncommon to find two individuals, each calling himself a Socialist, attacking each other with just as much bitterness as they both attack Capitalism.

The explanation of this phenomenon, it seems to me, and as I have endeavored to point out in my first chapter, lies in the fact that, generally speaking, Socialists are much more concerned with the means for bringing



into being an ultimate state of civilized society, than with the real nature of that ultimate state. By the outsider, Socialism, like Christianity, must be judged by fundamentals, and not by details. To him the animosities, jealousies and disputes between those calling themselves Socialists, find their parallel in the interdenominational disputes and jealousies among those calling themselves Christians.

Nor, it seems to me, is this attitude on the part of the Non-Socialist wholly without justification. The Average Man is far more concerned with the ultimate form of the social order under which he or his children may have to live, than with any particular means advocated for the realization of that ultimate form, though the means also, especially if they be violent, may be of importance to him.

However this may be, it is certainly true that only when he thus approaches the subject in the large, can the Average Man, who has neither the time nor the inclination to undertake a detailed study of the programs of the many conflicting factions within the movement, hope to arrive at a reasoned conclusion with regard to its expediency or its practicability. For this reason, therefore, in endeavoring to present the subject to the Average Man, I have dealt with Socialism in the large.

This book makes no claim to scholarship, in the

academic sense. I have purposely avoided quotations or citations of a technical or philosophic nature. It is with the practical aspects of Socialism, rather than with fine spun theories, that the Average Man is concerned. Footnotes have been avoided as tending to distract attention from the central thought. No bibliography is appended because anything short of a complete bibliography would be of little use to one undertaking an exhaustive study of anti-Socialist literature, and because such a bibliography would be out of keeping with a book such as this is intended to be. Furthermore, the selected lists of readings which can be found in any good library will afford to those desirous of pursuing the subject further a satisfactory starting point for their reading.

Reference is made in the text to Brasol's *Socialism vs. Civilization* and to Mr. Spargo's analyses and criticisms of Bolshevism. Both writers are merciless in their indictment of the Bolsheviki. Mr. Brasol, who writes as a non-Socialist, maintains the thesis that Bolshevism is the logical and inevitable final stage of Marxian Socialism, a conclusion with which I am heartily in accord. Mr. Spargo, on the other hand; attacks Bolshevism as an utter perversion of Socialism: something quite at variance with it. Both writers are concerned quite as much with the actual activities of the Bolsheviki as with any theories which may lie

behind such activities. One who attempts to reconcile such conflicting attitudes will find very helpful a book by Vladimir G. Simkhovitch, *Marxism Versus Socialism*, Henry Holt & Co., 1913.

Personally, in launching this little volume upon the troubled sea of politico-economic theory, so agitated of late by the conflicting cross-currents of Socialistic and anti-Socialistic rhetoric, I have not hoped, nor has it been my purpose, to make an effective or convincing appeal to the Socialist already confirmed in the faith. Le Bon, in his *Psychology of Socialism*, makes very clear the hopelessness of such an undertaking. And his conclusions are abundantly confirmed by the experience of any who have tried to argue with Socialists about the feasibility or expediency of that ultimate state of society for which they yearn, and for the attainment of which they labor. One might, with as much hope of success, attempt to persuade a man of the errors of his religious beliefs. For the confirmed Socialist, Socialism is a religion, a faith: a faith, moreover, which has its roots embedded in emotion rather than in reason. The confirmed Socialist, therefore, will find in this book nothing of interest or of profit.

Fortunately, however, the vast majority of those who compose organized society are not as yet confirmed in the Socialist Faith. In their attitude toward Socialism they fall into three classes, namely: first,

those who are opposed to Socialism because they have an understanding of what it really is and whither it inevitably leads, and who, therefore, are capable of presenting a reasoned opposition to it; second, those who are instinctively opposed to Socialism, but who have no accurate understanding of its real significance and its fundamental errors, and who, therefore, are dumb in the presence of some suave, sophistical and glib exponent of its theories; finally, those, and they constitute in the aggregate a large and growing number, who, without having given the slightest thought to its practical aspects or its ultimate effect upon civilized society, are captivated by the lofty idealism of the Movement and its tempting promises, and who, therefore, maintain an attitude of sympathy toward it, which may at any time be converted into an active participation in its advancement.

For the first of these classes this book will have no message. To address it to them would be a presumption: a preaching of repentance to the righteous. With the two remaining classes, however, it is different. The arguments against Socialism have frequently been presented by the trained economist, who has failed to realise that the technical language of his profession and the theoretical character of his argument defeat his own end, so far, at least, as the Average Man is concerned.

It has been my endeavor, therefore, in the following pages, to present in logical, non-technical language certain of the simpler theoretical, and also practical, arguments against Socialism. In so doing I have hoped to give to him who is instinctively but unreasoningly opposed to the Movement a reason for the faith that is in him. I shall hope also that to some, at least, who, without understanding its significance or its inevitable outcome, are inclined to look upon it with sympathy and approval, but who have not as yet actively allied themselves with it, the arguments and facts presented will in some measure reveal the real character of Socialism, with the result that their attention and their energy will be turned to saner instrumentalities of reform and progress.

I fully realize that, in spite of my best efforts to avoid form and substance which would weary or confuse the Average Man, there is much in the book which demands careful reading and thoughtful attention: that, as one reader of the manuscript put it, it may be "too judicial" to hold the attention of the Average Man. To this I can only reply that the subject is one which demands thoughtful and judicial treatment, for only when it is studied in this way will the sophistry and error of Socialism, and the emotionalism and dishonesty of the propaganda in support of its contentions be revealed and understood. It is my firm conviction



tion that when the true nature of the Movement, and the inevitable results of its consummation are once clearly understood by any lover of Anglo-Saxon liberty and justice, he will have none of it.

I would take this opportunity to acknowledge my indebtedness, and to express my thanks to those who have been of great assistance to me in the preparation of this little book. Especially would I mention my wife, who, out of a busy life, always found the time to assist in the correction of manuscript and proof; Miss Helen W. Davenport, of New York, whose careful final reading and correction of the manuscript did much to lighten the burden and boredom of proof reading; my life-long friend, James B. Pratt, Professor of Philosophy in Williams College, whose keen and kindly criticism of the manuscript was always most stimulating and suggestive; and Professor Arthur L. Frothingham, of Princeton, N. J., who not only placed at my disposal his very valuable collection of radical literature, but actively assisted me in making selections for the purpose of illustration.

W. H. D., JR.

WILLIAMSTOWN, MASS.,  
January 12, 1922.



# CONTENTS

	PAGE
PREFACE . . . . .	v
CHAPTER	
I.—WHAT IS SOCIALISM? . . . . .	3
II.—SOME FUNDAMENTAL FALLACIES . . . . .	21
III.—SOCIALIST LOGIC . . . . .	36
IV.—THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM . . . . .	53
V.—SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA . . . . .	73
VI.—SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA ( <i>Continued</i> ) . . . . .	95
VII.—SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA ( <i>Continued</i> ) . . . . .	118
VIII.—THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION . . . . .	143
IX.—SOCIALISM IN ACTION . . . . .	177
X.—THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM . . . . .	210









**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**





# SOCIALISM AND THE AVERAGE MAN

## CHAPTER I

### WHAT IS SOCIALISM?

SOMEONE has said that the civilized world to-day is full of Socialists, but that there is no such thing as Socialism. The truth of this statement, like that of the old assertion that were an explosion to occur in the middle of the Sahara Desert with no creature present there would be no sound, depends entirely upon definition. If we define sound as waves set up in the atmosphere there certainly would be sound produced by the explosion supposed. Again, if we narrow the definition, and define sound as atmospheric waves capable of producing sensations on the hearing organs of living creatures, the supposed explosion would unquestionably produce sound. If, on the other hand, we define sound as the effect actually produced by certain atmospheric waves upon the organs of hearing of living creatures the supposed explosion would pro-

## 4 SOCIALISM AND AVERAGE MAN

duce no sound. So it is with Socialism. If by the term we mean a government, actually set up and functioning, it is certainly true, with the possible exception of Russia, that Socialism nowhere exists. I say with the possible exception of Russia because the dictatorship established by Lenine and his followers is not regarded as Socialism by many leading Socialists. If, on the other hand, we define or regard Socialism as a body of doctrines, political, social and economic, then, assuredly Socialism is a very real and a very potent force to be reckoned with.

To define Socialism as a body of doctrines, however, does not carry us very far on the road to an understanding of what Socialism is. Not only is there a very considerable number of what we might call Schools, which, while they hold certain fundamental doctrines in common, differ so widely on others that they utterly repudiate all but their own; but within the several Schools there is the widest divergence, not only as to the methods to be employed to bring into being the Socialist order of society but also as to the extent to which general or special doctrines shall be carried within that society if, and when, established. Again there are many individuals, constituting in the aggregate a large group, who find it impossible to ally themselves with any one particular School and who prefer to pick and choose doctrines to their par-

ticular liking from those of the several Schools, or even to invent doctrines of their own. From this it will easily be seen that Socialism, by that meaning a body of doctrines, is susceptible of classification not only vertically, into more or less clearly differentiated Schools; but transversely to represent the differences of opinion within the several Schools as to methods and extent in respect to the application of their doctrines; and even diagonally, to represent the doctrines of those who find it impossible to reconcile their own ideas with those of any particular School.

Within the brief compass of this little volume it will be impossible to enter into any exhaustive analysis of the characteristic doctrines of the various Schools of Socialism. All that can be done, and all that will be attempted, will be to point out the fundamental characteristics of the more prominent Schools, showing wherein they are agreed and the more important points wherein they differ, indicating also the fallacies in certain of the arguments which they advance in support of their doctrines; and from the material thus brought together attempt to draw a picture of the society Socialism would introduce. It must be admitted at the outset that this picture will of necessity be vague and unsatisfactory to any but the mind of a Socialist, but if there is any one characteristic which permeates the writings and speech of Socialists gener-

## 6 SOCIALISM AND AVERAGE MAN

ally, it is a proneness for generalities and a shyness of practical details.

The doctrines of Socialism may be roughly divided into those which deal with effecting its establishment on the one hand, and those which deal on the other, with the organization of society after it is established. While they do not neglect the latter, present day Socialists devote by far the greater part of their time and energy to propagating the former, and, it may be added, are much more explicit in this field than in the latter, though even here they frequently are so vague as to permit the widest possible differences of interpretation. The task, therefore, of making a clear cut, concise statement of the doctrines of Socialism is by no means an easy one.

Modern Socialism is in greater part the result of the teaching of Karl Marx, and may be said to date from the middle of the last century. This does not mean that Marx flashed upon the world an entirely new conception of organized society. Plato pictured a communistic state. The early Church was largely communistic in its organization. The Anabaptist movement in the early part of the 16th Century, under the leadership of John of Leyden, was the very essence of Communism, at least in its inception. The Revolution of 1789 incidentally gave to France a practical experiment in Communism, or at least in the methods

generally approved by Communists. With all these previous examples in the political history of the past, why should it be said that modern Socialism dates from the writings of Karl Marx? The reason lies not in any contrast between the state of society which he advocates and the societies sought to be established in the cases referred to. It is to be found rather in the difference between the ends he sought to accomplish by it, and the reasons he advanced in its support, and in what was sought to be accomplished by the earlier movements.

Plato, for example, advocated his communistic state, not because he was in any way concerned about the economic condition of the people of his city, nor was his state to include all dwelling within the city. His sole aim was to establish a better state, one which should be more efficient, more powerful. In this he was true to the Greek idea that the State is everything and the individual nothing. The Communism of the early Church was established, not as an end in itself, but as purely incidental to a weak though growing religious movement. It was wholly voluntary, merely accessory to something infinitely more important to the minds of those engaged in it, and it endured only so long as the Church felt itself weak and insecure. The Communism of the Anabaptist movement was, at its inception at least, again purely incidental to a re-



## 8 SOCIALISM AND AVERAGE MAN

ligious movement, though it was but a short time before it took on a highly political character. The communistic features of the Revolution from 1793 on were incident to an economic and political movement from the very beginning. In so far as it was political, it may be thought to be similar to the Communism of Plato. It differed from this, however, in two vital respects. Plato's Communism was to apply only to the aristocratic classes, who alone were to continue to rule; and had for its object, as already pointed out, the sole purpose of establishing a more efficient and a more powerful state. The communistic features of the French Revolution on the other hand were primarily economic in purpose, namely: to improve the condition of the Proletariat, and only secondarily were they political, that is, merely for the purpose of effecting the economic end in view.

The communistic features of the Revolution, therefore, have much more in common with the Socialism of Marx than with the Communism of Plato. The Socialism of Marx, like the movement of 1793, looks to the betterment of the economic condition of the Proletariat, but it rests upon a much more highly developed philosophic basis. Marx was wholly under the influence of the historical School of Philosophy, and of the economic interpretation of history. He was among the first to attempt to support a socialistic





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



A second proposition which he advances is that the miserable condition of the workers is due wholly to the fact that the means of production, that is, plant, machinery, tools and raw materials, have become largely concentrated in hands other than those who use them in the actual processes of production, who exact from the actual toilers, for the privilege of using them, a toll which is of necessity deducted from the value of the product of their labor. From this he argues that the means of production should and must be owned by the workers themselves. These two theories, that Labor alone produces wealth, and that Labor alone should own and possess the means of production, together with possibly a third, namely: that of Class Struggle, constitute the basic principles of Marxian Socialism. All others necessarily or by inference follow from them. Furthermore, these theories are accepted by all of the several schools of Socialism, and it is probably true that they are the only ones upon which they are wholly agreed.

The first two propositions sound simple and clear enough, but, like all Socialist doctrines, as soon as one turns from regarding them in the abstract and attempts to work out a plan for giving effect to them, their vagueness upon essential points becomes manifest, and it is because of this that the several Schools have arisen. Take the first: Labor alone produces

wealth. What constitutes Labor? Does Labor include merely those who work with their hands, or can the term be extended to include also those who work with their heads? Can it be made to cover those engaged in the processes of distribution as well as those engaged solely in the processes of production, or is it limited strictly to the latter? Take the second: Labor alone should own and possess the means of production. Does this mean that the toilers in general should own in the aggregate all means of production? Does it mean that the toilers in a given industry should own in the aggregate all means of production engaged in that industry? Does it mean that the toilers in each separate plant should own and operate their particular plant as a separate and distinct co-operative industry? Or does it mean that the State should own and operate all the means of production, holding title, and administering in trust for the Proletariat?

It is upon such questions as these that the leading Socialists find themselves hopelessly at variance. And when they turn their attention to the more practical question of actually bringing into being the socialistic organization of society they find themselves even further apart, with the result that, with their several followings, they have established the different Schools of Socialism. Of course, though the aims of Socialism are international and seek the ultimate wiping out of

all nationalist states, the doctrines of any one leader, and consequently of his following, are more or less colored by his own social, political and economic environment. It is but natural, therefore, that we find the adherents of the several Schools roughly following nationalistic lines. This fact, however, is not necessarily because of nationality, blood ties or a reverence for national institutions, but rather because the doctrines of the particular School are the result of special or peculiar conditions which are the political, social and economic inheritance of a given people, and that they have been framed to meet and to overcome evils, real or imagined, which are most oppressive in the life of the workers in the particular state.

As has already been suggested, since the Socialists believe that all the disadvantages under which the working classes are laboring, and all the miseries which they endure are due to the Capitalistic organization of society, fostered and maintained by the governments of all civilized states, it is but natural that the Socialist movement should concern itself for the present much more with devising means to free the workers from this system and from the governments which they hold responsible for it, than with constructive plans looking to the actual organization and control of society in their ideal state. The immediate aims of Socialism, therefore, may with perfect justice be said to be de-

structive. Only in a contingent sense, that is, if and when the present order is overthrown, can it be said to have any constructive program. So true is this that many reforms of present governments and even of non-governmental organizations, looking to the betterment of the living and working conditions of the masses, are bitterly opposed by leading Socialists as tending to make the workers contented with their lot and, therefore, to delay the bringing in of the Socialist order.

It is but natural, then, that differentiation between the various Schools lies more in the methods which they suggest for the ushering in of their proposed order than in any other vital respects. Thus we find two groups urging the use of parliamentary machinery, but curiously enough for quite opposite ends. The one claiming that the Proletariat, as well as the Capitalistic members of the present order must be educated up to the value of the Socialist program by legislation actually socialistic in character, while at the same time they see in every such reform, of what they believe to be a socialistic nature, a real step toward the ultimate establishment of Socialism itself. The other group of these parliamentarists urge the entry of Socialists into the legislative bodies of their respective countries, not for the purpose of effecting reforms, but rather to defeat them, in order that the condition of the toilers may

## 14 SOCIALISM AND AVERAGE MAN

continue oppressive and may, therefore, hasten the day of revolution. This latter group is much the smaller of these two.

Again there is a large group holding that Socialists should wholly abstain from any and all political action: that they should lay all their emphasis on economic pressure, and by strikes and sabotage (that is, soldiering on the job, injuring machinery and plant, spoiling the product, etc.) render his business so unprofitable to the Capitalist as to drive him from it and leave it to the workers. More radical still is the group which advocates a resort to force, not merely as implied in sabotage, but actual recourse to arms. These are but rough classifications, and it will be found by anyone who attempts to go into the subject that there is an infinite number of variations within the several groups, but in the main he will find these three: the reformists and parliamentarists, the economic or laborite group, and the militant or revolutionary group.

If we turn to the question of the organization of industry under the proposed Socialistic State, that is to the ownership and control of the means of production, distribution and exchange, we find no less divergence in opinion among the accredited leaders of the movement. As already pointed out, Socialists of all Schools are agreed that in order to end forever the exploitation of Labor the means of production must be



owned by the workers themselves, but they are unable to agree as to how this ownership shall be vested. There are the so-called State Socialists, who advocate the ownership of all the means of production, distribution and exchange by the State, that is, an entity primarily political. Some of these see in the present growing tendency toward government ownership or control of all public utilities a promise of the day when, not only public utilities, but even those now considered private industries, shall be owned and controlled by the State. They advocate an organization in which there shall be no employer but the State, and, as the State shall consist of none but Socialists, they conceive a sort of self-employing commonwealth. As this ownership is to extend only to industries in which it is necessary to *employ* labor it would not in any way affect the ownership of the means of production by one who labored solely by and for himself, as the cobbler, the seamstress, the tinsmith, the blacksmith or the farmer who by himself cultivates his small plot of ground.

One should be careful to distinguish this State Socialism from Collectivist Capitalism on the one hand and Communism on the other. State Socialism can exist only when and where Socialists are in control of the government, and advocates of Collectivist Capitalism are considered as distinctly of the enemy, for the Socialists argue, that so long as the State remains



in the control of the Capitalist class, Labor will continue to be exploited by that class. State Socialism like Collectivist Capitalism contemplates a politico-economic organization, with this important difference, namely: that in the former the reins of government shall be in the hands of the Socialists, while in the latter they remain in the hands of the Capitalists. The thoroughgoing Communist contemplates an organization of society, which, if it is not wholly, is at least primarily and fundamentally, economic, and only slightly, if at all, political in its composition and purpose: that is, one in which government shall be confined within the narrowest possible limits of activity, such as the conduct of foreign relations and the most general matters of domestic public interest, while all other relations between individuals or groups shall rest solely on voluntary agreement. He realizes the possibility, even the probability, that in the process of its establishment strong political organization will be necessary, and for this period advocates a dictatorship of the Proletariat. But this dictatorship, he asserts, is but a means to an end. His ultimate goal is a purely co-operative commonwealth in which, because all are happy and have nothing to make them discontented or envious, government will be absolutely unnecessary.

The State Socialist is at one extreme, the Communist at the other. Between the two lie such Schools as the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



obtains, an inevitable and irreconcilable conflict of interest between Labor and Capital: that they have not, and never can have, anything in common: that industrial peace and happiness is impossible until Capitalism is wiped out: that the two are natural and implacable enemies. This doctrine of the Class Struggle has been more and more emphasized by Socialists until now it has become the Class War: and war in no figurative sense. Within the last few years, and especially since the great world conflict, Socialists, in constantly growing numbers, have been preaching revolution. By this they no longer mean as formerly a bloodless revolution, one effected by a capture of the machinery of government by constitutional means, but one effected by force of arms, by actual war. Even those Socialists who still cling to the old idea that Socialism can and must be brought about by peaceful means are beginning reluctantly to admit that force may be necessary, and to assert that, if driven to it, they, as well as their more fiery comrades, would have recourse to it.

Before closing this chapter let us go back to the question which gives it its title. What then is Socialism? The answer, as already stated, cannot be given in any terms which will not be open to criticism on the ground of indefiniteness. In some respects any attempted answer would of necessity be too broad,

while in others it would be too narrow. But remembering that we are dealing with a "philosophy of the vague" we may with some degree of justification summarize our answer as follows: Socialism is a body of doctrines which hold (1) that Labor alone produces wealth; (2) that, therefore, the worker is entitled to the whole value of the product of his labor; (3) that any portion of the value of the product taken or retained by Capital as its portion is wrongfully taken from Labor's due, and therefore a robbery of Labor; (4) that Labor, in order to avoid being thus robbed by Capital, should and must own all the means of production, distribution, and exchange; (5) that thus the interests of Capital and Labor have nothing in common, that there is an inevitable and eternal conflict between them; (6) that this conflict of interests results in a Class Struggle; (7) that this struggle must and can have but one ending, the defeat and elimination of Capital; (8) that this struggle is to be won by Labor through peaceful means, if possible, but if necessary by resort to force, that is by bloodshed and war; (9) that in order to make secure its victory over Capital, present governments, whether they be autocratic or democratic, since they are founded upon, and support the Capitalistic system, must be captured or overthrown, again, by peaceful means if possible, but if necessary by force of arms; (10) that in the place of present governments

there must be established and maintained governments wholly sympathetic with the ideals and aims of Socialism and, therefore, controlled by Socialists.

Socialists, with more and more vehemence, are preaching that in the ideal state which they advocate, the control of the government shall be wholly in the hands of the Proletariat. It, therefore, becomes evident that the introduction of Socialism would mean the passing not only of the present so-called orthodox economic system, based upon human nature and experience, but of many if not most of the fundamental principles of the science of politics and even of civilization itself.

## CHAPTER II

### SOME FUNDAMENTAL FALLACIES

IN the foregoing chapter certain fundamental doctrines of Socialism were examined solely with the object of ascertaining, if possible, what Socialism really is: what it stands for: what it aims at. In the present chapter an attempt will be made to analyze the arguments by which Socialists endeavor to support certain of their more fundamental doctrines. As in the previous chapter, let us consider first the doctrine that Labor alone produces wealth. This, as has already been stated is a Marxian doctrine, and has been universally accepted by Socialists of all types and degrees from his day to the present, as has been the argument by which he supported it. We can, therefore, regard his argument as orthodox and authoritative from the Socialist viewpoint. This argument has been summed up with admirable clearness and brevity by Mr. Boris L. Brasol in his very valuable book, *Socialism vs. Civilization*. He puts it as follows:

“According to this theory, the capital, ‘C,’ employed in a given industrial enterprise is made up of two com-

ponents: one—the sum of money ‘c’ laid out upon the material means of production, and the other—the sum of money ‘v’ expended upon the labor power. Thus, ‘c’ comprises raw materials, buildings, machinery, and tools used for productive purposes and represents the portion which Marx called ‘constant’ or fixed capital. As to ‘v,’ it is the portion which is usually regarded as variable capital. At first, then,  $C = c + v$ . Marx amplifies his illustration with figures and supposes that capital ‘C’ = \$500, of which \$400 are constant capital, ‘c,’ and \$100, the money expended on labor, otherwise ‘v.’ He then affirms further that, after the process of production has been terminated, capital ‘C’ is no longer equal to \$500 ( $c + v$ , or  $\$400 + \$100$ ) but  $(‘c’ + ‘v’) + ‘s,’$  whereby ‘s’ represents a certain surplus value which is the result of the process of production itself. If we now assume that ‘s’ is equal to \$100, it would mean that the original capital ‘C,’ which amounted to \$500, has risen to ‘c’ + ‘s,’ or, otherwise,  $\$500 + \$100 = \$600$ . Marx further explains that one part of the labor process is being devoted to the reproduction of the value of the labor power, *i.e.*, the value of its means of subsistence, the second part being entirely devoted to the production of ‘s,’ *i.e.*, the surplus value which is the net profit of the capitalist. Therefore, if the average time for the reproduction of the means of subsistence is equal to six hours, then,



according to Marx, every hour of the labor day which is in excess of the six hours is merely the time during which the workman devotes his efforts to creating the surplus value, or the net profit of the capitalist. The logical conclusion is thereupon drawn that, the longer the labor day is, the more benefit has the capitalist out of 'v,' or out of the variable capital expended for labor power.

"In other words Marx asserts that the capitalist's profit is entirely due to labor. On the other hand, Marx, as well as more recent Socialists, asserts that the value of capital itself represents the quantity of labor embodied in it. Therefore, the division of Capital into fixed capital and variable capital in reality has but little significance, since fixed capital is itself nothing but crystallized labor, and is a material incarnation of the value which was contributed to it by Labor.

"Therefore, if we follow Marx's formula, we ought to say that 'c,' which is equal to \$400, and 'v,' which is equal to \$100, in reality represents nothing but labor. The only difference between 'c' and 'v,' according to Marx, consists in the fact that 'c' is a portion of work which has been already accomplished and which has assumed the crystallized form of buildings, machinery, tools, etc., whereas 'v' is the fluid work itself. Moreover, the Socialists affirm that the participation of capital in the process of production, although abso-



lutely indispensable from a technical point of view, brings no change in the essential character of the capitalistic system. The Socialists say that the means of production, which are expressed by 'c,' have been taken away from the workmen almost by force. After having lost the means of production, the workman became a proletarian who was compelled to sell his labor power on the market."

This argument is ingenious, but is it sound, will it bear the test of searching analysis? In order to test it, let us consider it in connection with a particular industry, the leather industry. A starts making leather from the hides of his cattle. He does this by the labor of himself and his sons alone. All share equally in the returns from the finished product. They make the necessary chemicals themselves from materials found on their own farm, in ample quantities for their small industry. For the sake of argument, we will admit the Socialist's contention that up to this point the finished product, the leather, thus manufactured, is the result solely of Labor. But the Socialist must admit that so far Labor receives the entire value of its product.

Now let us suppose that this leather is of such an admirable quality that the demand for it increases beyond the point where A and his sons are able to supply it with their own unassisted labor. It becomes





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



dustry, to receive merely the value of their Labor, in spite of the fact that they (A and his sons) have contributed and are continuing to contribute the raw materials, plant, and machinery, *i.e.*, the Capital? Or should this Capital, which even the Socialists admit is absolutely indispensable to the industry from a technical point of view, participate in some measure in the proceeds of the value of the product?

In attempting to answer this question, we may frankly admit the Socialists' contention that the laborer is entitled to the full value of the product of his labor, but the Socialists, if they are honest, must admit that he is entitled to no more than this. Now in the case assumed, A and his sons continue to contribute their labor along with the labor of X, Y and Z (those additionally engaged in the industry) in the creation of the finished product. But whereas X, Y and Z contribute their labor (and in this respect for labor of the same kind and value, are and should be on the same footing as A and his sons), X, Y and Z contribute their labor and nothing else, while A and his sons contribute not only their labor but also the plant, machinery and raw materials, without which the labor of X, Y and Z would be able to produce nothing, for it would remain a purely potential factor in production. Into the value of the finished product go (a) the full value of the raw materials upon which the work has been done; (b) a

certain portion of the value of the plant and machinery; and (c) the value of the labor involved in converting the raw materials into the finished product. To these three factors the Socialists generally would add a fourth, (d) the existence of organized society which by supplying a market for the product gives it its value. Admitting for the present that this fourth factor does contribute to the value of the product, it must be recognized that its contribution is of a totally different character from that made by factors (a) (b) and (c). We will, therefore, postpone consideration of it until after we have discussed certain points which relate more particularly to the other factors.

If we do this it would seem that even if Labor is entitled to the full value of the product of its labor this does not mean that it is entitled to the full value of the finished product, for Labor has contributed but a part of that final value. The difference between that portion of the value contributed by the labor of X, Y and Z, and of A and his sons, and the final value of the leather produced has been contributed by factors (a) and (b) above. But these factors were the full and sole property of A and his sons, their "crystallized labor," their Capital, the accumulation of which had in no way involved the exploitation of Labor. Unless the Socialists are prepared to extend their proposition, and claim that Labor is entitled to more than the value

of its product, it would seem that A and his sons alone were entitled to the value of the finished product in excess of the portion of that value contributed by themselves and X, Y and Z as laborers. In other words, that A and his sons were entitled to a return on their capital as such. If this is sound, and it would be difficult to see wherein it is not, they would be entitled to this return so long as their united capital, or their several shares, remained in the enterprise, whether they all, or any one of them withdrew from actual labor in the process of manufacture. In neither case could X, Y or Z justly complain that they were being deprived of the full value of the product of their labor.

To proceed one step further, if X, Y and Z have received the full value of the product of their labor, one who purchases the finished leather from A and his sons, to be used as raw material in his own industry, has in no way robbed them, nor have the means of production been taken away from them almost by force. The finished products of many industries become the raw-materials, or machinery in others. If it is true, therefore, that the finished leather taken by the purchaser in the case before us is in no way wrongfully taken from X, Y and Z, we were perfectly justified in waiving the question above as to whether the machinery acquired by A and his sons for the

development of their business was taken almost by force from the workmen who made it.

The Socialist doctrine that Labor alone produces wealth is true only under pioneer conditions or, in the initial stages of production, that is, where man by his labor converts the resources of nature, which have not as yet been reduced to ownership, into articles of use or convenience. As soon as the articles so manufactured are themselves employed in the manufacture of other articles, capable again of so being employed, and, therefore, constituting economic wealth, something other than Labor has entered into the production of this second group of articles. This something is Capital. To call it "crystallized labor" does not alter its character. The one who originally manufactured it solely by his labor has received for it the full value of his labor. The one who has acquired it has given in exchange for it, either some other article which he has manufactured solely by his own labor, or money which represents full compensation for his labor, so that, in either case, the one who originally manufactured it no longer can claim any right, title or interest in it. It is true that it still is and always will be the result of his labor, but he has received from it and for it the full value of the labor he expended upon it. He has no further claim upon it, or interest in it. The article, while it may in a sense be said to represent Labor,



is not itself Labor. And in so far as it is essential to, and is employed in, the manufacture of other articles, it introduces into their value (the economic wealth which they represent), an element other than Labor.

Pioneer conditions in Europe have long since been a thing of the past, and even in the United States, though they may still survive in the memories of some, they can be actually observed but rarely outside the four walls of the "Movie Theatre." As Professor Carver, in his *Social Justice* has most clearly pointed out, our economic life to-day is controlled by conditions utterly different from those obtaining in the primitive simplicity of the frontier community. In such a community, production was the result of a maximum of Labor combined with a minimum of tools. The tools, moreover, were in many cases manufactured by those who used them. Under present conditions, on the other hand, as the necessary result of the marvellous mechanical inventions of the past century, coupled with the increased demand for all kinds of conveniences, mechanical and otherwise, not to mention luxuries, which always inevitably follows in the train of wealth, production is the result of a maximum of tools and machinery combined with, if not a minimum, at least a much smaller proportion of Labor. In other words, in primitive communities, Labor, if not the sole, is far

away the most important element in the production of wealth. Capital, even where it enters in, plays but a minor part. Under present conditions, while it cannot perhaps be said that the situation is reversed, the relative importance of the two factors has undergone a tremendous change, so that Capital is in every sense as necessary as Labor in the processes of production, and hence in the production of wealth.

Nor are the present economic methods, which have resulted in this tremendous alteration of the relative importance of Labor and Capital in the processes of production, the result of the Capitalistic system, meaning by that the wage system, the exploitation of Labor. Nor is Capital any more than Labor responsible for them. Nor, as a matter of fact, is either Labor or Capital, or the two in combination, responsible for them. The cause lies deeper than that. It is to be found in human nature itself: in that instinct which constantly and relentlessly urges man on in the attempt to secure a more satisfying adjustment to his environment. The luxuries of yesterday are the necessities of to-day. Added possessions breed new desires. Desires, when the means of their satisfaction are present, inevitably become needs: needs of the individual, the community, the State; and enterprise is always ready to satisfy needs, *provided enterprise is assured of its full reward*. To deny this reward is to slay enterprise.

Let us go back for a moment to the case of A and his sons. There was a real need for leather of the kind and quality which they were manufacturing. This need grew beyond the point where they were able to supply it, except by the enlargement of their facilities, that is, except as they were able and willing to increase the amount of capital, tools, machinery and raw materials, necessary for increased production. The market was there. They had the money, the savings from their own fully paid labor, with which to make the necessary development of their plant, etc. Enterprise alone was needed, but in the absence of some force capable of arousing it, stimulating it, it would continue to lie dormant. The only force capable of such effect is the hope of reward. Now the hope of reward, though in some measure capable with all men, and in a high degree with some, such as artists, scientists, etc., of being satisfied by the mere fact of achievement, makes its strongest and most general appeal to man's acquisitive and possessive instincts. Fame, or the satisfaction in the altruistic contribution to the welfare of his fellow creatures may be reward enough and to spare for some men, but with the vast majority of men, the world over, the acquisitive and possessive instincts are among the most powerful in their nature, and these demand a material reward. In the case of A and his sons, therefore, as would be the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Socialist maintains that society contributes the whole value he proves too much for his own case, for, that being true, Labor contributes nothing to the value of the product and is entitled to no compensation for the value of the product of its labor, since the only value which attaches to the product is contributed by organized society. The Socialists, therefore, cannot maintain that Society contributes the entire value to the manufactured product.

There remains then to consider the assumption that society contributes but a part of the value of the manufactured product. If this be so, then upon the reasoning employed to show that A and his sons were entitled to a return on their invested capital, Society can claim no more than to share with Labor and Capital in the returns from the value of the product. This it can do, and does, in the form of taxes.

To sum up: we see, therefore, that Marx's doctrine that Labor alone produces wealth is true, and can be true, only under frontier or pioneer conditions; (2) that everywhere else it is utterly false, and that Capital is as essential to the production of wealth as is Labor; (3) that this being true, though Labor is entitled to the full value of the product of its labor, it is not entitled to the full value of the product of the industry, because it has not alone produced it; (4) that unless Labor is prepared to lay claim to more than

the value of the product of its labor it is not entitled to the difference between the value of its product and the value of the product of the industry; (5) that if Labor is entitled to the full value of the product of its labor, that is, its contribution to the value of the product of the industry, because it is its contribution, Capital is entitled to the value of its contribution, namely, the difference between the value of that contributed by Labor and the final value of the product of the industry; (6) we saw further, that Labor, having received the full value of the product of its labor has no further interest in, or claim to, the product of the industry; that, therefore, (7) when the product of the industry is acquired *as capital* by another for use in his industry, neither the laborers in the producing industry, nor those in the acquiring, have been done any injustice, much less been deprived of the means of production, almost by force; (8) that Capital, no less essential to production by modern mechanical methods than Labor, will not be forthcoming in the absence of the prospect of material reward; (9) that thus to cut off the supply of necessary Capital would inevitably result in effectually stopping the wheels of production and of progress.



## CHAPTER III

### SOCIALIST LOGIC

OF course, if and when it be established (1) that Labor, though entitled to the full value of the product of its labor, is not entitled to the full value of the product of the industry; and (2) that Labor has in no way been unjustly deprived of the ownership of the means of production; the claim that Labor should and must own all the means of production falls to the ground. The Socialist argument in support of the expropriation of the means of production and distribution is that Labor alone produced them; that Labor has in some way been wrongfully deprived of them; and, that being wrongfully in the possession and ownership of Capital, they are being used for the further exploitation of Labor. The fact that because of the fallacy of the major premise this argument is utterly illogical does not in the least embarrass the confirmed Socialist. He has a supreme contempt for logic. The facts of human experience and the fundamental instincts of human nature, in so far as they tend to discredit or negative his theory, he blandly waives

aside or totally ignores. He has a proneness for false analogies and half truths which amounts almost to a passion. It is not surprising, therefore, to find the Socialist, in spite of the fatal fallacy in his fundamental proposition, indicated in the foregoing chapter, attempting to support the doctrines of Socialism which necessarily, or by inference, follow from this fundamental proposition, by arguments no less unsound and illogical. Let us first consider the argument in support of the doctrine of expropriation by Labor of the means of production and distribution, and the methods proposed for carrying it out.

Mr. Spargo is probably the ablest exponent of Socialism in this country to-day. In examining his arguments, therefore, we cannot be charged with attacking one who is not thoroughly conversant with his subject and for that reason incompetent to present it or defend it. Mr. Spargo is a moderate. While he sees in the triumph of Socialism a revolution, he would secure its triumph by evolution. While he can see no necessity or justification for a resort to violence and bloodshed in order to vest in the workers the ownership and control of the means of production and distribution, he nevertheless realizes that the act of expropriation, by whatever means accomplished, calls for justification. He evidently is conscious of the fallacy pointed out in the foregoing chapter, whereby an attempt is made to

justify expropriation on the ground that Labor has been wrongfully deprived of the means of production, for he goes at the problem in quite another way.

In his little book, *The Substance of Socialism*, Lecture II, Section III, he makes the assertion that "there are no absolute property rights anywhere." By this he does not mean that there is no justification for private property of any kind, or that under Socialism private property would or should be done away with; for he very emphatically takes issue with those Socialists, followers of Proudhon, who maintain, in the words of the latter's maxim that, "Property is robbery," and that "Property holders are thieves." He merely is laying the foundation for the assertion which he makes later on that in all civilized states, whenever the State desires to sequester property it can do so. "Taxation," he says, "is, of course, a familiar example of the collective disregard of private property rights." And again, "The powers of domain and ultimate ownership" . . . "prove conclusively that there is no allodial property in land, nor any form of absolute property. A state or municipality desires land which is the 'property' of one of its citizens for some public purpose, such as building a hospital or a bridge, making a park or a roadway. The 'owner' of the land does not agree to sell it, whereupon the state or municipality takes the land from him—often at its own valuation!

Even when the land is needed by a quasi-private corporation, such as a railway company, the collective power is used to take away the ownership of the land from one citizen and transfer it to others.”

To the superficial thinker, and to the ignorant, such analogies seem sound and convincing. Let us, however, examine them and see whether they really afford any justification for the Socialist doctrine of expropriation *by Labor* of the means of production and distribution. It has never been admitted under our own form and theory of government that the power of taxation could be used for the private benefit of any individual or group. Our courts, both Federal and State, have again and again laid it down as a fundamental principle of our institutions that the purpose for which a tax is imposed must be a *public purpose*, that is, it must be something the supposed benefits of which are open and available to any and every member of the community, without distinction of race, sex, religion, occupation or social position. The government is supported wholly by taxation, its protection and powers are extended to and exercised on behalf of all. Public highways are open to the use of all. Public hospitals may be availed of by all. Municipal sewage systems are open to all for connection and use, and, even if not availed of, benefit all by tending to preserve the public health. Public educational systems, again, though



they may not be availed of by all, benefit all, in so far as they prevent ignorance and pauperism, and promote an intelligent citizenship. And so on throughout the whole field of taxation, it will be found that wherever the validity of a tax has been questioned on this ground, if it has been sustained, it is because it has been found to be for a public purpose, one, the benefits of which are open to all who care to avail of them; while, if it has been denied, it has been on the ground that the purpose was not a public one. The principle holds true, even in those cases where municipal hospitals, or the services of a district nurse, supported by taxation, are free only in cases where the patients are unable to pay for them themselves. All the members of the district taxed are benefited by the added security to the public health. What is true in our country is also true in England, and increasingly so on the Continent of Europe. The days when a monarch or an aristocratic group could, under color of the taxing power, take money from the pockets of their subjects or their fellow citizens and transfer it to their own pockets, for their exclusive and private benefit are a thing of the past.

The same is true of the power of eminent domain. The thing taken, whether it be land, for parks, public buildings, or highways; bridges, railways and equipment, including terminals; water power plants; gas





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Mr. Spargo seems to have entirely missed this point, and to assume that under our theory of government the community, which he seems to identify with the State, can take ("sequestrate" is the word he uses) any and "all forms of property"; for, after submitting several examples of a proper exercise of the power of eminent domain, all of which have been sustained as such on the very grounds set forth above, he continues, as follows: "Nothing, not even one's pocket-handkerchief, can be said to be exempt from this ultimate power of society. If, therefore, one's handkerchief is not taken away from him, it is simply because the community does not *desire* to take it." (The italics are mine.) Had he said *need it for a public purpose*, no one would or could take issue with him, but mere *desire*, except as it may serve as an urge to the accomplishment of a public benefit, can never justify an exercise of the power of eminent domain. It might well be that X was possessed of wealth in excess of the aggregate of that possessed by all others in the community in which he lived. It might be that there was a unanimous *desire* on the part of the other members of this community to take and distribute among themselves X's wealth, his property. But there is no civilized country in the world to-day where this desire would justify an exercise of the power of eminent domain for such a purpose. Such an act as taking and distributing the property of

X in the way and for the purpose suggested, simply to satisfy the desires of the other members of the community would be pure confiscation, and confiscation for no purpose recognized by the constitution or laws of any civilized peoples, as the destruction of decayed or poisonous food stuffs, the killing of diseased cattle, the destruction of rusted, blighted or diseased crops. It would be recognized as robbery and nothing else. Where property is taken, therefore, either by the power of taxation or by the power of eminent domain, it must be taken for a purpose which primarily will benefit the public as a whole, though it may benefit some individuals more than others, and some possibly not at all. This special benefit or advantage, however, must be entirely secondary, merely incidental, to the primary object of providing a public benefit; and is permitted (never sought for) simply because of the absolute impossibility of effecting an absolute equality of distribution of such benefits among those who are to, or may, share in them. Now let us see whether the Socialist doctrine of expropriation bears any real analogy to the theories of taxation and eminent domain.

In attempting to answer this question, it must be borne in mind that the Socialist doctrine of expropriation by Labor of the means of production and distribution rests on the propositions, (1) that Labor alone produces wealth; (2) that Labor is entitled to the full



value of the product of its labor; (3) that Labor has been wrongfully deprived of the means of production; and (4) that Labor must take, hold and control the means of production and distribution in order to prevent the further exploitation of the workers. In other words, the Socialist doctrine of expropriation of the means of production and distribution by Labor is advanced solely in the interests of Labor, whether Labor be narrowly or broadly defined so as to include merely those who work with their hands, or those who work with their heads as well. It proposes to take the property of the other members of the community, in so far as that property consists of the means of production and distribution and transfer it, not to the people as a whole, but to the workers in the various industries engaged in production and distribution.

This, of course, does not apply to the aims of the thoroughgoing and consistent State-Socialists. Where the powers of taxation and eminent domain could and would be used to take a great ship building establishment, or a munitions plant, solely for the purpose of better serving the nation at large, in the exercise of its duty of securing the public safety and defence, the Socialists would take over these same instrumentalities of production solely in the interest, and solely for the benefit of those engaged in them in the processes of production. They might claim that such a transfer

would result in a benefit to the community or the general public as well, and that, therefore, the taking was for a public purpose and so a proper exercise of the power of eminent domain. But such an argument would be utterly unsound, for, as we have pointed out above, the exercise of the power of eminent domain is justified only where the purpose for which it is invoked is designed to be primarily and fundamentally one which will benefit the public as a whole, regardless of class or occupation; while in the case of expropriation by the workers in any given industry of the means of production essential to it, the taking is primarily and fundamentally for the benefit of the workers themselves. Any benefit to the public at large would be purely incidental.

What the Socialists are interested in, and what they are constantly preaching to the workers is the advancement of the interests of Labor, regardless of the effect upon the interests of any other class or classes making up in the aggregate the general public. The Socialist doctrine of expropriation of the means of production and distribution by Labor has its roots in the *desire* of Labor to possess its instrumentalities, not to be administered in the interests of the public, but in their own interests, exclusive of any and all others. The doctrine, if carried out, would result in a taking, differing in no slightest respect from that supposed in the

case of X and the other members of his community, considered above.

In the foregoing discussion we have proceeded on the theory that the means of production and distribution were to be taken by Labor without compensation to their present owners. There is, however, a very decided difference of opinion among Socialists as to whether compensation should or should not be made. The arguments of those who advocate expropriation without compensation will be briefly considered later on in this chapter. For the present let us go back to Mr. Spargo's assertion that "there are no absolute property rights anywhere," upon which he founds his argument in favor of expropriation. Mr. Spargo is among those Socialists who favor making some compensation to the present owners of the means of production and distribution when the time comes for their being taken over by Labor. He advocates this on the ground that (quoting Liebknecht), "We recognize that it would be unjust to hold those who have built up a privileged situation for themselves, on the basis of bad legislation, personally responsible for that bad legislation, and to punish them personally.

"We especially state that in our opinion it is the duty of the State to give an indemnity to those whose interests will be injured by the necessary abolition of laws contrary to the common good, *in so far as this indem-*

*nity is consistent with the interests of the nation as a whole.*” *Substance of Socialism*, page 13, B. W. Huebsch, 1909, (The italics are mine.) It will be noted that “the duty of the State to give an indemnity” is conditioned upon its being found, at the time when the expropriation takes place, to be “consistent with the interests of the nation as a whole.” There is here no unqualified recognition of a *right* in the property owners to compensation for their property taken. Compensation, or indemnity, if granted, is to be wholly an act of grace. Mr. Spargo seems to think that this is the case with compensation made to an owner where property is taken under the power of eminent domain, for in the passage quoted at the beginning of this chapter, it will be remembered that in his effort to show that “there are no absolute property rights anywhere” he cites the taking of land by the State for a public purpose “*often at its own valuation.*” (The italics are mine.)

In so reasoning Mr. Spargo is either ignorant of, or ignores, the fact that by Article V of the Amendments to our Federal Constitution, the Federal Government is forbidden to take private property for a public use, “without *just* compensation.” (The italics are mine.): and that by the XIV Amendment, the State Governments are forbidden to deprive anyone of his property “without due process of law”: and that “due process



of law," in connection with the exercise of the power of eminent domain, has been held by the Supreme Court to involve "just compensation." Furthermore, he is either ignorant of, or ignores, the fact that the question of whether or not the compensation offered by the State is "just" is one reviewable by the courts; and that if, upon such review, it is found to be inadequate, the property cannot be taken. The recognized power of eminent domain, coupled as it is to-day (whatever it may have been in the past) with the Constitutional obligation on the part of the State to make "just" compensation for the property taken, instead of amounting to a denial of the existence of absolute property rights, is the strongest kind of affirmance of them.

If the Socialists reply that such Constitutional provisions, laws and judicial decisions are bad laws, it may be pointed out that such a reply begs the question: that it is mere assertion unsupported by evidence or sound argument; that the burden of proof in support of it rests upon the Socialists and that they have failed or neglected to support it. The exercise of the power of eminent domain, like the power of the State to forbid the use of property for certain purposes or under certain conditions, is but an instance of a power essential to it in the discharge of its fundamental right and duty to promote and to protect the general wel-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



as a matter of expediency, it would be advisable to compensate such owners, he was in doubt as to whether such compensation should be full or only partial. And, upon being questioned by someone in the audience as to whether the Government might not take them over without any compensation at all, replied in the affirmative, and added that there was ample precedent for so doing in Lincoln's Emancipation Proclamation, freeing the slaves. The meeting at that point being resolved into a forum, I was afforded the opportunity to point out the utter fallacy of the analogy: to indicate that whereas in the case of the freeing of the slaves, although the former owners were thereby divested of their ownership, that ownership was not transferred to, or vested in, any other person or group of persons (not in any legal sense can a man be said to be an owner of himself) while in the case of the proposed taking over of the railroads, the ownership would be taken from those in whom it was vested and vested in others; that whereas the effect of what was done in the one case was absolutely to wipe out a title and ownership which had previously existed, the effect in the action proposed would be to continue the title and ownership in being, but to transfer it to others than those in whom it had previously been vested. To this the speaker replied that he was unable to see any real distinction between the two cases.



But Mr. Stokes is not alone among those prominent in the Socialist ranks who should be stronger in their powers of logic than to use this utterly false analogy. In his book, *Socialism As It Is*, Mr. W. E. Walling, in answer to the question which he himself puts, "How far shall existing vested rights be compensated?", quotes Mr. H. G. Wells as follows: "And as for taking property from the owners, why shouldn't we? The world has not only in the past taken slaves from their owners, with no compensation or with meager compensation; but in the history of mankind, dark as it is, there are innumerable cases of slaveowners resigning their inhuman rights." We see here both Mr. Walling and Mr. Wells guilty not only of the illogicality committed by Mr. Stokes, but of the further one of confusing a purely voluntary resignation or extinction by slaveholders of their inhuman rights, with a compulsory transfer to others of rights not held to be inhuman by any, other than Socialists. These illustrations of fallacious reasoning among Socialists can be multiplied without limit by anyone who cares to examine their literature or listen to their addresses; but because they are typical, and because they are taken from the utterances of those standing high in Socialist circles, they will serve to indicate how great is the necessity for careful analysis of all Socialist argument by those who would not be deceived.

To summarize: we have seen (1) that although it is not true that Labor has been wrongfully deprived of the means of production, the Socialists, nevertheless, make this the basis of their argument in support of the doctrine of expropriation of the means of production and distribution by Labor; (2) that Mr. Spargo's argument in support of his assertion "that there are no absolute property rights anywhere" is unsound, because the limitations placed upon the exercise of those powers amounts to the strongest kind of affirmance of property rights; (3) that Mr. Spargo's suggested analogy between the governmental exercise of its powers of taxation and eminent domain, and the proposed expropriation by Labor is altogether false, because of his failure to recognize the fact that the powers of taxation and eminent domain can be exercised only in behalf of the general public, while the power of expropriation would be exercised solely in behalf of a special class; (4) that the argument based upon the legislative freeing of slaves is unsound because of the failure to distinguish between the absolute extinction of ownership and the transfer of ownership; (5) that the same error vitiates the argument based upon the voluntary freeing of slaves by their owners.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE SOCIALIST PROGRAM

THE non-socialist who attempts to present the Socialist program and propaganda is invariably attacked by Socialists as wilfully or ignorantly misrepresenting their position. It is not expected that the present effort will escape such criticism, especially as in a volume of this size and character it is necessary, as far as possible, to eliminate frequent and lengthy documentary quotations, and to ignore many distinctions which are the subject of heated controversies within the movement itself. It cannot and will not be denied that there are very real differences in the teachings of the othordox Socialists, the State Socialists, the Guild Socialists, the Syndicalists, the I.W.W., and the Communists. But to one outside the movement these differences appear to lie rather in the methods which these various Schools advocate for the accomplishment of Socialism, and the extent to which its more fundamental principles should be carried, than in the fundamental principles themselves. That is, they seem to



indicate the lines of demarkation between the Right, Centre and Left of a single movement rather than separate and distinct movements.

For instance, they all urge the development and intensification of the "Class Struggle." They all agree that Capitalism and the wage system are responsible for most of the economic evils, real or imaginary, of which they complain. They all agree that Capitalism and present forms of government, in so far as they represent or foster Capitalism, must be abolished. They all agree that the means of production and distribution must be taken out of the hands of private Capitalists. They all agree that the governments of the future, whatever their form, and whatever powers they may exercise, must be in the control of the workers. They differ as to the ways and means to be adopted for the abolishment of present governments: as to the extent and methods of expropriation of the means of production and distribution, that is, not only as to what and how much shall be expropriated, but also as to whether or not compensation shall be made to present owners, and if made, as to the form and amount. They differ also on the question of who shall be vested with the title of the properties to be expropriated, whether it shall be the State, the workers as a whole, or the workers in the several industries. They differ widely as to the form of government to be

established and the powers which government should exercise.

Lest this be thought by Socialists to be an unfair statement of the situation, I take the liberty of quoting at some length from *Socialism in Thought and Action*, a very recent book by Harry W. Laidler, Secretary of the Intercollegiate Socialists Society, who certainly is not open to the charge of misrepresentation. "Most Socialists," says Mr. Laidler at page 161, "have very distinct views as to the methods, which, in their opinion, the workers should pursue in their onward march toward Socialism.

"These views have, throughout the history of the movement, divided Socialists into separate camps. In the days of the first International, the question of tactics gave rise to a heated controversy between the Marxists, who depended on political and industrial action, and the anarchists under Bacounin who inclined toward violent methods. Later, in Germany and elsewhere, controversy waged over the relative desirability of the opportunistic tactics of Bernstein and his Revisionist School, and the no-compromise tactics of Liebknecht, Kautsky and others. Then came the syndicalist wave, with its emphasis on industrial action, and its scorn of parliamentarianism. Of recent years, with the outbreak of the Russian Revolution, and the development of the Soviet state, there has appeared

throughout the world a wide cleavage on tactical grounds between the moderate Socialists who were largely represented at the International Socialist Conference at Berne, and the Socialists of the Left wing, who are inclined to give their adherence to the so-called Third International, formed at Moscow in the Spring of 1919."

This passage may be properly regarded as an authoritative acknowledgment by Socialists that all the movements above referred to, and even the Communist movement under Lenine in Russia, are but phases of one and the same thing, Socialism. This being so, no Socialist, whatever may be his particular School, is in a position to maintain that the tenets of any other School are not Socialism. Any widespread politico-economic movement is bound to have within it factions with more or less divergent views on matters of policy, but this does not give to any one faction the right to claim that its views alone represent the movement. The test of whether a faction can rightly claim a place in the movement is whether its ultimate goal is essentially the same as that of all other factions. This fact Mr. Laidler has evidently grasped, and holding the high place which he does in Socialist circles, he is in a position to speak with an authority binding upon all others within the movement who lack the courage to face the consequences of the admission which he makes.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



a means 'of keeping alive the burning ideals of revolution in the hearts of the people.' ” In a note, Mr. Laidler points out that “the word revolution, as used in *most socialist literature*, does not connote a violent overthrow, but merely a change from one system to another.” (The italics are mine.) He continues:

“On the industrial field, Socialists should strive to organize the workers into industrial unions, as opposed to trade unions, and should particularly agitate in the key industries. They should constantly educate the workers in the value of ‘mass action,’ and should especially stress the power of mass demonstration and general strikes.

“The workers, the extreme left insists, should also form local and national workingmen’s councils or soviets. When the psychological moment arrives *they should seize the industrial and political machinery, transfer the power from the bourgeois political state to the proletarian state formed on the basis of workingmen’s councils, set up a temporary dictatorship of the proletariat, permit only those engaged in useful work to have any voice in the management of the newly formed state, arm the workers and suppress the bourgeoisie.*

“The proletariat should then proceed to ‘develop a workers’ control of industry, *expropriate the banks, confiscate the railroads and all large organizations of*

*industry—providing, possibly, for small investors,—and then advance in the direction of a complete communist-socialism.* When that condition of society will have been attained, all citizens will be producers, classes will have disappeared, the dictatorship and coercive measures will have ceased, and the political state (used in the Marxian sense) will have passed into memory.” (The italics are mine.)

Having thus summed up the program of the Left he turns to that of the more moderate Centre and Right, which he presents as follows:

“On the other hand, the moderate Socialists feel that the workers should adopt a different line of tactics: They should organize into independent parties of workers by hand and brain, into trade and industrial unions and into working class co-operatives. On the political field they should join a workingman’s party connected with the *international* Socialist and Labor movement and work persistently for the success of the political movement of the workers. Socialists who are elected to office should fight for measures calculated to give the workers more power and physical and intellectual strength, to the end that the mass of producers may become more effective in their fight for a higher civilization. At the same time, and primarily, legislators should use their vantage ground to educate the people in the principles of socialism and should



beware of concentrating their main effort on small reforms which it is the interest of non-socialist reformers to advance. The workers should continue their struggle at the ballot box for the control of the machinery of government, until their aims are achieved.

“In the meantime, socialists should, wherever possible, strengthen the economic wing of the labor movement—the trade and industrial union—and should conduct an educational campaign for the purpose of persuading the workers of the advantages of close co-operation between existing unions, and, particularly, of the necessity of industrial unionism. They should urge the producers to fight not only for higher wages and shorter hours, but for a larger share in the management of shop conditions, for a new status in industry, and for complete industrial democracy. They should also teach the value of the general strike, and other legitimate mass movements for political and social ends, when these movements are properly planned and timed.

“Socialists and workers generally should do their part in the development of the co-operative movement. Co-operation provides a valuable training ground in industrial management, decreases the profits of the middlemen, and oftentimes is of great assistance during strikes and during the transition stages. In connection with all of the activities, furthermore, a strong

educational work should be conducted. All of these movements will give to the workers, during their period of struggle, a training in industrial and political citizenship which will prove invaluable to them when they finally secure control of the government of the country.

“After obtaining control of the government through the vote of the electorate, the socialist movement should see to it that the political machinery is made as responsive as possible to the desires of all the people, and, most moderates claim, should insist on universal, equal and secret ballot, and other democratic safeguards. A minority would favor methods more akin to the soviet idea. The movement should then proceed to the socialization of industry. All industry cannot, of course, be socialized at once. . . .”

“While it is thus impossible to socialize all industry at once, the moderates believe that industry should be taken over as rapidly as it is possible to provide adequate administrative machinery therefor, and are of the belief that, when the consciously directed will of the community is directed toward a social end, progress cannot only be rapid, but safe as well. While they are divided regarding the procedure for the socialization of industry, the majority are inclined to the belief that, if socialization occurs during times of comparative quiet, *some form of compensation will*

*probably be devised. On this question there has been a shift to the left during the past few years."* (The italics are mine.)

This summary, while moderate as might be expected, coming as it does from a Socialist, is frank and honest. And a careful examination of the writings of other leading Socialists will establish its accuracy in all major details. Its very moderation makes it particularly valuable as revealing the almost certain results of the final establishment of Socialism. It will be noted, as already suggested, that the chief points of difference between the radicals of the extreme Left and their more moderate comrades of the Centre and Right is in the methods which they advocate for the attainment of their common end: that while the Moderates advocate parliamentary methods and a more or less gradual course of transition, the Radicals spurn such means and all temporizing, and urge a violent *coup d'état* at the first opportunity, followed immediately by the introduction of their entire scheme for the reorganization of society and of the State.

The fact that of late years there has been a decided trend toward the Left, while this is deplored by the Right and by the more moderate elements of the Centre is of the greatest significance, for there is every indication that this trend will tend rather to increase than to diminish, and that ultimately this wing of the



party will represent the real driving force of the movement. With this in mind as a decided possibility, not to say probability, we may well consider somewhat in detail certain of the points suggested in the program of the extreme Left set out above.

It will be borne in mind that no distinction is drawn between governments. Republican governments like those of England, France and the United States are no more acceptable to the Radical than the more autocratic forms of former European states. With respect of one and all, the Radical apparently proceeds on the assumption that under them the workers are excluded from all participation and practically all political rights. He ignores the fact that there is, and for a long time has been, an ever increasing and more effective representation of the laboring classes in all legislative bodies. He repudiates the fundamental idea that a legislature should, so far as possible, recognize and endeavor to advance and harmonize the many and varied interests of the community or state as a whole. And, because the interests of the toilers are not advanced to the exclusion of all others, inveighs against class government. However, it will be noted that it is not class government as such that he objects to, but only government by the so-called Capitalistic class. He regards all existing governments as Capitalistic. Ignoring all that has been done, and is being done by these govern-

ments, largely, though not wholly, through the influence which the representatives of Labor exercise in their legislatures, he regards them solely as instruments in the hands of Capital for the oppression of the masses. It will be noted that he repudiates the democratic principle whereby all classes and interests in the State are given a voice, and all are given a vote in its legislative assemblies in such proportion as they respectively bear to the whole, and proposes to set up a government exclusively controlled by Labor: one which permits "only those engaged in useful work to have any voice in the management." And to make such a government secure in its control he would "arm the workers and suppress the bourgeoisie."

A glance at Russia is all that is necessary to reveal what would be the effect upon the average member of our present order of the establishment of such *régime*. Such reference to Russia is not open to objection on the part of Socialists. It is a fact of most sinister significance that throughout the world, Socialists of all shades and degrees, Right and Centre as well as Left, have maintained an aggressively sympathetic attitude toward the great experiment. Those who have not openly and actively approved and furthered Lenine's program, have resented criticism of it. Those who have not advocated, and do not now advocate his practices, have condoned and excused these, or, in the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



banks; confiscate the railroads and all large organizations of industry—providing, possibly, for small investors,—and then advance in the direction of a complete communist-socialism.” The proceeding in the direction of a complete Communist-socialism can mean nothing less than that, not only the large organizations of industry are to be expropriated, but the lesser as well: that is, all industries in which there is now the relation of employer and employee, and, therefore, according to Socialist doctrine, the exploitation of Labor. In the expropriation of the banks and the confiscation of the railroads and all large organizations of industry (and as we have just pointed out, small organizations as well) provision is possibly to be made for small investors. On this possibility of compensation or provision Mr. Laidler in a note beginning on page 167 gives some interesting and illuminating Socialist ideas.

“Most socialist leaders,” he says, “prior to the war advised compensation of one form or another in the taking over of industry, *not so much as a matter of right, but as a matter of expediency*. Those who believe that industries should be confiscated declare that the Capitalists have confiscated the earnings of the workers and the products of the soil for years, and that confiscation would simply mean ‘the expropriation of the expropriators.’ ” (The italics are mine.) It will be noted that here again comes in the old Socialist fallacy

that Capital has confiscated the earnings of Labor, from which it is argued that Capital has no claim to compensation as of right in the event of expropriation. But to continue: referring to methods of compensation, supposing it to be deemed "expedient," Mr. Laidler tells us that, "Some Socialists favor giving the Capitalists an annuity terminable within a reasonable period; others favor the issuance of bonds with a decreasing rate of interest, and with the ultimate repudiation of the principal or the payment of such principals in instalments, while still others advocate compensation based on the real value of the property, relieved of its water. Most Socialists contend that the government, on transferring industry from private to public ownership, should raise as much money as possible from such forms of direct taxation as inheritance, income, and land values taxes. Kautsky dwells on the difficulty of evading taxation on incomes under a system where the government has issued bonds to private owners.

From these statements it appears at first glance that with certain Socialists there is a fair-minded disposition to deal honestly with the owners if, and when, their properties are expropriated. Such, at least, is the impression derived from the suggestion that for compensation the government issue bonds, the principal of which is to be paid off in instalments. But such

a suggestion must be taken in connection with further details. And in this connection Kautsky's suggestions are extremely significant, since he holds a place high in the councils of Socialism and his teachings are held in the highest regard by Socialists of the Centre throughout the world.

Kautsky is among those who favor the issuing of government bonds by way of compensation to present owners when their properties are confiscated, but of how real value such compensation would be to the recipients with the government in the absolute control of the Socialists may be judged from the following summary of his position, quoted by Mr. Walling in his *Socialism As It Is*, page 431. "As soon as all Capitalist wealth had taken the form of (government) bonds, it would be possible to raise a progressive income, property and inheritance tax, to a height which until then was impossible. . . . It is a well-known fact that the higher the tax the greater the efforts at tax dodging. But when a condition exists where any concealment of income and property is impossible, even then we would not be in a position to force the income and property tax as high as we wish, because the Capitalists, if the tax on their income or property pressed them too closely, would simply leave the State. . . . The situation is completely changed, however, when Capitalist property takes the form of public debts.



. . . The tax would then be raised as high as desired without the possibility of tax frauds. It would then also be impossible to escape taxation by emigration, for the tax could simply be taken from the interest before it was paid out. *If necessary it might be put so high as to be equivalent, or nearly so, to a confiscation of the great properties.*" (The italics are mine.) The same idea underlies the propositions, to give to the Capitalists an annuity "terminable within a reasonable period," or to issue bonds "with a decreasing rate of interest, and with the ultimate repudiation of the principal." We encounter it again in an address before the Students of University College, as far back as October, 1907, delivered by Mr. Bernard Shaw, to which Mr. Arnold-Foster calls attention in his book, *English Socialism of Today*. Mr. Shaw may be said to represent the views of the Fabian Society, and cannot, therefore, be called a radical of the Left, and yet, in speaking of the socialization of the land, he is reported to have said that the landlords should of course be fully compensated for the land of which they are deprived, but that the compensation should be obtained by taxing them at least 19s. in the pound.

Mr. Laidler has admitted that of late years the trend has been toward the Left. We will accept the word of an authority on the subject as justifying the conclusion that if and when Socialism becomes an accom-

plished fact, the *régime* established will reflect the program and ideas of the Radicals of the extreme Left rather than those of the more moderate Centre and Right, and that those peoples who may be so unfortunate as to suffer such a change are destined to pass through experiences differing, if at all, only in degree from those through which Russia is passing to-day.

In the present hour of the world's misery and discontent, there is an ever-growing number of those who look with sympathy on Socialism. Without analyzing them, they accept the fair promises of the Socialists of a happier day if and when Socialism shall be established. Deeply moved by a sense of injustice in the present order, they see, or think they see, in the Socialist program a real and permanent cure for all our present social and economic ills. They do not pause to consider whether the suggested cure may not be worse than the disease. The idealism of the movement attracts and holds them. They fail or refuse to recognize that theory and practice always may be, and frequently are, two very different things, especially when theory is based upon false premises, or ignores constant and fundamental factors. Those who are so moved would do well to remember certain all-important points with regard to the Socialist program, namely:

(1) That though there are several Schools of Socialism, these various Schools are but part of one

and the same movement, constituting its Right, Centre and Left; (2) that these Schools are all looking forward to and working for the attainment of substantially one and the same goal; (3) that this ultimate goal is revolution, the overthrow of the existing economic and political order; (4) that to effect this, while the Right and more moderate Centre advocate parliamentary means and a gradual transition; the more Radical Centre and the Left advocate violence and a complete and immediate transition at the psychological moment; (5) that it is admitted on high Socialist authority that the trend within the movement is toward the Left; (6) that, whether this be so or not, Right, Centre and Left, all contemplate the ultimate expropriation of all private Capital now employed in production and distribution, not to include exchange as well; (7) that this expropriation will most probably be effected without compensation to present owners; or if with compensation, the compensation will ultimately be taken in the form of confiscatory taxes; (8) that only the more moderate elements of the movement advocate anything like a democratic form of government; while the more radical elements (and be it remembered the trend is in their direction) advocate the total exclusion of the Bourgeoisie from all political rights; (9) that these same elements advocate the arming of the workers for the total suppression of the



bourgeoisie; (10) that the situation in Russia under Leninism may fairly be taken as indicating what this would mean, and as showing what would be the final destiny of society under a Socialistic *régime*; (11) that the suppression of the Bourgeoisie means the absolute and utter ruin of all who now make a living in any of the processes of production and distribution involving the employment by them of others for wages.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



probably much greater in the early stages of the movement than it is to-day. The reason for this lies in the fact that it is on an intellectual plane far above that of the average Proletarian. As it is the Proletarians of all peoples, however, that Socialism hopes to enlist in its support, its appeal must be presented to them not only purged of all lengthy and wearisome argument, but in such form as to excite their desires and stir their emotions. In other words, while the Philosophic type of propaganda is calculated to draw to the movement individuals possessed of a certain kind of intellectual ability, who may further it as leaders and as propagandists, this type is wholly unsuited for reaching the intellectually untrained masses from whose numbers the leaders of the movement hope to recruit its rank and file.

As this type of propaganda is almost always in the form of books far larger than the present volume or in lengthy pamphlets or articles, and as its chief purpose is to convince by protracted and fine-spun argument, it is impossible adequately to illustrate it in the present discussion of the subject. But one who cares to examine it can, without taking up the works of French, German or Italian writers, either in the original or in translation, gain a very fair impression of its nature from reading almost any of the works on the subject by such American authors as Spargo, Hill-



quit or Laidler; or by such English authors as W. E. Walling, H. G. Wells, or George Bernard Shaw.

One who undertakes the reading of such works will find them for the most part serious and restrained in their treatment of the subject. Though they continually refer to the coming Revolution and discuss ways and means for hastening its accomplishment, it will be found that the word is used generally only in its broad sense, that is, as meaning nothing more than a complete overturn of the existing order, not at all necessarily by violence. In fact, it will be found that most writings of this type reveal a distinct opposition on the part of the author to violence in any form, or for any purpose. Thus, while they advocate Revolution, they urge its accomplishment by evolution. The thoughtful and discriminating or critical reader will find the logic in such works frequently tinged with emotionalism. This, however, is not to be wondered at, for emotionalism is an important, not to say a dominating, factor in the make-up of every Socialist.

Such a reader will not have gone very far before he realizes that while the authors are accustomed to stress the lessons of history, they overlook many of the oft repeated, and therefore, the most important of those lessons: lessons which reveal the constant presence and the potency of the human factor: instincts and frailties which are inherent in human nature itself.

For instance, they constantly and consistently ignore such instincts as the parental, the acquisitive, the possessive, and the proprietary: such frailties as the love of power, the fear of power, the tendency to abuse power, the facility with which an individual persuades himself, or a group persuades itself that what he or it wants it is right that he or it should have, not to mention jealousies, animosities and hatreds, individual and collective, due to conflicts of interests real or imagined. I say that they wholly ignore these human factors. I should, perhaps, rather have said that they ignore the fact that they are fundamental in human nature itself; for they recognize and condemn them in the present order, but they seem to regard their existence as an effect of that order, rather than as something entirely independent of it, and therefore, largely, if not wholly its cause. This inference is inevitable after a study of the order which they propose as a substitute, for in the development of their scheme they proceed as though it were entirely unnecessary to take even the slightest account of these same instincts and frailties. Their whole argument, in short, is based largely upon the false assumption of the perfectibility of human nature through a change of social, economic and governmental environment. It is worth noting in this connection that Lenine seems to have perceived this weakness in the position of the philoso-

phical Socialists, for he is reported on one occasion to have said, in substance, that the Class Struggle can never end: that the present expropriators of the Bourgeoisie will themselves in turn inevitably become a new type of Bourgeoisie, who, in turn, will have to be overthrown by the everpresent Proletariat, and so on indefinitely. The accuracy of this prophecy is confirmed, not only by the course of events in the French Revolution, as we shall see in Chapter VIII, but by the more recent events in Russia.

It may be true that the number of converts made by this type of propaganda to-day is relatively small, when compared with the number made by other types. But it must be remembered that the trend within the movement is toward the Left, and that every convert, potentially at least, is a unit of strength added to that wing of the movement. In spite of such logical fallacies as have been pointed out in Chapters II and III, there are and always will be, even among the educated, certain individuals who are easily persuaded by such arguments: individuals incapable of detecting half truths, false analogies and false, because incomplete, interpretations of history; individuals, in short, for whom the speciousness or sophistry of an argument in no way detracts from its persuasive force. This being so, although this type of propaganda may still be of no little value in calling attention to real defects



in our present order; in so far as it seeks to persuade that Socialism is the cure for those defects, it should be subjected to the most careful and searching analysis and exposure by all who understand the real errors of Socialism, and the general ruin and misery that its triumph would involve.

When we turn to the Emotional type, we again find that it is very difficult to give specific examples. Like the intellectual, it almost always appears in rather lengthy articles, and its force lies rather in the general tone of the article as a whole than in any single or specific statements contained in it. It is frequently encountered in the editorial columns of so-called journals of opinion of radical tendencies, and in speeches and letters to the press, protesting against measures adopted by the Government to protect the great mass of law-abiding society from disorder and violence incident to the furthering of some *cause*. It rarely, if ever, contains statements which are themselves violent or seditious. But it manifests an unbounded sympathy for those engaged in making such statements. It magnifies their untiring efforts on behalf of the workers, their generosity, the hardships they endure in their unselfish devotion to suffering humanity. It invariably refers to all prosecutions and punishments as persecutions, if those convicted of violating the law did so in the course of attempting to further their cause. It

always refers to capital punishment in such cases as murder or assassination.

Two or three illustrations, which happen to be rather brief, taken from the report of the Hearings before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, in the second session of the Sixty-Sixth Congress, on the charges made against the Department of Justice by Louis F. Post and others, will serve to illustrate this. In 1908, when the activities and utterances of the noted anarchist, Emma Goldman, were under general condemnation, there appeared in Mr. Post's own magazine the following, reprinted from an article in her defense by Mr. Hall: "With many of her views I do not agree, but I have known Miss Goldman for about 10 years, and I know no one who is kinder, more unselfish, or broader minded; and withal she has an indomitable courage both in word and deed. Her home and her slender earnings are always at the disposal of the poor, the oppressed and the unpopular." This was a most unblushing attempt to hinder the Government in its fundamental duty to protect the public from violence and disorder consequent upon the preaching of such doctrines as those of Miss Goldman and her associate, Alexander Berkman. It was an attempt to divert public attention from the real nature and menace of their teachings and activities by an appeal for sympathy in behalf of martyred virtue.

As much might be said for many an amiable burglar. To be sure Miss Goldman is an Anarchist and not a Socialist, but this bit of propaganda in her behalf differs in no whit from that which is being poured forth in behalf of those who run counter to the law in their misguided efforts to advance the cause of Socialism.

Another illustration is found in an editorial by Mr. Post himself, under date of February 25, 1905, on the assassination of the Russian Grand Duke Sergius. It reads in part as follows: "He who loves liberty and hates oppression, whosoever and whatsoever he may be, will approve or condemn the assassination of the Russian Grand Duke Sergius (if he would be logical) according to his principles regarding forcible resistance. . . . If the assassinations of such men as Sergius caused for the purpose of suppressing the commonest liberties may be approved or passed lightly over, how can his own assassination be condemned? If the civil war against oppression, in which armies meet in combat and thousands must die by violence, may arouse enthusiasm, why should the kind of civil war which selects assassins themselves for assassination excite terror? For this is civil war, and if any homicide can be just at all, if it can be useful at all, then must such homicide be useful and just. The non-resistant may with propriety denounce it, but men of





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Another form which this Emotional type of propaganda assumes is an attitude of persistent faultfinding, not only with existing conditions, but with every effort private or public to remedy those conditions, excepting always, of course, efforts which are being made by the Socialists and their sympathizers. Existing institutions, governmental and economic, are pictured as breaking down, and in their fall as threatening to carry with them civilization itself. The brutalities of the Capitalistic system are likened to those of the German Armies in France, Belgium and Serbia. The condition of the masses is likened to that of the peoples in those unhappy countries. Representative Government is pictured as in utter collapse, or a mere travesty of what it purports to be. Two short passages which appeared in *The Public* at the time of the strike of the silk workers in Paterson, N. J., admirably illustrate this attitude. The first of these, referring to the conditions which prevailed in the city at the time, contains the following: "Could industrial conditions possibly be worse if the professed anarchists had their way and all coercive government were abolished? Think of it." The second reads as follows: "The law is the protection of society, say the jurists and statesmen. Protection against whom? Against those who have nothing. It is a protection to the rich against the poor, a protection of the few against the many. The rich

need the law and use it without having to feel its weight; the poor support the law, but cannot use it. The poor are beneath the law, while the rich are above it. Those who are above the law do not feel its burden. To them it can be no burden. They are free. Their will is not restrained by the law, nor are their acts circumscribed by it. They are beyond it and above it and have no concern with it. They are exempt from the law; they are anarchists.”

Of exactly the same nature is the following, taken from the *New York Nation* of Feb. 7, 1920: “The arbitrary arrests of individuals on trumped-up charges, the breaking up or surveillance of public meetings, the censorship of mail and of the press, the maintenance of an army of Government spies and secret agents, the ousting from office of persons duly elected according to law because of membership in a political party which the Government has put under the ban, the torturing of prisoners, and the wresting of justice by administrative officials and the courts, have reached a point where little more is needed to precipitate a revolution.” Again of the same nature is a passage which appeared in the *New York Nation* just after the trouble at Centralia, Washington, when the Armistice Day Parade was attacked by members of the I.W.W. and four persons were killed. The *Nation* commented on the event, in part as follows: “The country is reaping what it



has sown; it has been teaching millions how to kill. It has expounded the doctrine that the way to punish a fellow you do not like was to apply 'force without stint' to him, and we are now witnessing the private application of the doctrine on a large scale. The most lawless continue to be judges and district attorneys and law officers generally."

These passages, like so much of the Socialist propaganda, illustrate both the emotional and the inflammatory types. In their unqualified assumption of the universal and utter venality of legislatures and courts they all but approach the hysterical. By unqualified antithesis of rich and poor they make an unblushing appeal to envy, hatred and passion. Undoubtedly, there are numerically many instances where both legislatures and courts have been respecters of persons, but when compared to the great mass of cases where these branches of Government discharge their respective functions with skill and integrity, they are relatively very few.

Yet another characteristic of this type of propaganda is its apparent assumption that loftiness of aim, or purity of motive prompting to an otherwise criminal act purges such act of all criminality. This attitude of mind has been strikingly manifest in criticisms of the Government for prosecuting those who attempted to evade or obstruct the draft, or who otherwise attempted





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



tion. This type of propaganda is most commonly found in the so-called journals of opinion of radical tendencies, above referred to, and because of the pseudo-respectability which attaches to such publications is most successful in confusing, where it does not actually deceive, the casual or indiscriminating reader. Those engaged in it discourse at great length on the ideals of liberty for which our fathers fought and died. They argue that freedom of speech and of the press are the *sine qua non* of free institutions. They point with the grand gesture to the Constitution of the United States with its guaranty of freedom of speech and of the press. Every effort of the Government, State or Federal, to protect society from the dangers attendant upon the preaching of sedition and violence calls forth from them a torrent of lamentation and foreboding. In every such instance they see a departure from the high idealism of the Fathers, and a step toward the final abandonment or destruction of all popular institutions. They discover in it a great conspiracy on the part of Capital, through the governments, "which they hold in absolute control," to throttle and suppress the legitimate longings and aspirations of the masses. They charge the Government, and such of the press as support it, with attempting to set up a *régime* similar to that in Russia under the late Czar.



This attitude toward free speech and a free press is but a single phase of an attitude toward the much broader problem of liberty and free institutions in general, and, therefore, should be considered in connection with it.

Probably at no time in the history of the world has there been so widespread and so keen an interest in the problems of free government as during and since the Great War. But, as is inevitable under such conditions, much of the thinking on the subject has been, and still is, confused and muddy in the extreme. Among those guilty of this kind of thinking and utterance, the radical Socialist propagandists of the emotional type are among the most conspicuous. It may be added, that frequently, because of their respectability, they are also among the most dangerous to those very institutions in support of which they purport to speak. With them the word Democracy has become a thing to conjure with. They fail utterly to realize that democracy is but one of many forms of politically organized society, and can hope to operate successfully only when it adheres and gives effect to the fundamental principles of the science of politics. Carried away by vague and glowing conceptions of liberty and equality, they fail to grasp the basic fact that if a Democracy is to be preserved from degenerating into anarchy, its citizens must be as fully subject to its laws as they

would be under any other form of state. This error is due not only to the emphasis which they place upon liberty and equality in the democratic state, but to a total failure to apprehend the true meaning of these terms in relation to government in general.

In government, liberty and law go hand in hand. Where there is no law there is no liberty. Take away the law, and every man is at the mercy of his fellow, with the advantage always to the strong, while society is reduced to a state of anarchy. The word liberty, therefore, in connection with Democracy, as well as in connection with any other form of government, means liberty within the law. The same is true of the term equality. It does not mean that the citizens, either individually or in groups, are on an equality with the duly constituted officers of Government, legislative, executive and judicial, in the matter of exercising the privileges or performing the duties of their respective offices. Nor does it mean that every citizen is, or should be, cut to the same social and economic pattern and measurement. What it does mean is that each citizen shall be on exactly the same footing with his fellows : first, in the performance of such political acts as are permitted to citizens by their Constitution; second, in his ability to hold office under the Government; third, in his ability to seek and to obtain legal redress in the courts, without discrimination or favor;





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



of the principle, or its applicability to cases of incitement to violence, where such incitement is the act of an individual or a group, moved by motives of personal hatred, greed or revenge, the propagandist of the emotional type would persuade his readers that, when the incitement proceeds from a desire to effect some political or economic change the principle does not, or should not apply. His argument in support of this contention may be summed up as follows: A distinction, it is said, should be made between incitement to violence by the individual or group, from purely personal motives on the one hand, and the dissemination of political or economic doctrines on the other. With respect of the latter, there should be no limitation whatsoever. The position of the radical on the matter is set forth with startling frankness and *naïveté* in an interview with Eugene V. Debs, reported in the *Appeal to Reason*, under date of April 17, 1920. The following question was put to Mr. Debs: "If it was right for Russia to suspend free speech and free press, was it not also right for the United States to suspend free speech in your case during the war?" To this Mr. Debs is reported to have replied, "No. The Russian revolution was a forward step. American participation in the war was a reactionary step. In suppressing me, because I was a revolutionist, a backward step was taken."



The speciousness and sophistry of this argument, or assertion, is well calculated to confuse many, even among the well educated. It makes the criminality of the act turn upon the alleged motive lying behind it, and on that alone. If we are prepared to admit that the alleged motive shall be the test of the criminality of an act, in other words, that the end can be shown in justification of the means, a Moslem, claiming that his intention was merely to lay up for himself treasure in heaven, could slay a Christian with impunity. One also, who conscientiously believed that he was, in so doing, benefiting his fellowmen by killing captains of industry would be perfectly justified, and perfectly safe. Incitement to violence is in no degree divested of its criminality by calling it the dissemination of political or economic doctrine. It may be the doctrine of a group that it should secure its political or economic ends by a resort to violence or by resistance to the enforcement of the law. But the Constitutional right of free speech cannot be invoked or extended to cover the preaching of such a doctrine. The preaching of such a doctrine is an incitement to violence, and incitement to violence is a crime. No man or body of men has a right to commit a crime.

The Emotionalist draws no distinction between that which may be properly described as a political or economic doctrine, and the methods advocated for securing

its adoption. He insists that anything connected with the advocacy of political or economic change is political or economic doctrine, and, therefore, within the scope of the Constitutional guaranty of freedom of speech and of the press. He argues that this right is so sacred that the people of a state acting through their duly constituted governments have no right to take any steps to prevent or forestall the violence which the radical agitator would stir up; that society can do nothing until there is an overt act of violence. In his solicitude for the integrity of freedom of speech and of the press, as he conceives it, he would jeopardize not only the rights of other individuals, but the very existence of organized society as it has been built up through the ages, not to say of civilization itself.

If freedom of speech and of the press does not mean unbridled license of each, what are the limits which should be set, and what principle is to determine where the line is to be drawn? The problem is felt by many to be fraught with the greatest difficulty. As a matter of fact it is extremely simple. The line should be drawn between utterances which advocate change by any constitutional method, and those which advocate violence or a resistance to, or defiance of, the law or the legally constituted authority in the State as a means of effecting such change. To be sure, it will always remain to apply the principle in each individual case as





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



justify a clear and rigid demarcation of the limits of freedom of speech and of the press. He who insists otherwise not only emphasizes one form of liberty at the expense of all others, but fails to grasp the very nature and essence of liberty in its broadest sense.

Before attempting to summarize the content of this chapter it would seem best to consider the two remaining types of Socialist propaganda, namely: the Dishonest and the Inflammatory, which are considered in Chapters VI and VII, when the subject as a whole can be more satisfactorily brought together in compact form.



## CHAPTER VI

### SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA—CONTINUED

IN considering the Dishonest type of Socialist propaganda, there are certain points that must be constantly borne in mind. In the first place it must be remembered that all propaganda is biased. It is always an attempt to present a cause in its most or its least favorable light, depending upon whether it is in support of, or opposed to, the cause. It is to be expected, therefore, that if the propaganda be in support of a cause, facts and arguments favorable to it will be emphasized, while those that are contra will be minimized, explained away or refuted. On the other hand if the propaganda be hostile, facts and arguments which are unfavorable or destructive will be emphasized while those that are favorable will be ignored or minimized.

This is as true of anti-Socialist propaganda as of the propaganda of the Socialists themselves. Any propagandist is under a terrible temptation to shade the truth to serve his ends. And it must be admitted that anti-Socialist speakers and the anti-Socialist press have all too often yielded to this temptation. In so

doing they have hurt rather than helped the cause in which they are enlisted, for they have lent color to the charge that they were deceiving the people. This charge is being reiterated *ad nauseam* not only by the out and out Radicals, but by writers in the so-called journals of opinion of radical sympathies. These radicals and their sympathizers in turn are overdoing the "holier than thou" form of attack, for in seeking to create the impression that conservative press and platform are utterly venal and untrustworthy they, themselves, are descending to the very thing they condemn in their opponents.

This whole matter was admirably discussed in an article entitled "Propaganda and the News" by Mr. W. J. Ghent, which appeared in *The Review* under date of May 1, 1920. No one outside of radical circles can accuse Mr. Ghent of being a reactionary. His record belies the charge. Not only his sympathies, however, but his wide experience as a journalist lend great weight to his opinion on the subject. He closes the article referred to as follows: "As a constructive radical, I should prefer to believe that the greater virtue of practice, no less than of precept, is to be found in at least some of the organs of radicalism. But long experience and a reasonably close application to the subject compel me to say that, in this matter of the manipulation of the news, the radical journals are





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



further from the truth than those who rely on the Conservative. When it is borne in mind that the Radical press devotes a far greater proportion of its space to propaganda than does the Conservative, it will be seen that the situation is indeed serious.

If we turn from the press to the platform it is even more so. Among the better educated, and therefore the more conservative elements of the people, the platform, as a means of education, has been almost entirely supplanted by the press and the library. Among the less educated, the wholly illiterate, the foreign born, the incompetent, the discontented and the idle on the other hand, the platform still is among the most powerful, if not actually the most powerful, agency for the propagation of ideas. For every one reached by the conservatively constructive forces of society by this means, there are literally thousands reached by the Radicals.

Keeping this situation before us, let us now turn to an examination of some of the Socialist propaganda of this Dishonest Type. Since for the past two years Socialists all over the world have been looking with the keenest interest to the great experiment in Russia, it is not surprising to find many instances of falsification with regard to the true situation in that unhappy land. The Socialist would persuade his audience that here is being worked out the salvation of the



masses. The number of illustrations must, of necessity, be limited, but they are all, with one or two exceptions, either taken from authentic Socialist publications, or are a matter of such common report as to require no specific citation. The exceptions are taken from government documents.

In 1919, the Rand School of Social Science published a pamphlet by Albert Rhys Williams entitled, *76 Questions and Answers on the Bolsheviks and the Soviets*. In a brief introduction Mr. Williams is described as a war correspondent who “went to Russia and for fifteen months lived in the villages with the peasants, in the Red Army with the soldiers, and in the industries with the workers. He knew the people, as well as Lenine, Trotzky and all the others. . . . In the Foreign Office of the Soviet Government he helped prepare the propaganda which was sent into Germany to stir up the revolution.”

The first question in the pamphlet reads, “What is the present government of Russia?” To this, reply is made, “An industrial Republic, the first government of the working class in the world, owned by the workers and for the workers.” Two other questions and answers immediately following should be considered in connection with this one. They read as follows: “What is the form of government in Russia?” “It is a government of Soviets.” “Is it true that the

Soviets do not allow everyone to vote?" "It is true at the present time. The exploiters of Labor, idle people living off interest, members of the Czar's family, criminals and the insane are not allowed to vote in Russia. The Soviet slogan is 'A vote for everyone who works.' " . . . "Even at present 95 per cent in Russia can vote, while in the United States only 65 per cent can vote."

Now, even at the time when Mr. Williams was in Russia, there were reports coming from those who were equally well advised which were quite to the contrary on all the points which he here sets forth with such finality. These were invariably branded by the Socialists as Capitalistic lies. Attention was called to the fact that they were all made by those who were opposed to Socialism, and who had, therefore, certainly misrepresented conditions for the purpose of discrediting the great movement with the peoples of other countries. In this connection it is illuminating to bear in mind the statement quoted from the introduction to Mr. Williams' pamphlet, namely that: "In the foreign office of the Soviet Government he helped prepare the propaganda which was sent into Germany to stir up the revolution."

Within the past year, numerous individuals and committees representing Labor organizations in England, Germany and Italy, each and all ardent Socialists or





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Independents into the Third International at Moscow. The article is reprinted in part in the *New York Times* in its issue of November 22, 1920. The testimony of both these observers, neither of whom can be charged with having approached their task with anything but a sympathetic attitude of mind, is an absolute and sweeping negation of Mr. Williams' statements. Dr. Guest and Herr Dittman both assert in the strongest terms, and support their assertions by evidence, that the Government of Russia is an absolutely close corporation. It is a government by the Communist Party, under which none but Communists have any political rights whatsoever. "But," says Dr. Guest, "the Communist Party is not a party like the Labor or Conservative Party over here (England). It is a close corporation. To get into the Communist Party a man or woman must be proposed and seconded, and may be refused. If the candidate is accepted he is put on six months' probation and is known as a candidate for membership, this being apparently recognized as a definite status. A full member has to abide by strict rules, one of which is implicit obedience to orders." That this means something very different from what we mean by our "duty to obey the law" may be easily gathered from another part of the article in which the author is illustrating the universality and the rigidity of the party control. "On



another occasion," he says, "on being introduced to a very intelligent person, the man who introduced me said that he had told the friend 'to speak without any question of party discipline.' " Further emphasizing the Communistic exclusiveness of the government, Mr. Guest says: "The report of the ninth Congress of the Communist Party, published in the appendix to the Report of the British Labor Delegation, makes it quite clear that 'the party' (the Communist Party) is a disciplined, semi-military brotherhood which rules with an iron hand. References to 'iron' rule and analogous expressions are a feature of its wording."

To the same effect is the testimony of Herr Dittman. "The new Soviet bureaucracy and the Red Army," he says, "are controlled by the party that brought them into being and seeks to fill them with its spirit, but the Communist Party itself has not been able to develop organically along democratic lines, inasmuch as it sprang up in a minute and consists, for the greater part, of members lately (*un*) accustomed to Socialism or Communism. Only a relatively small circle of the party is educated in these subjects, and, therefore, controls the party intellectually and has established, for the safeguarding of its dictatorship, a severe military organization. Thus the leaders, Trotzky, Zinovieff, Radek, Bucharin and others, have the control in a dictatorial fashion over the Communist Party, through

the Communist Party over the Proletariat, and through the Proletariat over the mass of and therewith the assembled population of Russia." . . . "Freedom of the press, freedom of clubs and assemblies and personal freedom for all except Communists are as good as done away with."

The foregoing testimony, which none but the hardest or most fatuous of Socialist propagandists can deny or ignore, sufficiently disposes of the truth of Mr. Williams' assertions as to the form of government in Russia and its being "owned by the workers and for the workers." It would be interesting to know how widely these two reports were disseminated by the Socialist propagandists and by the so-called journals of opinion of radical sympathies which call so loudly for "the truth" on all the great social, economic and governmental problems of our day.

When we return to Mr. Williams' statements with regard to the franchise in Russia we find that they are equally untrustworthy. As already pointed out, "It is true," he says with an engaging candor, "at the present time," that the Soviets do not allow everyone to vote. "The exploiters of labor, idle people living off interest, members of the Czar's family, criminals and the insane are not allowed to vote in Russia. The Soviet slogan is 'A vote for everyone who works' . . . Even at present 95 per cent in Russia can





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



no matter how hard a man worked himself, if he employed anyone in his industry he was a bourgeois, and as such could enjoy no political rights. As to the peasants, than whom it would be difficult to find a harder working class, though under the letter of the law, they are entitled to vote, they are, as a matter of fact, forcibly excluded unless they accept the Communist doctrines in full and are admitted to the Communist Party. As the vast majority of them refuse to do this, and, therefore, remain outside the party, they are practically deprived of the franchise. This situation was testified to at the very time Mr. Williams was in Russia by many whose word was entitled to the highest respect. But their testimony was stigmatized by Socialists and all Radicals as Capitalistic lies.

On this point the articles of Dr. Guest and Herr Dittman are again of the greatest value. Herr Dittman says: "The elections to the Soviets take place publicly in meetings and the secret election is forbidden. The elections are for the most part indirect and take place under terroristic pressure, so that opposition is scarcely possible and undesirable elections are annulled." Dr. Guest enters more into detail. "The All-Russian Congress of Soviets is stage managed as are all the other pseudo-representative institutions of what Trotzky called 'the democracy of to-day.' And, as the British Labor Delegation expresses it, 'all possible means are



used to secure the dominance of the Communist Party in the elections to Soviets.' " He cites numerous examples of how this is effected, among which are the following: "In many towns opponents of Bolsheviks are forbidden to put forward candidates." "In 1918, in the *Izvestia* of July 15th, there was published an order prohibiting candidates belonging to Socialist parties other than the Bolshevik being elected to the central executive committee." "At Tula, Briank, Bersitza and Yaroslav whole Soviets have been dissolved because they were not Communists." "At the February, 1920, elections in Moscow, there was no possibility of bringing forward an opposition list of candidates, except in a few shops and factories, owing to arrangements made by the Communists. No posters or election literature and no public meetings were allowed for the opposition. Open pressure and threats of closing the factories were used to influence the voters."

"It should be remembered," continues Dr. Guest, "that all voting in Russia is in open meeting by show of hands. These meetings are arranged by the special electoral commission appointed by the local Soviet and are presided over by an *appointed* chairman, and a record of proceedings is taken by an *appointed* secretary. The arrangements give the fullest opportunity for the exercise of electoral pressure." (The italics are mine.)

Another question and answer in Mr. Williams' pamphlet read as follows: "When the workers took over the factories and mines, did they not make any mistakes?" "They did. Lack of experience and technical skill led them to many blunders. But they learned quickly, and after a time many factories turned out more products than before." While this statement as to the economic condition of Russia under Bolshevist rule has again and again been discredited by reports from other sources no less trustworthy, it is not necessary to rely upon such reports. Official Bolshevist documents and articles published in the official organs of their press reveal Mr. Williams' utter insincerity, not to use a stronger term, in thus attempting to create in the minds of his readers the impression that the economic and industrial life of Russia was already on the way to a rapid and complete rehabilitation. They all testify to the utter and hopeless breakdown of the impossible system which the visionary and fanatical dictators have attempted to force upon the people.

These reports are summarized, and, in many instances quoted, in two articles appearing in issues of *The Weekly Review* for August 18th and 25th, respectively, 1920, under the caption, "Economic Collapse in Soviet Russia." I quote from the second of these articles. "The output in locomotive shops in 1919 was 40 per cent. of that of 1913, the year before





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Mr. Williams, in company with numerous Bolshevist sympathizers (and it will be remembered that with few exceptions Socialists throughout the world have been aggressively sympathetic toward the Bolsheviki) endeavors to create in the minds of his readers the impression that the present government in Russia is a pure Democracy, embodying to the fullest degree the principle of majority control. In this connection under two questions, "What do Americans think about Russia?" and "How do we know that the Soviet is the Government that the people of Russia want?" he quotes from Col. Wm. B. Thompson, former head of the American Red Cross Mission in Russia. "Russia," says Colonel Thompson, "is a government of the working men and the soldiers, of the peasants and the mechanics. . . . It is a democracy which comes as near being representative of the soil as it would be possible to find anywhere. . . . No less than 60 per cent. of the Russians are Bolsheviks." . . . "Virtually the entire population of Russia consists of peasants and industrial workers. That is the reason why the government of the Bolsheviki—*the majority*—is entirely made up of representatives of these workers." (The italics are mine.) To the same effect is a statement contained in a pamphlet circulated by *The* (New York) *Nation* attacking the trustworthiness of the press in general. The passage in point reads



in part as follows: "How many newspapers have ever carried the simple fact that the literal Russian meaning of the Russian word Bolshevism, is *the majority?*"

Now most intelligent people know, and have known from the first, that the word Bolsheviki means majority, but they also know that as used in Russia it meant merely the majority faction of a party, just as the word Mensheviki was used to indicate the minority faction. It has never been used there to indicate a majority of the whole population, as Colonel Thompson would persuade his readers when he says that "no less than 60 per cent of the Russians are Bolsheviks." The passages already quoted from the reports of Dr. Guest and Herr Dittman make it clear that none but members of the Communist Party enjoy political rights: that the party is the Government. But Herr Dittman supports previous testimony on the subject when he states that, "According to the latest official statistics of the Central Committee of the party" it numbers in the whole of Russia only 604,000 members. This out of a total population of some 190,000,000.

It would be possible to cite any number of other instances where Mr. Williams has allowed himself a degree of latitude with regard to the facts equal to that in the cases cited. But as the purpose of this chapter is not to refute the mass of false testimony which the Socialists have so industriously spread

abroad, but rather to call attention to its existence, that the public may be placed on its guard, the foregoing examples from this particular source are sufficient. If Mr. Williams had the opportunities for observation and was the trained observer which the writer of the introduction to the pamphlet would lead its readers to believe, there is but one conclusion to be drawn as to Mr. Williams' regard for the truth, to say nothing of that of the Directors of the Rand School, which circulates his pamphlet.

Socialists and Socialist sympathizers generally have done all in their power to persuade the workers of this and other countries that Russia under the new *régime* was a workingmen's paradise. It has been pictured as a place where the toilers received high pay, and were afforded full leisure for the development of the intellectual and esthetic side of their natures; a place where each could do that which he was best fitted to do, and that, therefore, which would be most congenial to him; a place, in short, where Labor was free and independent. This may have been true in the first stages of Bolshevist control, but if so it was for but the shortest of periods. Almost from the first there was the strongest kind of evidence to the contrary. The leaders soon found that their communistic theories about Labor would not work in practice. Production fell off to so alarming a degree as to come almost to





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



anywhere, the lying propaganda about the freedom of Labor in Russia continues to be circulated.

But it is not with reference to Russia alone that the Socialists and their supporters indulge in this Dishonest propaganda. Socialists throughout the world look forward to the day when all present governments shall be done away with, and they resort to any and every means calculated to discredit them with their followers and those whom they would bring into the fold. To this end they publish abroad statements with regard to the government and those in authority which in many instances are absolutely untrue, and in many others are but half truth. These half truths are often more pernicious than the out and out falsehoods, for they are much more difficult to refute. They contain just enough truth to give them color, and yet as they are presented, they create a totally false impression of the real situation. One of the commonest forms in which this type of dishonesty is encountered is where some single instance of an abuse of power occurs and it is reported in fullest details and then said to be typical of the general practice of the government or its officials in similar cases. Along this line, and for the purpose of bringing the Government of the United States into disrepute with the masses, Socialists in this country were most active in connection with the apprehension and attempted deportation of the Reds in the Fall of



1919. There has seldom been so reckless and unscrupulous a campaign of falsehood and misrepresentation as was conducted during that time. Much of it is clearly referable to a high degree of emotionalism, but this is not true of all of it by any means, and emotionalism, which allows itself unbridled license in the circulating of charges without any attempt to investigate their truth and with the manifest purpose of discrediting the Government, differs but little, if at all, from plain dishonesty.

Space does not permit of the introduction of examples of this type of the dishonest propaganda, but one who would look into the matter for himself will find many convincing and illuminating illustrations of its existence and its nature in the report on the charges made against the Department of Justice by Louis F. Post and others, at the hearings before The Committee on Rules, House of Representatives, Sixty-Sixth Congress, Second Session, Part I. This document may be obtained on application to one's Congressman.

One case, however, deserves particular attention. It is in connection with the hearings at Ellis Island in the case of Emma Goldman, preliminary to her deportation to Russia. The Socialist press and its sympathizers among the journals of opinion as well as that of the Reds in general commented on this hearing at

## 116. SOCIALISM AND AVERAGE MAN

length. It was described as a “star chamber proceeding” in which the accused was given no chance to be heard and was sought to be railroaded out of the country, in violation of all our fundamental conceptions of liberty and of her constitutional rights. Now what actually took place at this hearing is reported in the document above referred to, at pages 28 and 170, respectively. Furthermore, it is a matter of record in the Records of the Hearings conducted at the time at Ellis Island. I quote from page 28 of the Hearings before The Committee on Rules :

“Two representatives of the Department of Justice were present at that hearing under instructions to take every possible precaution to see that she had a fair trial. At the outset of the hearing, Goldman’s counsel submitted as part of the record a written ‘protest and objection’ offered by her. This was admitted, although it had no bearing upon the facts or law involved. Thereafter, on advice of counsel, Goldman refused to answer any questions and, although given ample opportunity, submitted no evidence in her own behalf. She attempted no defense. Yet her protest and objection, filed before the hearing, contained accusations of alleged unfair inquisitorial methods used at the hearing and, of course gained wide publicity.” At page 170, “Her statement was handed out to newspaper men for publication before the hearing had been completed,





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY  
BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



## CHAPTER VII

### SOCIALIST PROPAGANDA—CONTINUED

IN taking up the Inflammatory Type of Socialist Propaganda, I would again call to the attention of the reader the fact that the great Socialist movement comprises many Schools; that the test of whether any one of the Schools is Socialist, is not the means which it advocates for the ushering in of the Socialist order, but what are the fundamental characteristics of that order. I would again emphasize what has already been pointed out, that all these Schools aim at the total abolition of the existing social, economic and governmental order; that they would substitute for it one in which, without compensation, the means of production, distribution and exchange would be taken from their present owners and turned over to others; that they would totally abolish the wage system as between individuals, and that they would set up a government controlled and operated by the workers and for the workers. I would emphasize that in constantly growing numbers, the members of these various Schools are asserting that the new order can never be es-



established by any means other than a resort to armed force, and that even the mildest of them are beginning to admit that they may be "driven to this, if the Capitalist classes resist the movement." I would lay great stress upon the fact that all Schools, however widely they may differ among themselves, recognize that they stand together as opposed to the Capitalists and their supporters, and that they all vigorously oppose any and every effort of existing governments to combat the activities of any School or group. In short I would have the reader realize that the difference between the Communist Party of America, the Communist Labor Party, the I. W. W., and the Socialist Party, not to mention the divisions of the Right, Centre and Left of the various Socialist Parties on the other side, are but differences in detail, differences in method. They are all working for one common end: Socialism. That end, if and when accomplished, would in all probability fail in certain respects of fulfilling the special ideas of each and every one of the various Schools, but it would certainly give effect to the fundamental ideas common to all. And that would be Socialism.

I fully realize that in taking this position I lay myself open to attack at the hands of the members of each group or School, but unless each School is prepared to assert that the essence of Socialism con-

sists in the methods which it advocates for the accomplishment of the one common end, I cannot but feel that my position is reasonably secure. With this clearly in mind, I do not feel that the reader, or the more moderate Socialists, can maintain that in citing illustrations of the Inflammatory Type of propaganda, emanating from the more radical groups, I am guilty of misrepresenting the activities of the Socialists or the Socialist movement as a whole.

It is but natural that the propaganda of the more radical groups should be more crudely inflammatory than that of the more moderate. The Radicals for the most part put forth their greatest efforts among the lowest strata of society: the illiterates, the incompetents, the lazy, those incapable of performing any but the meanest and most poorly paid kinds of labor; the foreign born, who have come to us from lands of governmental and economic oppression and who are totally ignorant of our institutions and of the possibilities which they afford for a greater freedom. They are quick also to take advantage of any transient cause of discontent, even among the more sober and better educated elements of Labor, as in the case of strikes, when the workers are feeling the pinch of lost wages. The Moderates, on the other hand, address themselves to a distinctly better class; one which would be disgusted and alienated by the crudities and the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



If you hold your ground they will establish martial law; they will break up your meetings, raid your homes, arrest you—just as they are doing to the steel strikers in Gary now. In other words they will try to crush your spirit, break your solidarity with your fellow workers and send you back to work like a lot of beaten dogs. Will you submit tamely to all this?" . . .

"There is only one way out for the workers of America. The workers must capture the powers of the State. They must conquer the means by which the capitalist class maintains itself in power. The answer to the Dictatorship of the Capitalists is the Dictatorship of the workers."

To the same effect is the following, taken from an article entitled "Railroad Workers Fight On" which appeared under date of April 20, 1920, in *The Voice of Labor*, an official publication of the Communist Labor Party of America, and is reprinted in the Report of the Hearings before the Committee on Rules, House of Representatives on the charges by Louis F. Post and others, already referred to (see page 137 of the Report): "For a long time you were promised redress of your grievances, and you waited—you waited until this great truth dawned upon you: That the only power to force redress of your grievances is your own strength and not the good will of Mr. Wilson, Mr. Hines, or Mr. Railroad President.



“All the powers of darkness have joined hands to combat you, because they realize full well that your present revolt threatens them with disaster. These vultures understand that such a strike as yours, a strike that paralyzes the railroads, the main artery of production, a strike against the will of the union leaders, who are considered lawful because they are the servants of your capitalistic masters—such a strike deals a powerful blow to their domination.” . . .

“Do not content yourself with crumbs from the sumptuous table of your masters. Fight on for more than crumbs. Fight on for the seizure of all the means of production, all the factories and mills, all the mines and railroads. All of these belong to you. All of these are the product of your labor. But all of them were grabbed by your exploiters, the capitalists, who maintain their grip upon you with the aid of the Government.” . . .

“Create a new organization, a real working class revolutionary organization, with which you can lay hold of the governmental powers, which at present are being used by the capitalist class to enslave you and bleed you to death.”

This sort of thing, however, is not confined to the utterances of the so-called Communist groups. At a meeting held in New York, November 7, 1919, in commemoration of the establishment of the Bolshevik

Government in Russia, August Claesons, one of the Socialists later expelled from the New York Assembly, referring to our courts and judges, said: "If they are not thieves, a great many of them are receivers of stolen goods, and you can imagine—you can imagine—how much justice you can get from this bunch." In the same speech he is reported to have told his hearers that, "the American people were brutal, bestial and inferior to the Russian Comrades of the Socialists," and that, "there is no American Republic, that it is merely one huge institution, based upon fraud, and that the members of the Assembly fill their seats and sit in the Assembly with stolen property." (See Report of the Lusk Committee, page 554.) Of a similar nature is a remark made by Eugene V. Debs, in a speech at a Socialist Rally at Cleveland, March 12, 1919. "With every drop of blood in my veins," said Mr. Debs, "I despise their laws and I will defy them. I am going to speak to you as a Socialist, as a Revolutionist and as a Bolshevist, if you please." (Page 555.)

From a pamphlet, entitled *The Rights of the Masses*, published by the Socialist Party, I take the following: "Whether in a Democratic state or a Republican state, with a Democratic president or a Republican president, has there ever been a single instance that the courts, the militia, the police and every power of





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Government of the United States is so framed that those under it enjoy a degree of freedom and an opportunity for personal advancement greater than is afforded by any other government in the world. As previously pointed out, the function of government is to promote the happiness of the people as a whole, not that of any one class. And the chief problem in the performance of this duty is to reconcile the many and conflicting interests which must inevitably exist in organized society, so that each shall enjoy the greatest possible opportunity for advancement compatible with the securing of a like opportunity to the others. The right and interest of the people as a whole, that peace and order shall be maintained, places upon the Government the highest duty to use such means as it has, to guard against disturbances whenever conditions arise which indicate the probability of their occurring. Experience has all too often shown that when large numbers of men are out on strike, where feeling runs high, there is every probability that acts of violence will follow, and the government which failed to take preventive measures under such circumstances would be recreant to the duty it owes to its people as a whole. The police and the militia are the ordinary and proper means to be employed in such cases. There certainly have been instances in which the members of these organizations or those in command have been guilty of ex-



cesses, but on the other hand there have been countless instances where they have shown an almost Spartan self control and moderation.

The same may be said of our courts. It is undeniable that in some cases the courts have made mistakes. Being composed of human beings it would be strange if they had not. It is also true that in some cases they have declared unconstitutional legislation looking to the improvement of the conditions of the workers. But an examination of the cases in which the constitutionality of legislation of this nature has come before the courts, reveals that instances in which such legislation has been sustained so far exceed those in which it has been declared unconstitutional, as to render the latter class of cases almost negligible. Furthermore, it must be remembered that other classes of society, as well as society as a whole, have rights secured to them by the Constitution which the courts are bound to regard and to uphold.

A second type of Inflammatory propaganda is found in that which seeks to stir up envy and class hatred. The following examples are admirable illustrations. The following is taken from *The Rights of the Masses*, by George D. Brewer, already referred to, a pamphlet circulated by the Socialist Party. On pages 15 and 16 we read, "Let us consider the mansion that stands on the hill or avenue. It is worth, let us say, two million

dollars, and has another two million dollars worth of furnishings in the interior.

“The designs of this mansion are drawn in the brain of an architect. Physical labor drove every nail, placed every prop and column, did all the paper hanging, painting, frescoing, wood work, plastering; placed every fixture, every rug and every latch on the doors; did all the excavating and beautifying of the lawns and the gardens—in fact, did all the work, both brain and physical, in connection with this manor-house. But Labor does not live in the place that it alone has erected. Labor lives in a hovel down on the other side of the railroad yards that it also created and usually pays rent or tribute to the man who lives in the mansion, for the privilege of occupying the shack.”

“Labor produces everything. Houses, food, clothing, conveyances; necessities of all kinds and all the luxuries, and yet has practically nothing.”

“The worker functions in every activity of industrial life and in the production of wealth. The chief function of the capitalist owner is to absorb the greater





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



bought all the books they wanted, although they don't read them, but merely buy them to show off the fine bindings on their shelves and make a pretense of literary culture. They have sent their boys and girls to college, from which, if the parents were not rich and powerful, most of them would be expelled because they have been so pampered and spoiled by excessive luxury that they have become degenerate. They take their families and go trotting around the globe whenever they feel like it. They give balls that cost more than a working man's wages amount to in a lifetime. Their whole life is a ceaseless round of luxury, gluttony and wasteful extravagance."

One more illustration, which, while it does not bear the official stamp of any Socialist organization, can not be repudiated by Socialists of any stripe as out of accord with their own methods of stirring up class hatred and jealousy. It is typical of numberless such appeals to hate and envy thrown out by individuals who have come under the influence of the teachings and methods of the Socialists, and for which the Socialists, therefore, are directly responsible. The remarks quoted will be found in the Report of the Lusk Committee at page 837, and are taken from an address made by one Ouderkirk, to some three or four hundred striking mill workers, in Utica, N.Y., October 23, 1919. "It is you," he said, "that produce the nice automobile, the fine



steam yacht, the Parlor and Pullman cars, and all the wealth for the capitalists, and instead of you using them you get the second-hand bicycle and a dusty, dirty old coach, and have your sons sent to France to fight for these damned profiteers."

It requires no great powers of imagination to picture the effect of such utterances upon the minds and passions of men and women already under the strain of a bitter economic struggle, or discouraged and downhearted because, possibly through no fault of their own, out of employment or under financial pressure. It will readily be seen that minds in which such seed has been sown are well prepared to respond to the further direct or indirect incitement to violence and bloodshed.

Propaganda constituting a direct incitement to violence is the crudest of all which goes to make up the Inflammatory type, and, as would naturally be supposed, is most commonly encountered in the literature and utterances of those constituting the most radical factions of the Socialist movement as a whole. But even those commonly reckoned among the Moderates have indulged in it, and on certain occasions it has been countenanced at public meetings held under the auspices of the regular Socialist Party. And, as has already been pointed out, Socialists everywhere are bitter in their denunciation of all efforts on the part of the authorities to suppress it. Even the Moderates, there-

fore, are in no position to maintain that Socialism is opposed to violence and never preaches it.

Let us now look at a few examples of this type of Inflammatory propaganda. I quote first from the closing section of the Manifesto of the Third Communist International, adopted at Moscow, March, 1919. This Manifesto has received the enthusiastic approval of Socialists of the Left and more radical Centre throughout the world, even where, as shown in a later chapter, they have refused to join the Third International; and the Manifesto has been widely circulated. Under the caption, *The Way to Victory*, occur the following passages: "The revolutionary era compels the proletariat to make use of the means of battle which will concentrate its entire energies, namely *mass action, with its logical resultant, direct conflict with the governmental machinery in open combat. All other methods, such as revolutionary use of bourgeois parliamentarism, will be of only secondary significance.*" . . . "Now the Entente states unmask themselves as world despoilers and murderers of the proletariat. Together with the German bourgeoisie and social patriots, with hypocritical phrases about peace on their lips, they are trying to throttle the revolution of the Europe proletariat by means of their war machinery and stupid barbaric colonial soldiery. Indescribable is the White Terror of the bourgeois cannibals. Incalculable are the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



I am aware that in citing this passage from the Manifesto of the Anarchist-Communists I am going outside what may properly be called Socialist propaganda. It is inserted, however, because of the rather striking similarity which it bears to the following extract from a speech made by William Bross Lloyd at a meeting of Socialists held in the City of Milwaukee, January 12, 1919, and presided over by the Socialist Mayor of the city. The remarks, therefore, received the official sanction of the members and officers of the Socialist Party, at least of that city. Mr. Lloyd spoke in part as follows: "We know that the readier we are to fight, the bigger army we have got, the bigger navy, the more ammunition, the less chance there is for us to have to fight. So what we want is revolutionary preparedness. We want to organize, so if you want to put a piece of propaganda in the hands of everybody in Milwaukee, you can do it in three or four hours. If you want every socialist in Milwaukee at a certain place, at a certain time, with a rifle in his hand, or a bad egg, he will be there. We want a mobilization plan and an organization for the revolution. We want to get rifles, machine guns, field artillery and the munitions for it. You want to get dynamite. You want to tell off the men for the revolution, when it starts here. You want to tell off the men who are to take the dynamite to the armory doors and blow them in, and capture the guns



and ammunition there so that the capitalist won't have any. You want to tell off the men to dynamite the doors of the banks to get the money to finance the revolution." (In Lusk Committee Report, pages 553 and 554.)

If the Socialists, in spite of the fact that the above remarks were made at a Socialist meeting, still object that they can not be cited as illustrating Socialist propaganda, on the ground that Mr. Lloyd has been convicted and sentenced for his activities as a member of the Communist Party of America, let them do so. Such objection, in the light of the other attendant circumstances, will carry but little weight with thinking people. No such objection, however, can be raised with respect to the writings and utterances of Mr. Victor Berger, twice elected to the United States Congress on the Socialist ticket. Writing in the *Social Democratic Herald* of Milwaukee, Mr. Berger used the following language: "We know right well that the social question can no more be solved by street riots and insurrections than by bombs and dynamite. Yet by the ballot alone it will never be solved. Up to this time men have always solved great questions by blood and iron. Therefore, each of the 500,000 Socialist voters, and of the two million workingmen who instinctively incline our way, should, besides doing much reading and still more thinking, also have a good rifle and

the necessary rounds of ammunition in his home and be prepared to back up his ballot with his bullets if necessary. . . . Now I deny that dealing with a blind and greedy plutocratic class as we are dealing in this country, the outcome can ever be peaceable, or that any reasonable change can ever be brought about by the ballot in the end." This passage is cited by Mr. W. E. Walling, at page 241 of his *Socialism as It is*, in the chapter on "Revolutionary Politics."

As further illustrating the advocacy of violence by accredited spokesmen of the Socialist Party, I would call attention to an extract from a speech by Louis Waldman, delegate from New York to the Socialist Convention held in Chicago, in September, 1919, and cited in the Report of the Lusk Committee at page 554. Mr. Waldman was one of the Socialists expelled from the New York Assembly. "If," said Mr. Waldman on that occasion, "I knew we could sway the boys when they get the guns to use them against the capitalist class I would be for universal military training."

As typical of the sort of thing the I. W. W. is circulating among our foreign language population, a passage from an article appearing in the March, 1919, issue of *Luokkataistelu* is highly significant. This publication is advertised in *The One Big Union*, the official monthly organ of the I. W. W. as an independent I. W. W. paper. The extract referred to reads: "And





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



first instance, the Moderates, as a last resource, would precipitate a conflict of blood and iron. Preaching the doctrine of Class hatred and the Class War, they one and all, by the testimony of their accredited spokesmen are prepared to carry their doctrines to their logical conclusions.

Looking back now over the subject of Socialist Propaganda, we should note certain things regarding it. For whether we consider the attainment of the Socialist order as practicable or not, the fact remains that their propaganda for its attainment is a constant and a very serious menace to the peace and order of society. In doing this we find the following points worthy of attention: (1) There are four more or less distinct types of Socialist Propaganda; (a) the Philosophical, (b) the Emotional, (c) the Dishonest and (d) the Inflammatory. (2) The Philosophical type, though at the foundation of the whole Socialist movement, is to-day the least influential, since it is for the most part over the heads of those whom the Socialists are more actively endeavoring to reach. (3) This type, though purporting to be a serious attempt at a reasoned presentation of the Cause, is largely based upon illogicalities such as have been pointed out in chapters II and III; and invariably ignores or belittles those lessons of history which militate against the Socialist ideal. (4) It proceeds upon the false assump-



tion of the perfectibility of human nature through change of social, economic and governmental environment, and fails to grasp the fact that present institutions are largely the result of factors in human nature which are fundamental and constant. (5) The fundamental idea of the Emotional type of Socialist propaganda seems to be that society consists of good poor men on the one hand, and bad rich men on the other, for (6) it seems to regard the interests of the masses as the only interests worthy and legitimate to be considered and furthered by government. (7) Consciously or unconsciously it repudiates the fundamental conception of Democratic institutions, namely: that the interests of each class of society are entitled to the protection of the State in so far as is compatible with the legitimate development of the respective interests of all other classes, or those of society as a whole. (8) It regards all legislative measures designed to protect the interests of Capital as necessarily designed to oppress Labor; and considers all modern governments as nothing more than instruments in the hands of Capital for holding Labor in slavery. (9) It substitutes emotionalism for reason and sentimentality for justice to the point of making the motive prompting to an act the test of its criminality. (10) It confuses liberty with license to the point of ignoring the fundamental principle that one man's liberty ends where

another's begins. (11) When we turn to the Dishonest type of Socialist propaganda we must remember that all propaganda is biased, and this is true of anti-Socialist as well as of Socialist propaganda. (12) We must remember also that the members of the reading public generally confine themselves to journals with whose ideas they are thoroughly in harmony. (13) We must remember, however, that the Radicals are much more industrious in circulating propaganda in support of their ideas than are the Conservatives, both through the medium of the press and from the platform. (14) A careful investigation of the subject will show that, in the matter of falsifying or garbling the news, the Radical press is no better than the Conservative, while in the opinion of some, whose judgment is entitled to great weight, the Radical press is in this respect the great offender. (15) This Dishonest propaganda has of late concerned itself most actively with regard to the great experiment in Russia, seeking to persuade the workers in all lands that the situation there was little short of a workingman's paradise. These reports, however, have been proven false again and again not only by the testimony of other Socialist observers coming direct from Russia, but by official Bolshevist documents, and articles published in the official Bolshevist press. (16) It also constantly aims at discrediting with the masses our present governmental, social and economic insti-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY  
BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



this type of propaganda by playing upon the jealousy, greed, and passion of the masses, aims to stir up class hatred, and suspicion and hatred of all existing governments and all governmental authority, and to arouse them to the point where they will attempt the overthrow of the present order in a bloody and obliterating Revolution.



## CHAPTER VIII

### THE SOCIAL REVOLUTION

WE have seen that the broad end and aim of Socialists is to effect a Social Revolution : to abolish once and for all what they call the Bourgeois State and Bourgeois Society, and in their place erect a State in which the Workers alone shall have voice and vote ; and in which class distinctions shall no more exist. We have seen that with some it is the hope to accomplish this by a process of gradual change, by parliamentary means and an active and ceaseless propaganda aimed at educating the people to an understanding and appreciation of Socialist ideals ; but that with an alarmingly increasing number there is a disposition to demand an immediate transition, effected by force of arms. Within the last four or five years this call to the Proletariat to unite in direct action to bring about the Revolution has become more and more frequent and insistent. It forms the principal theme of nearly every Socialist address, and almost all current Socialist literature. It is emphasized in many instances to the practical exclusion of all other aspects of the move-

ment. One searches almost in vain for any even of the essentials of the *régime* to be established. The glory of the struggle and the ultimate victory so confidently predicted are the all absorbing topic. It, therefore, well behooves us to examine into the nature of this proposed struggle with a view to ascertaining what would be its inevitable effect upon the security and happiness of the average man or woman.

Fortunately we are not left to our imaginations. History has painted the picture for us. We have not only the spectacle of Russia before our very eyes, but the strikingly similar experiences of France from 1789 to 1795. To be sure, the history of the Russian Revolution is yet to be written, but its principal features are already a matter of common knowledge outside Socialist circles. Within those circles all its blunders and incompetencies, its deceptions and hypocrisies, its fantastic theories and dogmas, its official robbery and slaughter, even its obliteration of civilization itself, count as nothing in the balance as against the uprising and the *alleged* emancipation of the Proletariat. But, since the history of these dark days in Russia has not yet been written, and lest the Socialists charge that a case has been built up on Capitalistic lies, let us turn to the French Revolution, which, before the overthrow of the old *régime* in Russia, was eulogized by Socialists as pointing the way to the Social Revolution. And let





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



enjoys and exercises are not the patrimony or the prerogative of a privileged class.

The Socialist, on the other hand, looks at the whole matter from a different angle. He too draws his inspirations from the great events of the Revolution, but rather from the events themselves than from the results which have come down to succeeding generations, in the form of more Democratic institutions. For the Socialist, the glory of the Revolution lies in the fact that for a few months political and economic power was exercised by the Proletariat to the practical exclusion of all others. In every other respect the net result was merely the establishment of the rule of the Bourgeoisie, something altogether disappointing and undesirable. For him, the methods employed by the radical leaders of the various factions, which in rapid succession found themselves in control of the situation, are all important. There is, to be sure, here and there mild condemnation of some of the grosser atrocities of the Terror, but more often there is a manifest inclination to justify them as necessary to secure the ends of the Revolution, and as being really no worse than what governments have always resorted to to maintain their authority. This is hardly to be wondered at in the light of what has been shown in my previous chapters on Socialist Program and Propaganda.

The first active step in the Revolution was taken



when the members of the Third Estate withdrew from the States-General shortly after it had been convened by Louis XVI at Versailles, May 5, 1789. But the stage had already been set. Economically, France was in a desperate state. For a decade she had suffered a series of poor harvests, culminating in the summer of 1788 with an almost total failure of all crops. Crowning this, the following winter was one of unprecedented severity. The peasantry in the country, and the workers in the cities alike were reduced almost to the point of starvation, while the Court and the Nobility continued to indulge themselves in an endless round of luxury and extravagance. Intellectually, old ideas, religious and political, had been thoroughly undermined by bitter and relentless criticism from many an able pen, among the most poignant of which was that of Voltaire. While the writings of Rousseau and his followers, with their glowing pictures of the State of Nature, in which freedom and happiness were assured to all, had taken strong hold upon the imaginations of men and women long accustomed to the anxiety and pinch of poverty and distress.

It is not my purpose here to attempt a chronological summary of the chief events of the five years following the meeting of the States-General above referred to. I propose rather to take up certain features of the struggle which have received the approval of the

Socialists, and see what inferences are to be drawn from this approval, and what their bearing is upon the problem with which Socialism confronts us to-day. In doing this, as already stated, I shall, for the most part, take the record of the facts as they are set forth by Mr. E. Belfort Bax in his little volume, *The French Revolution*. Mr. Bax is a Socialist as well as a historian, and his Socialistic tendencies temper all his writings. This little book on the French Revolution was originally published in 1889 in serial form in *Justice*, the weekly organ of the Social Democratic Federation, an English organization of the more Radical Socialist type.

According to most authorities, the chief ends of the Revolution in the minds of its leaders, throughout its course, were political. Economic action, except possibly during the period of the Commune, was of importance only as it tended to promote Freedom. According to Mr. Bax, however, whereas originally primarily political, from the 10th of August, 1792, on, its character changed. "The political revolution," he says, "suddenly became transformed into a revolution one of whose objects at least was greater social and economical, as distinguished from political, equality." "The Commune may be taken as the representative in the Revolution of the proletarian interest, pure and simple. Though the circumstances of the time caused it





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



discoverable only in the common terror. Fraternity appeared as brotherhoods of hate, conspiracy and crime. But let us examine somewhat in detail certain of these points.

No one can read any accredited account of the Revolution without being impressed with the factional strife which characterized it throughout. These factions were to be found not only in the Assembly (the constitutional legislative body), but in the extraordinary Committees which grew up, and in the powerful political Clubs. These Clubs in particular were the centres of plots and conspiracies without number. The Assembly was constantly under pressure of threats and actual force. From the middle of August, 1792, it was wholly subject to the will of the Commune (the revolutionary body in control of the City of Paris), which at the end of two years had become entirely subordinate to the Committee of Public Safety. The climax was reached when this once powerful Committee became, in term merely, a rubber stamp for Robespierre and his little circle of intimates. This narrowing and concentration of power in the hands of those advocating and employing ever more radical methods is one of the most sinister lessons of the Revolution for all who are not themselves in sympathy with the ideals and practices of the Radicals.

Let us turn first to the question of property rights.



One of the first things done by the Assembly after the fall of the Bastille, July 14, 1789, was to draw up the Declaration of the Rights of Man, in which the sacredness of private property is affirmed in the strongest terms. But the events which immediately followed and which continued throughout the course of the Revolution show conclusively of how much value such paper guarantees are when those possessed of Communistic or Socialistic ideas are in control of government; and indicate beyond all question what would happen to-morrow should the Socialists come into power. In spite of the declaration in favor of private property, confiscations commenced almost immediately. These began with the lands of the Church and of the emigrant Nobility, but soon were extended to all kinds of property. With the land, the original idea was, not that it should be held by the State, but rather that it should be redistributed among the landless, at a price easily within their reach, and upon the easiest terms of payment. This scheme, however, never came into general effect, and though some of the land was sold, it passed to foreigners and speculators in large blocks. The great bulk of it remained in the hands of the State, a theoretical security for the enormous issues of paper money to which we will refer later on.

Of these confiscations Mr. Bax tells us: "The first property to be sold was that of the Church. . . .

The sales began in 1789, and the period of greatest activity was from August, 1790, to January, 1791."

Shortly after the overthrow of the monarchy in the fall of 1792 "it was decided that the lands and property of the emigrant aristocrats which now came into the market should not be sold hap-hazard and *en masse* like the ecclesiastical property, but should be duly apportioned into small lots, which the small cultivator might hire or purchase on easy terms."

"During the winter '92-3 the movable effects of the 'emigrant' came into the possession of speculators and jobbers by means of sham sales. So flagrant was the abuse, that the Convention had to step in, but without much effect. After the fall of the Girondists," June 2, 1794, "the partition of the lands among the peasantry was again definitely ordered. . . . Exceptional measures were the order of things all round, and comparatively few small transfers were affected. This did not prevent the confiscation both of lands and movables of the nobles and suspects going on at a greater pace than ever. But it was various agents of the Government in the departments who made vast fortunes out of them by their clever manœuvring. Two-thirds of the houses in Paris were now 'national property.' The Convention decreed that 'goods' to the value of one milliard should be reserved for the citizen soldiers returned from the wars. This milliard,





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Legislative Assembly conceived the happy idea of making these lands security for an issue of assignats. This plan was put into operation the following month, with an initial issue of 400,000,000 livres. Before it was superseded by the Convention in September, 1792, it had issued 1,800,000,000 livres. This, however, was but the beginning. The Convention, the new legislative body of the Republic, which began its sessions September 21, 1792, and which was wholly under the domination of the Commune, far surpassed this. In spite of the fact that experience had shown the Church lands to be of little value as security, because of the difficulty of realizing on them by way of sale, the Convention, within a period of three years continued to flood the country with paper, until by the end of that time its issues amounted in the aggregate to the truly appalling sum of 7,250,000,000 francs. And, in spite of the most savage regulations with regard to those who refused to accept them at their face value, they had depreciated 99 per cent. With the pre-existing issues of livres, aggregating 1,800,000,000, not to mention the "forced loans" exacted of all who were believed to be possessed of wealth, it can be seen to what a state the finances of the country had been brought with the Government in the hands of the Proletariat, in its turn, under the benign leadership and guidance of a group of inexperienced and fanatical leaders.



“This,” Burke truly remarks, “is the finance of philosophy.”

The Law of Maximum, September 17, 1792, “by means of which,” Mr. Bax tells us, “at a stroke, the starvation and misery previously existing were allayed,” deserves attention because of the enthusiasm which he and many another Socialist manifest for it. “The Law of Maximum,” he continues, “enacted a fixed price for bread-stuffs, above which it was penal to sell them. To avert the possibility of the dealers refusing to sell at all, it was made compulsory upon them to do so. They were, moreover, obliged to furnish accurate accounts of their stock, which could, if desirable, be peremptorily ‘checked’ by the authorities. The law was subsequently extended to all the necessities of life.”

Again the parallel with the situation created in Russia under the Bolshevist *régime* is most startling. It is highly probable that the Bolsheviki themselves do not know the exact amount of paper money they have issued. But in spite of the fact that many months previous thereto, it was practically worthless, as late as October, 1920, they were turning it out at the rate of thirteen tons a day, with the result that a pocket full of wire nails possessed a purchasing power far in excess of as many paper rubles. They have, by legislation and administrative decrees, established maximum

prices for practically everything, but with no avail. Prices have risen to unbelievable heights, and contraband traffic and speculation defy all efforts to check them. Measures intended to compel sales at the fixed prices have resulted either in the concealment of stocks of supplies on hand, or the cutting down of production to the actual needs of the producers themselves. The whole situation proves conclusively, if further proof were necessary, that legislation which ignores fundamental human instincts is in the end impotent.

“The Law of Maximum and the progressive income-tax,” says Mr. Bax, “are the only two measures of a directly Socialistic tendency which have ever been practically applied, and they were applied with complete success. And yet it is strange that at least the first of these measures, when proposed now-a-days, is viewed by many Socialists with indifference, not to say suspicion. . . . Those who have triumphed over the old-fashioned bourgeois fallacies of the wickedness and inutility of interfering with the sacred laws of political economy by direct legislative interference with freedom of production, still wince at the notion of direct legislative interference with freedom (so-called) of exchange.”

Mr. Bax's confident assertion that the Law of Maximum was applied with “complete success” is in regard to a matter of fact concerning which there





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



price of coal, to take but one instance. And the Administration was obliged to raise the price fixed, in order to secure the necessary production. The same has been, and still is, the case in Russia. The peasants refuse to plant crops in excess of their personal needs, where they know that any excess above those needs will be taken at a price artificially fixed, to say nothing of their being required to accept in payment money not worth the paper on which it is printed. The laws of political economy, which Mr. Bax, in common with so many Socialists, holds so lightly, emanate from, and are dependent upon, human nature, fundamental human instincts, desires and frailties; and unless, and until, human nature changes, the laws of economics, though they may temporarily be set aside, will always and relentlessly reassert themselves. In the course of centuries yet unborn human nature may undergo profound and far-reaching changes. But that, as yet, we differ little from our savage ancestors, when once the restraints of ordered authority are removed, has been depressingly demonstrated in the years of tragedy through which civilization has passed since August, 1914. If Socialism is ever destined to succeed it can and will be only when human nature has undergone changes of which there is little or no indication to-day. The changes must first come, Socialism is impotent to effect those changes.



Another aspect of the Social Revolution which should challenge the attention of the Average Man is its methods of administering justice. On this point the French Revolution, as well as the more recent events in Russia, give us some very illuminating hints as to what would happen with the coming of the Social Revolution. We are accustomed to the administration of justice by judges trained in the law, sworn to do justice according to the law, and presiding over courts organized with the sole purpose of securing by every means possible an impartial determination of the controversies coming before them, whether civil or criminal. Every conceivable means is employed to secure to the parties an impartial hearing: Jurors suspected of bias may be challenged. Evidence calculated merely to prejudice the court or the jury may be excluded. The right to summon witnesses in one's own behalf by compulsory process is secured by law, as is also the right to cross-examine opposing witnesses. The writ of habeas corpus insures a reasonably prompt determination of guilt or innocence in all criminal actions. Bail is permitted in all but the most aggravated crimes of violence. In short, every precaution is taken to prevent a miscarriage of justice. That there are occasional miscarriages of justice can not be denied. Human nature is not infallible, and all human institutions are destined to fail on occasions. But, as pointed

out in a previous chapter, when compared with the vast number of cases both civil and criminal which are daily being handled by our courts with justice and impartiality, the number of those in which the result reflects partiality and injustice is almost negligible. And yet the vehemence with which Socialists of all hues inveigh against our courts leaves no room for doubt that with the coming of the Social Revolution the entire system would be swept aside, and in its place would be set up tribunals and a procedure modelled after those of the French Revolution or Soviet Russia. I am, of course, speaking now only of the days of the Revolution. What would be the nature of such judicial tribunals as the Socialists might establish after securing themselves in power it is doubtful if they themselves know. Certain it is, they have never committed themselves on the point.

Let us now see what were the conceptions and practices of the leaders of the French Revolution as to justice and its administration. Certain aspects of the subject will be revealed when we come to consider The Terror, but the following can not be overlooked, for again they are astonishingly like the ideas and practices of the Bolsheviki, and it must be remembered that with few exceptions the Socialists throughout the world have resented all criticism of the Bolsheviki. At the outset, there seems to have been a real effort to





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



committees, were charged with the enforcement of the Law of Suspects."

Although this statute did not do away with regular formalities at an ultimate trial, it at once became an instrument of persecution directed against all who were charged, with or without cause, of harboring sentiments in any way out of sympathy with the Commune, and became at once an instrument, not only of public, but of private enmity. The prisons, already crowded, were unable to accommodate the unfortunates who were now brought to them, and it became necessary to utilize other buildings. Many of those taken in this new net were never brought to trial, and remained in custody until released at the end of the Revolution, or by death.

Space permits of the consideration of but one other enactment revealing the conceptions of justice and judicial administration held by the leaders of France's Social Revolution. As the Terror developed under Robespierre the Revolutionary Tribunal became impatient of the delays incident to regular trials under the Law of Suspects, and at the dictation of Robespierre, was passed one of the most outrageous laws that ever stained the statute books of a state calling itself civilized. It was the famous Law of Prairial 22 (June 10, 1794). By its terms, Mr. Bax tells us, "persons sent before the revolutionary tribunal, now



divided into four sections, were refused the right of defense. This meant, of course, that whereas before about one-third of those accused were acquitted, henceforth all prisoners were condemned, when nothing else could be alleged against them, on the general and vague charge of 'conspiracies in the prisons.' Men and women were now tried by the public prosecutor, Fouquier Tinville, and the judges of the Tribunal, in batches of fifty or sixty at once. It would be a mistake to suppose that it was chiefly the well-to-do that suffered. On the contrary, out of 2,750 victims of Robespierre, only 650 belonged to the upper or middle classes. The tumbrils that wended their way daily to the Place de la Revolution and afterwards to the Faubourg St. Antoine, were largely filled with workingmen. During the last three weeks of the tyrant's rule, 1,125 persons were executed in Paris alone. *Thus did this criminal monster drown the Revolution itself in the blood of his victims.*" (The italics are mine.)

Mr. Bax's horror that the slaughter should have extended to the workers reveals very clearly the Socialist attitude towards all elements of society other than the Proletariat. In other words, butchery is all right so long as its victims are the upper classes or the Bourgeoisie, but all wrong if it touches the workingmen. That this idea lies back of Mr. Bax's condemnation of Robespierre is evidenced by his comparison of him

with other leaders in the Revolution. "What Robespierre desired," he says, "was in short, a Republic of starched, middle-class prigs, of which he himself was to be the type. The Herbertists," upon whose downfall Robespierre had become supreme, "especially men like Chaumette and Anacharsis Clootz, whatever their faults may have been, at least desired a change better worth fighting for than this. Their instincts were Socialistic though their ideas may have been vague, as they could scarcely fail to have been a century ago, when the 'great industry' had hardly begun."

Disquieting as these aspects of the Social Revolution may be they are mild compared to the policy of terrorism, which has developed not only in Russia, but which became the official policy in France, as power passed more and more into the hands of the Radicals. We will, for the most part allow Mr. Bax to tell what happened in the latter country.

In the winter of 1789, "in defiance of local authorities and guardians of the peace, bands ranging up to three or four hundred and more formed themselves all over France, seized and plundered granaries, religious houses, stores of all kinds, entered public buildings in the name of the people, destroying all legal documents (justly regarded as the instruments of their servitude) which they could lay their hands on, proclaimed the local dues and taxes abolished, summarily put to death





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



moment. Beforehand it would have seemed preposterous that 'an undisciplined mob' could take a fortress and paralyse the efforts of a reaction possessed of a trained army. Yet so it was.

"It is needless to say the moral effect of the popular victory throughout France was immense, every town becoming henceforth a revolutionary centre in the sense of possessing a definite revolutionary organization."

In August, 1792, Paris was threatened by the Prussian army. "In a conference between the Ministry and the recently formed Committee of General Defense, Danton," the leader of the Commune of the City of Paris, "boldly urged, as against a policy of waiting or of open attack, that one of terrorism should be adopted, first to intimidate the reactionary population of the city, and through them that of the whole country. 'The 10th of August,' said he, 'has divided France into two parties. The latter, which it is useless to dissemble constitutes the minority in the State, is the only one on which you can depend when it comes to the combat.' The timid and irresolute Ministry hesitated; Danton betook himself to the Commune. His project was accepted. The minority had indeed to fight the majority. Domiciliary visits were made during the night, and so large a number of suspected persons arrested, that the prisons were filled to over-



flowing.' (Compare this with the activities of the Bolsheviks.) . . . "About two o'clock the next day," September 2d, "the great bell or *tocsin* was sounded, the call-drum or *générale* was beaten along the thoroughfares, the famous September massacres were at hand. Danton in presenting himself before the Assembly to detail the measures that had been taken (without its consent) for the safety of the country, gave utterance to his celebrated *mot*:—'*Il faut de l'audace, de l'audace, et toujours de l'audace*' (we must have boldness, boldness, and always boldness)."

"Herewith began the summary executions, as they would have been called had they been done in the interests of 'established order' by men in uniform, or massacres, as they have been termed since they were effected in the interests of revolution" . . . "The matter originated with the destruction of thirty priests who were being conducted to the Abbaye. The prisons, about seven in number, were then visited in succession by a band of some three hundred men. Entrance was demanded by an improvised court, which, once inside, with the prison-registers open before them, began to adjudicate. The prisoners were severally called by name, their cases decided in a few minutes, after which they were successively removed nominally to another prison, or to be released. No sooner, however, had they reached the outer gate than

they were met by a forest of pikes and sabres. Those who were deemed innocent of treasonable practices, and were 'enlarged' with the cry of '*Vive la nation!*' (Long live the nation), were received with embracings and acclamation, but woe betide those who were conducted to the entrance in silence. Upon them the pikes and sabres at once fell, in some cases veritably hewing them to pieces." Again, compare this with the massacre of prisoners by Bolshevist soldiers and sailors.

Among those killed at this time was the Princesse de Lamballe, a friend and maid-of-honor to Marie Antoinette. "Arrived at the gate, her head was struck off, and her body stripped and disembowelled. A Sans-culotte (one of the Proletariat) subsequently boasted of having cooked and eaten one of the breasts of the princess." . . .

"The princess's head, with others, was paraded on a pike through the streets and under the windows of the 'Temple' where the queen was confined. The summary executions or massacres (according as we choose to call them) outside the prisons, continued at intervals from Sunday afternoon to the Thursday evening. Probably about 1,200 persons in all perished." Other authorities put the number considerably higher.

"There is no doubt that the principal actors in these events were either under the orders, or were at least





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



all who resented his ascendancy were traitors. The death of Marat, who was stabbed by Charlotte Corday to avenge the Girondins, gave yet another pretext for terrible measures of repression. In Paris, the armed ruffians who had long preyed upon respectable citizens were organized as a revolutionary army, and other revolutionary armies were established in the provinces. (Compare this with the personnel of the Russian Red Guards.) . . . As the bloody work went on the pretense of trial became more and more hollow, the chance of acquittal fainter and fainter. The Revolutionary Tribunal was a mere instrument of State. Knowing the slight foundation of its power the government deliberately sought to destroy all whose birth, political connections or past careers might mark them out as leaders of opposition. At the same time it took care to show that none was so obscure or so impotent as to be safe when its policy was to destroy."

"In the period of fifteen months," that is, from the establishment of the Terror to the fall and execution of Robespierre, July 27, 1794, "it has been calculated, about 17,000 persons had been executed in France under form of law. The number of those who were shot, drowned or otherwise massacred without the pretense of a trial can never be accurately known, but must



be reckoned far greater. The number of persons arrested and imprisoned reached hundreds of thousands, of whom many died in their crowded and filthy jails. The names on the list of *émigrés* at the close of the Terror were about 150,000. Of these a small portion had borne arms against their country. The rest were either harmless fugitives from destruction or had never quitted France, and had been placed on the list simply in order that they might incur the penalties of emigration. Every one of this multitude was liable to instant death if found in French territory. Their relatives were subjected to various pains and penalties. (Compare this with the Bolshevist practice of taking hostages from among the relatives of those of the old *régime* in their civil or military employ.) All the property of those condemned to death and of *émigrés* was confiscated. The carnage of the Terror spread far beyond the clergy and the nobility, beyond even the middle class, for peasants and artisans were among its victims. It spread far beyond those who could conspire or rebel, for bedridden old men and women and young boys and girls were often sacrificed.”

Speaking of this period Mr. Bax says, “Meanwhile Lyons, the last stronghold of Royalism and Girondism, had fallen, and Toulon had been recovered from the English, to whom it had been surrendered. Both towns were visited with a fearful vengeance. Collot

d'Herbois who was a member both of the Commune and of the Committee of Public Safety, acting in conjunction with Couthon, the disciple of Robespierre, ordered wholesale massacres of the inhabitants of the former city in his capacity of Commissioner. . . . Lebon worked the guillotine at Arras. Freron, the Dantonist, made his holocausts at Marseilles and Toulouse, and Tallien at Bordeaux. At Nantes, Carrier, another Commissioner, inaugurated his horrible *Noyades*, or drownings, in which those suspected of Royalism or Moderatism were placed in boats with false bottoms and drowned in the Loire. In some of these cases a man and a woman were tied together naked. This was called 'Republican marriage.' The Revolutionary Commissioners or Pro-Consuls in some cases traveled from town to town carrying a guillotine with them. All these things were very infamous, it will be said, and so they were. But they were not any worse, if so bad, as the acts of more than one respectable government in '48, of the Czar in Poland in '63, or of the Versaillists in Paris in '71, events which the middle classes have complacently swallowed without indignation!" Such comment reveals an attitude of mind differing in no respect from that of Mr. Post, indicated by his remarks on the assassination of the Grand Duke Sergius, cited in the chapter on Emotional Propaganda.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY  
BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



tionary fervor gasped its last breath. The Bourgeois had conquered; the day of the Proletarian was not yet, in spite of his temporary accession to power during the great revolutionary years."

This fully bears out what was said earlier in the chapter, namely: that in the eyes of the Socialist, for Bax voices the Socialist attitude on the subject, the French Revolution was a failure, in that it did not finally establish the rule of the Proletariat. That it marked the final overthrow in France of the already moribund feudal aristocracy and the monarchical absolutism based upon it; that it gave a tremendous urge forward to Democratic ideas in other countries of Europe; that from its ashes sprang a new France, freer, more prosperous, more happy, is all discounted by the fact that supreme power did not remain with the Proletariat, that "the Bourgeois had conquered."

What has been said may afford some idea of the true character of the Social Revolution of which the Socialists talk with so much enthusiasm, and into which they would so lightheartedly plunge their fellow citizens. Let Joseph Pierre Proudhon, himself a radical French writer and political agitator of the last century, as Le Bon quotes him in his *Psychology of Socialism*, sum up the situation.

"The social revolution," he says, "could only end in an immense cataclysm, of which the immediate effect



would be to lay waste the earth, and to confine society in a straitwaistcoat; and if it were possible that such a state of things should continue only a few weeks, to kill three or four millions of men by an unforeseen famine. When the government is without resources; when the country is without commerce and without produce; when Paris, starving, blockaded by the provinces, receives from them neither money nor provisions; when the workers, demoralized by the politics of their clubs and the idleness of their shops, seek their subsistence as best they may; when the State requires the jewels and plate of the citizens to send to the Mint; when house-to-house requisitions are the only means of collecting taxes; when the first granary is pillaged, the first house entered, the first church profaned, the first torch kindled, the first blood spilt, the first head fallen—when the abomination of desolation has come upon all France—oh then you will know what a social revolution is; an unbridled multitude, in arms, drunk with vengeance and with fury, armed with pikes, with hatchets, with naked swords; with cleavers and with hammers; the city mournful and silent; the police at the threshold; opinions suspected, words listened to, tears observed, sighs numbered, silence spied upon; espionage and denunciations; inexorable requisitions, forced and increasing loans, depreciated paper money; war with neighbors on the frontiers, impitiable pro-

consuls, the committee of public safety, a supreme body with a heart of brass; behold the fruits of the democratic and social revolution! With all my heart and soul I repudiate Socialism! It is impotent, immoral, fit only to make dupes and pilferers! This I declare in the face of the subterranean propaganda, the shameless sensualism, the muddy literature, the mendicity, and the besotted state of heart and mind that are beginning to take hold on a part of the workers. I am free of the follies of the Socialists!"





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



means of production and distribution, place these instrumentalities in the hands of the workers themselves, thus putting it beyond the power of anyone to exploit his fellow, and all would live together in contentment and brotherly love. Since in such a society all would be equal, jealousy, suspicion and hatred would disappear. Man would be free to develop his creative instinct. He would appreciate the dignity of Labor. There being nothing to arouse his baser instincts, his better self would expand. He would learn the joy of service and would glory in laboring for the promotion of the interests of his fellow men.

Such has been the contention of all Utopian dreamers throughout the ages. Were it sound, Socialism would have been an accomplished fact long ago. Unfortunately for the Socialists it does not accord with human experience. To be sure, there have been in the past, and there are to-day, communities within which the principles of Socialism or Communism seem to work successfully. But, as already pointed out, within such communities the Socialistic or Communistic features are always purely subordinate to something far more important in the minds of the members. I refer to such communities as the Anabaptists and their successors the Mennonites and the New Mennonites, together with the Shakers, and also the early Christian communities. Such communities are founded and



perpetuated not because of the Socialistic or Communistic blessings which they offer, but because of the religious appeal which they make to fanatics. So long as the religious appeal persists the Communistic features follow, but when the religious appeal fails the Communistic features disappear. The early Christian communities are, of course, an exception to this rule, not in that Communism persisted, but in that although the religious appeal continued and rapidly grew, nevertheless the Communistic features disappeared. This was because they were necessary only so long as these communities were weak. As soon as they were strong enough to stand on their own feet Communism was no longer necessary. The Shaker communities in Massachusetts, New York and elsewhere are striking proof that the religious and not the Communistic appeal is their very life blood. One of their fundamental tenets being celibacy, they were dependent upon enrolling new recruits for their perpetuation. With the passing of the period of intense religious fervor and fanaticism, although they held as firmly as ever to their Communistic ideals, these communities have been unable to recruit new members and are rapidly dying out. In other words, outside of economic and social visionaries and fanatics and their dupes, Communism and the Communistic features of Socialism are able to offer no effective appeal. But there are always present

in organized society vast numbers who easily become the dupes of any and every fanatical theorist. Herein lies the danger to organized society.

In reply to the foregoing line of reasoning, the Socialists always assert that the reason why Socialism has never endured where it has been attempted is because the conditions have never been satisfactory. In spite of the fact that many Socialistic and Communistic communities have attained a very high degree of prosperity so long as these features of their life have been supported by a marked religious enthusiasm, they contend that their ultimate failure has always been due to the fact that they were not their own masters; that they were forced to operate under adverse conditions, surrounded and hampered by hostile Capitalistic regulations; or that, as in the case of the French Revolution and in Russia to-day, they were brought into being as the result of an exhausting struggle which had paralyzed the economic life of the people. We are very fortunate, therefore, in being able to examine an experiment in Socialism in connection with which none of these adverse factors played the slightest part.

During the early nineties of the past century, Australia was passing through an economic crisis of unprecedented severity. Throughout the previous decade credits had been enormously extended. Retrenchment was an absolute necessity. At the same





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



of Labor. At the time of the crisis referred to he was editor of a radical Labor journal in Brisbane. With fanatical zeal he took up the cause of Labor. An ardent disciple of Karl Marx, it was only natural that he should point to Socialism as the panacea for all the ills of the Masses. Not only through the columns of his paper, which had a wide circulation in Labor circles, but through pamphlets and tracts he preached the doctrines of his adored leader. In addition, he established free reading rooms and forums where the constantly growing numbers of the unemployed might read and discuss the doctrines of Socialism. He soon was a recognized leader in Labor circles, and constantly addressed Labor gatherings. By such means he reached not only those in the cities, but the miners and sheep shearers in the back country. Largely under his leadership the struggle became one to the death between Capital and Labor. The Strike proved so effective a weapon in all branches of industry, that before long manufacturing plants of all kinds were forced to shut down, farms and ranches were deserted, commerce was at a standstill, and the ships which had formerly carried great cargoes of imports and exports lay idle at their moorings. Labor had all but ruined Capital. But in so doing it had all but ruined itself. Instead of receiving the high wages which they had demanded and for which they had struck, the workers



found themselves unable to secure employment at any wage at all. They had succeeded in pulling down the house, or nearly so, but were like to perish in the ruins. They had in a sense won a victory, but a victory which in its consequences was more bitter than defeat. They were forced to seek such employment as was offered at wages far below those they were receiving before they began the struggle.

It takes much less time, however, to destroy than to rebuild, and although the process of readjustment had been seriously and energetically undertaken, there were inevitably large numbers who were without regular employment, or even any employment at all. Among these Lane, undaunted by the situation, redoubled his efforts in the cause of Socialism. The aftermath of the great strike in no way convinced him of the unreasonableness and folly of the exorbitant demands of the Unions, but served only to strengthen his conviction that all the ills of Labor, real or imagined, were due solely to the Capitalistic system of production. Capitalism, therefore, must be defeated. If this could not be accomplished by strikes, sabotage and intimidation, it was at least possible for Labor to withdraw in a body to some new land, and there set up a commonwealth of its own, in which, united by a common interest and ambition, each should labor for all and all for each: a commonwealth in which, because the profits of the

employer would be eliminated, each worker would receive the full value of the product of his labor, and would, therefore, soon, if not from the very start, know a degree of prosperity and comfort impossible of attainment under Capitalism.

With renewed vigor he took up the task of securing recruits for such a movement. Already high in the esteem of those to whom he addressed his appeal, his fiery oratory and persuasive pen met with a success which must have been a surprise even to him. In an incredibly short time he had secured enough followers to insure the experiment, and so confident was he of its success that he pictured to his followers, who readily accepted as gospel his every utterance, a community which because of its prosperity and happiness would shortly draw to itself thousands of eager recruits, and in time become the envy as well as the despair of all Capitalistic society. The original plan called for some eight hundred families as the nucleus of the Association, but, for reasons which will appear later, nothing like this number ever reached the promised land, though there may have been something like the number signed up.

It is impossible in this short chapter to give in full the details of the plan of organization and government. But one who cares to read further on the subject will be well repaid by studying Mr. Stewart Grahame's





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



something different from expulsion, in which latter case nothing could be recovered by the person so expelled. Other features of the compact will appear as we proceed.

While engaged in conducting his recruiting campaign, Lane had not neglected the question of a suitable place for his new state. After considering such matters as climate and economic potentialities and advantages, he came to the conclusion that South America offered the greatest promise. And of all the South American States Paraguay seemed the most desirable. At the time Paraguay was still vainly struggling to regain its former prosperity, lost as the result of a disastrous war against the Argentine, Brazil and Uruguay. It was eager to secure desirable immigrants, and was prepared to make most advantageous concessions to such as would settle within its territory. To Paraguay, therefore, Lane dispatched three shrewd and trusted emissaries. On their arrival they found the Government most cordial to their scheme, and ready to meet them more than half-way. It finally agreed, first, to hand over to them, or rather to the New Australia Association (the name adopted by Lane for his organization) free of all charges, one hundred leagues (practically six hundred square miles) of land; second, to admit free of duty "anything that the immigrants chose to bring, or desired to import later,



for their own use"; third, to transport the immigrants and their possessions by rail, free of all charge, to the point nearest to their patent; and fourth, to grant them "local autonomy, with no responsibility except to the Central Government." The only condition attached was that within four years eight hundred families should settle on the land.

This vast concession comprised some of the most desirable lands in the State. Fertile and well watered by numerous streams capable of developing abundant water power, with one large stream navigable by rafts and light draft boats which afforded connection with the railway; well wooded with large tracts of various kinds of valuable timber; with wide open stretches, affording grazing grounds capable of sustaining seventy thousand head of cattle; and with a climate rivalling that of any other country in the world for agricultural purposes; this new land offered all that could be asked by any body of pioneers who were determined by hard work to build for the future welfare of themselves, their posterity and mankind. When, in addition to such fundamental values, it is remembered that the colonists were to be politically autonomous, that is, independent of any Capitalistic governmental interference, and that when in actual operation the Association was tax free, it will readily appear that no group of colonists could in reason ask

more. And that such was the opinion of Lane's agents appears from the closing sentences of their report, quoted by Mr. Grahame at page 37: "The great settlement advantage is that from the beginning we can get fresh food, fruit and vegetables close at hand until we grow our own. We think that an acre cleared in Paraguay will produce as much as two in most countries. We feel confident that with enough capital to land, sufficient tools and food to keep us say 18 months, *it will only be sheer laziness if we don't prosper.* And starvation is impossible." (The italics are mine.) The passage thus emphasized is of the utmost significance coming, not from hostile critics, but from three chosen leaders of the Association, and serves to refute the explanations and excuses for the subsequent miserable failure of the great experiment, ever since put forward by the Socialists.

This report, which set forth, far more in detail than has been done above, the wonderful advantages and opportunities offered in the promised land, was received with the greatest enthusiasm by Lane and his followers, and had a tremendous effect in stimulating recruiting. Nor was it among the submerged tenth that its influence was greatest. Lane was shrewd enough to realize that the success of his venture depended upon enlisting the most skilled, the sturdiest, the most determined, in the movement. And so suc-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



by brotherly love, and which had adopted as its motto "each for all and all for each."

Were it not for the greater tragedy which they foreshadowed, these incidents of the voyage would be high comedy. One thing, however, should be noted. The plan of the Association called for practically an absolute Democracy in all matters of control. But the situation which developed on shipboard soon made it clear that there are certain matters to the control of which Democracy does not lend itself. Lane had foreseen such possibilities, and had wisely, though inconsistently, taken steps to deal with them. In the first place he had secured the proxies of all members of the Association who remained behind; and in the second place he had secured the suspension of the Constitution for two years, thus making himself virtually a dictator. His first clash with his followers in this capacity came early in the voyage, when there was open defiance to a decree which he had issued. Upon his threatening to resign, however, peace was restored, and the situation accepted by the members with a fairly good grace.

It will be necessary also to pass over the incidents of the arrival of the colonists in Paraguay and their reception there both private and public, as well as the account of their journey by rail and ox-cart to their future home, though there are certain incidents, which it would repay the reader to study in Mr. Grahame's



account, which reveal the fundamental workings of human nature, a factor always wholly left out of account in Socialistic dreams and promises. Suffice it to say that the pilgrims received every promised assistance from the authorities, and were enthusiastically and cordially welcomed by the populace throughout their long journey inland.

Immediately upon arrival at the place previously selected for the establishment of the first colony, the men set about building a single large hall or house, 144 feet by 20 feet. This was divided into twelve compartments, one family to occupy one compartment. This house was constructed of wood and mud as there was no stone available. As the colony numbered some two hundred and fifty souls, and as there were in this number some sixty unmarried men and a number of unmarried women, it will be seen that many were forced to put up with meager accommodations. In course of time other rough buildings were erected which served merely to protect the individuals assigned to them from the weather. It was the month of October, 1893, the beginning of summer, a season attended with much rain and tropical heat. At first the necessity of securing shelter so occupied all, that there was little time for that leisure which had been promised as one of the benefits of Socialism, but which, when later insisted upon, proved to be a veritable curse.

One and all were too much occupied to have any time for bickerings and disputes.

When the community was once roughly housed, however, and the serious work for which it had been organized was undertaken, difficulties at once began to develop. The beautiful maxim, each for all and all for each, failed to function. The theory which had made so powerful an appeal when all were closely united by real and imaginary grievances against the hated Capitalists, failed to work among the members of the Association when the bond of hatred for the common enemy was no longer present. Just as on the voyage over, the question of who should do a given kind of necessary work proved a thorny one. The industrial organization of the colony was on strictly Labor Union lines. The eight-hour day was rigidly observed, and no one was to be called upon to do work other than that properly within the scope of his chosen trade or occupation. Each individual was to receive the same compensation for his eight hours work. There was no money in circulation, compensation being given in credits at the Association store. Almost at once jealousies and suspicions reared their heads in mockery of the promised co-operation and harmony. As between the different classes of occupation, the agriculturists, toiling for eight hours in the broiling sun, felt themselves put upon in comparison with the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



tion to obey? There were certain members of the Association who had thrown into the common fund amounts greatly in excess of the minimum of £60. It was altogether contrary to the principles of the Association that this fact should make any difference in the standing of such contributors in the community, but it was strictly in accord with human nature that they should feel that they were entitled to some measure of recognition in return for their greater contribution. As all were to receive the same compensation, it was but natural that they should expect and demand that this recognition be given expression in their being allotted positions of authority and honor in the Association. Those so situated were for the most part individuals who before joining had been storekeepers and tradesmen. Within the community, however, there were many individuals who were pre-eminently skilled in their several callings, men who had been foremen and managers before leaving Australia. To such it seemed altogether unreasonable and unjust that they should be placed under the direction and control of others, wholly unskilled in their particular occupations, simply because these, being able to do so, had freely given more into the common treasury than they, the skilled, were able to. It thus happened that whether a foreman was a skilled worker, competent to direct, or was a political job holder, those



under him were discontented and jealous. Moreover, as Mr. Grahame says, "the rank and file regarded it as an intolerable insult to be 'speeded up.' " Under such conditions, and since each was paid for his eight hours and not according to the amount of work accomplished, it was but natural that production should fall far short of the potential labor power of the colony. And it was but a short time before, to quote Mr. Grahame again, "It was freely alleged by almost every colonist against some other that the latter was working less vigorously for the benefit of 'all' than he would have done in his own interest."

Thus the community, which had as its watchword brotherly love, was torn by jealousies and hatreds. How bitter and at the same time how petty these were, may be judged from the following incidents cited by Mr. Grahame: "Three men who had brought saddles (presumably expecting to be appointed stockmen) refused to lend them to the official stockmen, so that the latter had to gallop in pursuit of cattle on makeshift saddles without stirrups! Similarly a colonist who had brought a magic lantern with him refused to give his brother Socialists an entertainment, though he would exhibit it for the amusement of the natives as often as requested."

Ill-feeling ran so high and production was running so low that Lane realized the immediate necessity for

adopting measures to save the situation. He therefore took upon himself the assignment of the work to be performed. "With a stern hand he put down revolt, and punished those who disputed his decisions by setting them the most distasteful tasks. No one was allowed to absent himself from the colony without Lane's permission, and incessant grumbling became the order of the day." Human nature is the same the world over. Man is more forcibly urged by self interest than by any other consideration, whether he be living under Capitalism or Socialism. His primal instincts, the acquisitive and possessory instincts, love of power and fear of power, and the tendency to abuse power, jealousy, covetousness, ambition, distrust and hatred, are inherent in human nature and are independent of environment.

Lane himself proved no exception to the rule. Having embarked on a policy of despotism, he easily found justification for continuing it. One of the fundamental tenets of the Association was total abstinence with regard to the use of spirits. While all those joining the Association had readily subscribed to this article of the Agreement some found it particularly irksome, especially after a hard day's toil. Early in December, 1893, three members of the community visited a neighboring native village and got gloriously drunk. This was an unpardonable sin in Lane's eyes.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



the preservation of order. Although Lane, in common with all Socialist theorists and agitators, had always bitterly inveighed against the resort to such instrumentalities by Capitalistic Governments for the maintenance of their authority, he did not hesitate for a moment to invoke them in support of his own assumed dictatorial powers. The display of force which he thus brought to his assistance instantly and effectively cowed the opposition, and the three miserable victims of his fanatical tyranny, together with certain others, both men and women, who voluntarily withdrew, left the colony for which they had sacrificed so much, and went out as penniless wanderers into the wilderness. Although they had contributed all that they had to the experiment, one of them as much as £1000, they were allowed to withdraw nothing. Their contributions had been voluntary gifts to the Cause, and were not subject to withdrawal in whole or in part.

The effect of the foregoing events was what might be expected. The community was divided into hostile factions. Suspicion and hatred were the order of the day. So occupied were they with the discussion of their troubles and their fears that neither men nor women had much time for anything else. All work was practically abandoned in favor of the more serious and attractive occupation of scheming and plotting.



Finally one group, consisting of about eighty, decided to withdraw from the settlement and cast themselves upon the mercy of the once despised British Government as represented by the British Consul at Monte Video. They, at least, were convinced that whatever the evils incident to Capitalistic Government, they were less than those of the hell into which their Socialistic dreams had plunged them.

Space does not permit, nor is it necessary for the purpose of this chapter, to go into the details of the ever deepening misery of those who remained. Lane's persistence in the exercise of dictatorial powers and the ever increasing friction between groups and individuals, resulted in further expulsions and withdrawals. The situation was in no way improved by the arrival in March, 1894, of a second contingent of about one hundred and ninety visionaries from Australia, who, discounting all unfavorable reports that had come back to them from the first settlers, had eagerly embarked for the promised land. Opposition to Lane increased, and finally he resigned, and with some forty-five adult followers and their children withdrew to establish an independent colony on additional lands which he had secured from the State. The experience of this band of seceders differed in no respect from that of the original colony. Production seemed to be impossible under the benign guidance of Socialism, and both

colonies were reduced not only to the most abject poverty but were actually on the verge of starvation. And this, in a land of which those sent out to investigate had reported that one acre there would produce twice as much as an acre almost anywhere else in the world, and in which, at the very side of the destitute and starving Socialists, individuals and Capitalists were successfully extracting the bounties of nature from soil and forest, and were living in plenty.

Finally, the dwellers in New Australia, the original colony, realizing the true cause of their misery, formally decided to abandon Socialism and its empty theories, and to get back to individualism. They approached the Government with a view to securing a repeal of its grant to the Association, and a substitution therefor of individual homestead grants to the individual members of the colony. This the Government consented to. Immediately new life was injected into the settlement. As soon as it was realized that none could rely for his support upon the efforts of his fellows, and that none could be called upon or was expected to contribute of his toil for the maintenance of the lazy and incompetent; in short, as soon as it was realized that each must stand or fall by his own effort, the spirit of industry revived. The men of the colony sought work in the cities, "anywhere where good wages could be earned by a man willing





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



addition grew a great deal of fruit, vegetables and maize (for the last of which, as also for all kinds of live-stock, there was always a good market)."

It is interesting to compare certain of the incidents connected with the New Australia experiment with what has more recently happened in Russia; for such a comparison must prove conclusively, to all but the confirmed Socialist, the inherent and fundamental fallacy of Socialism. Although the two experiments were entered upon under conditions as widely different as it is possible to conceive, they exhibit the most striking similarities in operation. In New Australia the colonists enjoyed every advantage which they could ask. They practically dictated to a government, eager to co-operate with them, the conditions under which they would live. The soil was of unrivaled productivity. The natural advantages and resources left nothing to be demanded, and required only the hand of man to return superabundant rewards. The climate was ideal. The colony was practically autonomous and altogether tax free. The Central Government of Paraguay, on more than one occasion, in addition to its original grant of six hundred square miles of territory, came forward with substantial cash subsidies. The surrounding native Indians were peaceable and lazy, so that the colonists were relieved from the necessity of competing with established communities



at their doors. In addition to the splendid herd of twenty-five hundred head of cattle, granted to them by the Government, the Association was well supplied with tools of all kinds necessary for a pioneer undertaking, and had an ample supply of cash on hand in its treasury. The members of the colony were healthy, hardy, adventurous men and women, skilled in agricultural and pastoral pursuits: a picked lot, resourceful and self-confident. Surely, if Socialism is capable of success under any conceivable conditions it should have succeeded in New Australia.

In Russia the situation was wholly different. The Revolution of 1917 placed the reins of Government in the hands of a people torn and exhausted by war. Public finances were on the verge of collapse. Industry was in a state of maladjustment and upheaval. Agriculture was languishing for lack of farm labor. The people were discouraged and desperate. Any authority which might gain control was confronted with the necessity of organizing a new government, involving the reconciliation of bitterly hostile factions, while at the same time continuing the conduct of the war. By a brilliant and unscrupulous stroke a group of fanatical Marxists gained the upper hand and proceeded to establish the workingman's paradise. In spite of the exhausted condition of the public treasury, Lenine and his adherents were able to secure ample funds by the very

simple expedient of confiscating all the property, real and personal, of the Bourgeoisie. Furthermore, they had under their control, and at their absolute disposal, all the vast natural resources of the country. The Russian people, especially the peasants, are as industrious as any in the world, and the lands of Russia are as fertile. Those in control were possessed of wealth and opportunity which, were there any foundation for their theories, would have insured the success of their undertaking. And yet, in almost exactly the same space of time necessary to bring about the utter failure of the New Australian experiment, great Russia was a pitiable ruin, socially, economically and politically.

How had it come about? The answer is simple, and, to all but the confirmed Socialist dreamer, should be convincing and final. It happened because Lenine, like William Lane, and like all other Socialist visionaries, failed to take into account the human factor. In reply to the Socialists and Socialist sympathizers who attribute the tragedy of the great Russian experiment to such factors as the blockade, the war weariness of the people, the exhaustion of its treasury, the disorganization of its industry, the disruption of its transportation system, the lack of farm labor and the hostility of Capitalistic governments the world over, it is only necessary to point to New Australia, where none of these factors was present.





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY  
BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



recognize that human nature is an admixture of good and evil, and in all our plans and calculations to count on an eternal warfare within our own breasts. As time goes on, it may be that the victories of the better self will increasingly outnumber those of the baser self, but the conflict will never end, at least so far as we are now able to see. Man may be able more effectually to restrain his baser instincts, but in all probability he will never be able to eradicate them, they will always be there, and will always have to be reckoned with. The successful operation of Socialism depends upon their extinction. Therefore, Socialism is destined to failure. Many of the reforms of a social nature advocated by Parliamentary Socialists, in company with other non-Socialist reformers, may, and undoubtedly should, be adopted, but the co-operative, non-competitive, communistic society of Marx and his disciples, like the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow will never be possible of attainment.

In considering the foregoing sketch of the New Australia experiment, and the deductions to be drawn from it in connection with the greater experiment in Russia, certain important things should be borne in mind. (1) The success of Socialism depends upon the validity of the Socialist assumption of the perfectibility of human nature through a change of social, economic and political environment. (2) In New Australia, the condi-



tions were selected or dictated by the Socialists themselves: they left nothing to be desired. This was admitted by one of the leaders, who, after enumerating the advantages secured, concluded, "it will only be sheer laziness if we don't prosper." (3) The colony was entirely removed from all Capitalistic coercion or influence, and unhampered by competitive neighbors. (4) The fundamental precept of the Association was "each for all and all for each"; a doctrine which, when put into operation, it was asserted, would foster and develop a spirit of brotherliness and co-operation that would promote and insure the general uplift and happiness of the workers. (5) In spite of the fact that every material factor was favorable, and in spite of the fact that every member of the colony had risked his all on the success of the venture, and, therefore, had every motive to co-operate for its success, the doctrine failed to function almost from the moment that the colonists were removed from the real or imagined oppressions of Capitalistic surroundings. (6) Self-interest, manifesting itself in jealousies, suspicions, hatreds, petty tyrannies, factional strifes and plots of the bitterest kind, asserted itself where, according to all Socialist theories, unselfishness should have ruled, and where all should have been amity and concord. (7) Though the members of the colony were the very flower of Australian Labor, when once the stimulus of personal possession

of the rewards of personal effort was removed, the standard of efficiency of the laziest and least competent almost at once became the standard of all, with the result that the actual productive power of the community was reduced far below its potentiality, and the community found itself on the verge of starvation.

(8) This necessitated the conscription of labor, that is, the assignment of designated tasks to the workers, so that for the promised freedom there was substituted veritable slavery. (9) The capital of the Association, since it was common property and no one had any particular personal interest in it, was so neglected and squandered that in an incredibly short time it had entirely disappeared, and the Association was bankrupt. (10) Finally, when the colonists in desperation abandoned the follies and impracticalities of Communistic Socialism and returned to a sane individualism, based upon the private ownership of the rewards of personal effort, the members of the community at once began to prosper. And in almost as short a time as it had taken to bring them to ruin and despair many of them were better off than they had ever been in their lives, thus proving conclusively that their recent failure, misery and degradation, were in no way caused by adverse external conditions, but by the absolute and utter irreconcilability of their Socialistic theories with fundamental human instincts. (11) While the condi-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



# CHAPTER X

## THE FUTURE OF SOCIALISM

PROPHECIES are usually dangerous to the reputation of the one who attempts them. And almost nowhere is this more apt to be true than in the allied fields of government and economics, national and international. Marx and Engels prophesied most specifically not only the imminent downfall of the Capitalistic system, but even the manner in which it was to occur. But the trend of events since they issued their great manifesto has been quite the opposite from that which they so confidently forecast, with the result that the more intelligent and thoughtful Socialists to-day are extremely careful in their predictions. "The best laid schemes o' mice and men gang aft a-gley." Political and economic developments have a very exasperating way of upsetting the most careful and painstaking calculations. And the individual or group, which, like William Lane and his blind followers, or Lenine and his disciples, stakes all on the certainty of predicted events, courts discomfiture and ridicule, and possibly disaster. It is not my intent, therefore, in this chapter to attempt any



definite and final statement with regard to the future of Socialism, either within the movement itself, or as a political factor within the various civilized states of the world.

While, however, it is the height of folly to make unqualified predictions as to the course of human events, true wisdom dictates a policy of preparedness based upon an examination of future possibilities. The general, who risks everything on the certainty of his calculations as to just what "must happen," plays a dangerous game. Napoleon found a terrible Russian winter more formidable than the guns of Moscow. The glorious spirit of France, the bull dog tenacity of England and the slow-moving might of the United States (factors entirely left out of the carefully prepared German plans) shattered a dream of world dominion. Though these and similar examples which might be drawn from military history, both ancient and modern, may be more dramatic, those which might be cited from political and economic history are oftentimes no less serious in their consequences. Therefore, though it would be idle to predict with certainty either the future development of the Socialist movement or its ultimate failure or success, it is well worth while to consider, not only, as we have been doing in the foregoing chapters, the nature of Socialism, but its possible developments.

Any consideration of the subject naturally falls under two heads, which, while they are quite separate and distinct, are at the same time very closely related, at least so far as non-Socialists are concerned with the movement. In the first place, what is to be the future of the Socialist Parties of Europe and America, so far as their internal control is concerned? Is this control to be in the hands of the Right, Centre or Left? Are the Parties going to preserve their unity, or are they going to split up into hostile factions? In the second place, what is to be the status of the Socialists as a political factor in their various countries? Are they likely to grow as a power, or are they likely to decline? Will the Socialist Parties preserve their identity, with their own party machinery and platforms, or will the individuals of whom they are composed unite themselves with other so-called radical progressive parties, for the purpose of insuring the passage of measures which go at least part way toward meeting the program advocated by present-day Socialists? The confused cross-currents of political and economic thought, both at home and abroad, due to the Great War and the effort at readjustment consequent upon it, make it very difficult to give any satisfactory replies to such questions. And such replies as may be given must of necessity be nothing more than personal opinion. But the problems presented by the questions must sooner or





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY  
BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



were hailed with delight, and such within the fold as dared to criticize or to object were denounced as traitors and renegades. It looked as though the Radicals of the Left were securely in the saddle, and that under their guidance Socialism was to devote its energies to extending to the rest of the world the blessings already being enjoyed by Russia.

By their interest in, and enthusiasm for, the great Russian experiment, Socialists of all countries were perhaps more closely united than at any time in the history of the movement. Lenine and his henchmen in Russia had blazed the trail which was to lead to the world-wide Social Revolution. Literally thousands, who had previously been identified with the Centre and even with the Right, swung over to the Left. Reformist and Parliamentarist leaders were denounced by their more fiery comrades, and discredited in the eyes of many of their former followers. The new leaders proclaimed the advent of the day which was to see the dissolution of all nationalistic boundaries and the establishment of the world commonwealth, ruled by the Proletariat.

Lenine and his little coterie of enthusiasts and visionaries were greatly flattered and encouraged by the reports of Socialist sympathy and support which came to them from all sides. Furthermore they had tasted unlimited power. It was but natural, therefore, that



they should regard themselves as the acclaimed and accredited leaders of Socialists and Socialism throughout the world. To them it seemed that the time had come for the assembling of a great Socialist gathering, which should proclaim anew the principles of the movement, with such changes as changed conditions rendered necessary, and which should provide for a closer affiliation and control of the Socialist Parties of the various countries of the world. They, therefore, issued the call for the Third International, to be held in Moscow, during the summer of 1919. As world conditions were still chaotic, it was practically impossible for the Parties of many countries to secure anything like a full representation, or even any representation at all. The result was that the assemblage was virtually under the dictatorship of Lenine, and all its deliberations, conclusions, and pronouncements were, of necessity, greatly influenced by actual conditions in Russia, and, therefore, reflected the doctrines and ideas of the extreme Left.

At this first meeting no conditions were specified for membership in the resultant Third International. But at the second meeting or congress, Lenine presented and secured the adoption of his famous "Twenty-one Points," which specifically set forth the conditions upon which the Socialist Parties of other countries, so desiring, might be permitted to enroll. It is impos-

sible to set forth in full this extraordinary document, but one who cares to examine it will find it in the issue of the *New York Call* of September 23, 1920. As, however, it has been the cause of heated controversy within the ranks of the Socialist Parties of all countries whenever and wherever the question of affiliation with the Third International has been presented, certain of its more important provisions must be considered.

After somewhat less than usual of the high-flown bombast which characterizes every Socialist Manifesto, in which, however, it is asserted that the Second International is "definitely smashed," and that the Centre groups are all attempting to "lean upon the Communist International, which is steadily growing in power," and which "has become the style"; it states that, "the Third International is an indirect confirmation of the fact that the Communist International has won the sympathies of the great majority of the class-conscious workers of the whole world and that it is daily becoming stronger." It then asserts that, "The Communist International is menaced by the danger of being diluted by unsteady elements noted for their half-way methods and which have not yet definitely shed the ideology of the Second International."

After outlining a program, including very specific statements of the methods to be employed for carrying it out, it proceeds to an enumeration of the conditions





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



*all the parties belonging to the Communist International."*

(All the above italics are mine.)

Article 17 requires all Parties desiring to join the Communist International to "bear the name: Communist party of such and such a country (section of the Third Communist International)."

Finally, Articles 20 and 21 read as follows: "20. Those parties that thus far wish to enter the Third International, but have not radically changed their former tactics, must see to it that two-thirds of the members of their central committees and of all their important central bodies are Comrades who unambiguously and publicly declared in favor of their parties' entry into the Third International before the second congress of the Communist International.

"Exceptions may be allowed with the approval of the executive committee of the Third International. The executive committee of the Communist International also has the right to make exceptions in the cases of the representatives of the center tendency named in paragraph 7." (Article 7 provided, among other things, that, "parties wishing to belong to the Communist International are obligated to proclaim a clean break with the reformism and with the policy of the 'center' and to propagate this break throughout the ranks of its entire membership.")



“21. Those party members who, on principle, reject the conditions and these laid down by the Communist International are to be expelled from the party.

“The same thing applies especially to delegates to the special party conventions.”

The passages above quoted make it very clear that Lenine and his henchmen in Russia were determined to assert, and to retain, control of the Communist-Socialist movement throughout the world. If the movement were successful, they would be possessed of a power undreamed of even by William II of Germany. In the entire history of the world no such magnificent vision of dominion has ever before taken possession of the mind of man. The position and power of the mediæval Pope pales to insignificance when brought into comparison with it. But Lenine, like Cæsar, Napoleon and William II, failed to take account of the human factor. Love of power and the abuse of power always beget jealousy of power and fear of power; and the arrogant conditions above set forth proved no exception to the rule.

The Socialist of Italy, Germany, France, England and the United States, whether of the Left, Center or Right, had given their enthusiastic support to their Russian Comrades; but they had given it to them as Comrades. While they joyously acclaimed them as the first to secure the emancipation of the toiling

masses, they still regarded them as but one of many co-equal bodies striving to the same end. In the conditions which Lenine laid down for their entrance into the fold of the Third International, however, they, or many of them, saw themselves in danger of being subordinated to a narrow and highly nationalistic domination. The result was that almost instantly the Socialist Parties of the several countries of Europe and America were plunged into the bitterest kind of factional disputes. The lines between the Radicals and the Conservatives, between the direct Actionists, and the Parliamentarists or Reformists, were more sharply drawn than ever, and excitement was at fever heat.

The leaders of the more moderate Center and Right feared that an acceptance of the conditions would involve not only the enforcement of a policy ill-suited to local conditions; but, what was far more important to them personally, their own individual political ruin. Under the terms laid down, they would certainly be expelled from the party, and being in bad odor with the Capitalistic and Bourgeois elements in their respective countries, they would become political outcasts. The Radicals, on the other hand, seeing a chance to be rid of their able opponents of the Center and Right, and being sure of recognition and preferment if their parties were affiliated with the Third Inter-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



ing-class movement of the world to the dictatorship of Russian Communism.”

A similar stand was taken by the more conservative representatives in practically all countries. The Radicals, on the other hand, united with Bombacci of Italy, who said, “The Third International is the highest authority accepted by all true Socialists of the world. We must obey its orders, expelling those among our leaders who do not accept revolutionary methods.”

It will be recognized that the positions thus taken by the two groups were absolutely irreconcilable. Although the abolition of all nationalistic ties, sympathies and allegiances, in favor of a universal Proletarian brotherhood is one of the fundamental tenets of Socialism, the Conservatives, on the issue presented, just like the whole body of German Socialists at the outbreak of the war, were unable to shake themselves loose from the predispositions of race and country. It is impossible to say whether, in insisting upon the program and the control of the Third International, Lenine hoped to secure the adherence of Socialists generally throughout the world; or, as is felt by some, aimed at an elimination from all parties of the less resolute and radical elements, believing with Bombacci that, “all the masses would follow the Communist Socialists,” thus offsetting such expulsions and disaffections as might result. But there can be no doubt as to what actually occurred.



The old Socialist Parties in all countries were hopelessly split. In Italy, France and Germany, where the Radicals succeeded in gaining the upper hand, the votes favored an acceptance of the conditions, and affiliation with the Third International. In the case of Italy, however, this control was but of short duration, and the action favoring affiliation with the Third International was, within a few months, repudiated by the great majority of the Socialist Party. In England and the United States the vote was overwhelmingly in opposition to such action, though in the United States the Communist Party and the Communist Labor Party, both offshoots of the Socialist Party, favored acceptance and affiliation.

Where formerly, under strong leadership, the differences of the Right, Center and Left, though at times extreme, were for the most part not permitted to interfere with the presentation of a united front in opposition to all Capitalist and Bourgeois ambitions and oppression, to-day a very different situation exists. The differences between the Communists and the Socialists, resulting from the split in the Parties, are no less hopelessly irreconcilable than were formerly those between the united elements of the Socialist Party and the Capitalists. The Radicals, by their acceptance of Lenine's Twenty-one Points, have definitely abandoned all Parliamentary methods and

adopted a program of direct action. The Conservatives still adhere to their Reformist tactics. Such being the situation, what are the possibilities with respect of the internal organization and control of the Socialist Parties of the various countries of the world?

The fate of the Radicals is intimately bound up with the success or failure of Lenine's experiment. Success of that experiment will insure to the Communists growth in numbers and prestige. Failure will mean discredit and a consequent loss in numbers. The Conservatives have been content to play a waiting game. Foreseeing the downfall of Lenine, with the discrediting of his methods in the eyes of thousands to whom he has been all but a god, they have been content to await that time, confident that then they will be returned to the direction and control of a united Socialist movement. Their position is well summarized by M. Blum, a Right Wing Socialist member of the French Chamber of Deputies, in the debate on the question of accepting the twenty-one conditions, during the French Socialist Congress at Tours, France, in the latter part of December, 1920. Addressing the members of the Left, he said, "When you people are tired of your adventure and want to come back to the old home you will find us guarding it for you."

As there is little prospect of Lenine's great experiment proving anything but an utter failure, there is





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



Otherwise, they would have been forced out entirely. Socialists, as well as non-Socialists, will do well to remember that Radicalism tends to become ever more radical; that the fires of misunderstanding, suspicion, jealousy, passion and hatred which it kindles and upon which it feeds, almost inevitably get beyond control, and threaten the very destruction of civilization. Fortunately, however, sooner or later, saner counsels prevail, and the slow and painful process of salvaging society is undertaken. Already there are signs that, even in Russia, this process is at work. The ultimate breakdown of Russian Communism will undoubtedly mark the beginning of the decline of the power of the Radical leaders over the Proletariat in other countries. When this occurs, the more conservative Socialists, who will have held their organization together in anticipation of the event, will, as in the case of Italy, again come into their own. This, however, does not mean that there will be no Radicals. What it does mean is that, among the rank and file, the Conservatives will in all probability secure, and for an indefinite time control, the larger following. But the cycle will undoubtedly again repeat itself. A new generation will forget the lessons of the past, and in some time of depression will listen to the evil counsels of new Radical leaders, and the swing will once more start in the other direction.



When we turn to the consideration of the position of the Socialist Parties of the various countries in their relation to the other political parties, we find that in the United States, Italy and France, they have decidedly lost ground. In Germany they are perhaps stronger than ever, but the conditions there, as a result of the Revolution, hardly admit of a fair comparison with such as have obtained in the other countries named.

In the elections for the French Senate, held January 8, 1921, the Radicals and Radical Socialists elected only forty-three members as against fifty-four, their former number, a loss of something over twenty per cent. In Italy, in the general election of May 15, 1921, the former one hundred seventy seats of the Socialists were reduced to one hundred twenty-four, a loss of over twenty-seven per cent. In the United States the Socialists, although they have maintained an independent Party Organization, have never been able to gain more than a foothold in either the Federal or State Legislatures. At the time of the 1912 election, the Socialists claimed an enrolled membership of one hundred twenty-five thousand, and, in the election, Debs, their candidate for President, polled about nine hundred thousand votes, or about six per cent of the total Presidential vote for all candidates. Four years later the enrolled membership had dropped to some eighty-three

thousand, and Benson, the Socialist candidate for President, received but about six hundred thousand votes out of a total vote for all candidates of about eighteen million five hundred thousand, or a little less than three and a quarter per cent of the total vote. In the fall of 1920, the membership had still further declined to not more than twenty-five thousand, and, in spite of the fact that the Suffrage Amendment had increased the total vote of the nation to about twenty-eight million, Debs, again the Socialist candidate, received less than one million votes, or about three and one-half per cent of the votes for all candidates. The close of the first half year of 1921 showed a still further decline in the enrolled membership of the Socialist Party, the number at that time standing at not more than about seventeen thousand.

The foregoing figures would seem to indicate that as a constitutional political factor, the Socialist groups are on the decline in France and Italy, while in the United States, their ability, by Constitutional means, to influence the course of political events is, and always has been, negligible. But one must not conclude from this that the menace of Socialism has passed, or is even on the decline. Nor should it be inferred from the falling off in the number of seats held by the Socialists in the legislature bodies of European States, or from the tremendous drop in the enrolled membership of the So-





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Socialist Parties are hopelessly torn and disintegrated by internal dissensions, and that their representation in their respective legislative bodies is materially reduced; while in the United States, the Socialist Party has never been able to exert any direct influence in the enactment of legislation, at least so far as the Federal Legislature is concerned. This, it may be added, holds true of practically all our State Legislatures. The meteoric career of the Non-Partisan League in North Dakota affords the most striking and the most instructive exception to the general rule. Our examination indicates, further, that the reduction in numbers and influence of the old Socialist Parties, both in Europe and this country, is due largely to the withdrawal from their ranks of the more Radical elements, with a view to forming independent extremist organizations. In the light of such conditions, the easy going and the thoughtless might be persuaded that there is little or no danger to be anticipated from Socialism and Socialist agitation in the future; that the Socialists, by their own inability to unite on any concerted plan of action, have rendered themselves innocuous. But one who so argues fails to distinguish between the dangers to Society involved in the actual accomplishment of the Social Revolution, that is, Socialism; and the dangers necessarily attendant upon the conduct of an unscrupulous and persistent agitation looking to such an accom-



plishment. Socialists, even the extremists, are coming to realize that the time has not arrived for the Social Revolution; that before that can be effected there must be a more or less protracted campaign of "education" conducted by means of a vigorous propaganda. The Class Consciousness of the Proletariat must be further awakened and developed. We need have no fears, therefore, of the immediate establishment of Socialism. It is my personal belief that if it ever is established it will be by generations as yet far in the future.

The danger which concerns us, and it is a very real one, lies in the unrest and disorder which are the inevitable concomitants of an active Socialist propaganda. I have earlier pointed out that the establishment of Socialism is absolutely dependent upon arousing in the minds and hearts of the Proletariat a firm belief in it, and a passionate desire for it. In the chapters dealing with Socialist Propaganda, I have pointed out that purely academic and philosophic arguments are of little avail with the average Proletarian; that if he is to be reached, it must be by an appeal more tangible in its promises and, therefore, more stimulating to the strongest instincts of his nature. I have given illustrations showing the Emotional, Dishonest and Inflammatory character of such propaganda, and have called attention to its purpose and its inevitable effect. It is

a significant commentary upon the working of the Socialist's mind that, while the very foundation of the order which he proposes is a spirit of brotherhood and co-operation, the means upon which he chiefly relies for its establishment is the stirring up of envy, hatred and strife. The Philosophic Socialist, playing with ideas before an intellectual audience is not on the firing line of the combat between Socialism and Capitalism, and he knows it. If he refers to the theory of the *Class Struggle*, he is very careful to make it appear that it is merely a theory, and to avoid any reference to the methods advocated and employed by his Comrades in the front line trenches in the *Class War*. But, in this, as in any other war, it is in the front line trenches that the actual fighting is done. In Germany, prior to 1914, the powers that were talked as glibly as any of the majesty of International Law. With the invasion of Belgium, however, it became evident to the rest of the world that their former protestations were the merest cant. When they made actual war, their actions spoke louder than their words. And so it is with the Socialists.

In the Winter of 1921, I listened to an address on Socialism by a Professor in the Rand School of Social Science, of New York City, delivered before an academic audience. In the course of his remarks he defined Socialism as the ownership by the State of all the





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



and, hence, to the Average Man. In a country such as ours, where Labor enjoys wages and a standard of living higher than in any other country of the world, there apparently is little danger, immediate or remote, of the Social Revolution. In spite of the fact that he is constantly told by the Socialist agitator that his condition is one of want and misery, that he is little better than a slave, the average laborer in the United States, especially if he is skilled, or on the way to become so, is pretty well contented with his lot. He rarely lacks any of the necessities of life, and generally has many of its comforts. He realizes that, except when compared with the very wealthy, he normally enjoys a very fair share of the general prosperity. He sees about him many men of his own class who have risen to positions of responsibility commanding high salaries. He sees the children of each succeeding generation marrying and, as a rule, living on a higher scale than that maintained by their parents. To such a man, and, as I have said, he is typical of the great mass of the Workers in the United States, Socialism makes little or no appeal.

But even in a country such as ours, there is always present a class of individuals who, because of their own shiftlessness or incompetence, or because of some crushing misfortune, are unable to compete with their more energetic, more able or more fortunate fellows. In a population of over one hundred millions this class



is naturally at all times very considerable. It has little or nothing to lose, and everything to gain by any change. It is always ready to listen to the promises of the glib Socialist agitator, and because of its own incompetence and lack of initiative, is always easily led. If, to this class, we add the elements of the under world, always ready to prey upon society, many of whom perceive in the period of transition to Socialism an opportunity for exercising their arts and wiles, we see, ready to the hand of the Socialist reaper, a field white to the harvest. Among such elements the doctrines of covetousness, jealousy and hatred, are as seed in fertile ground, springing up to blossom and bear fruit in plots, assaults, murders and the destruction of property.

It avails little for the Socialists to say that such acts are contrary to the fundamental ideals of Socialism. The utterances of those from time to time convicted of such offenses, too often prove conclusively that they acted under the direct and immediate influence and incitement of radical Socialistic or Communistic teachings to enable the Socialists to evade responsibility by vague references to the beautiful idealism of their faith. Fire is one of the greatest blessings possessed by mankind, but it may be, and often is, one of Nature's most destructive forces; and the man who uses it is bound to see that it is kept under proper

control. In seeking to arouse the bitterest of human passions, the ordinary Socialist agitator is having recourse to a force more destructive and more difficult to control than fire.

This is a fact of supreme importance. For the Average Man, the preservation of the peace, and the ordered progress of social, economic and political life are fundamental postulates of his existence. In the conditions which might prevail, if and when Socialism is established, he may have little or no interest, even for his children's children; but with the teachings and practices of Socialists, in their efforts to rouse the Proletariat, he is, or should be, vitally concerned. Radical Socialist agitation, like some festering sore on the human body, of which there is little or no danger that it will prove fatal, is a constant source of irritation, and, therefore, a drain on the healthy and energetic life of the body politic. If neglected, it may, at some time when the body is weakened by strain or stress, diffuse its poison throughout the whole system with a result well nigh deadly. Unfortunately, the trouble does not appear to be one which can be removed by the knife. It has its root in human nature. But this does not mean that it cannot, and should not, be kept under control. The poisonous and infectious nature of such agitation should be made clear to all, and wherever and whenever possible, should be subjected to





**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

# Know Your Bible

Forgotten Books' Full Membership provides unlimited access to more than 28,000 volumes of Christian literature for \$8.99/month

**HOLY BIBLE**

**Continue**

\*Fair use policy applies



Socialism, with its utter blindness to the omnipresence and the potency of the human factor will not be the instrument of man's social, economic and political salvation.

**THE END**



*A Selection from the  
Catalogue of*  
**G. P. PUTNAM'S SONS**



**Complete Catalogues sent  
on application**







**THIS PAGE IS LOCKED TO FREE MEMBERS**

Purchase full membership to immediately unlock this page

**SAVE \$3,999,994**

Did you know we sell  
paperback books too?

To buy our entire catalog  
in paperback would cost  
over \$4,000,000

Access it all now for  
\$8.99/month

\*Fair usage policy applies

**Continue**



# **The Science of Power**

**By  
Benjamin Kidd**

**Author of "Social Evolution," "Principles of Western  
Civilization," etc.**

**The author has grasped the fundamental character of the present age. He has put his finger on the tendencies that have imperilled Western civilization and has traced these to their source. The author crosses swords with many of the leaders of modern thought, and it is a sharp-edged weapon he wields with skill and power. The book is a protest against making the Darwinian hypothesis the basis of a science of civilization, and emphasizes the value, too little recognized, of social heredity.**

---

**G. P. Putnam's Sons**

**New York**

**London**