

methods and often provided the stimulus that have made state activities successful, and that has afforded the outlet for those not content in the state's rigid service. But this is possible only when public industry is small compared to private. The saturation point is soon reached. And further, the solution we have adopted of the political problem—forbidding or discouraging state employees taking an active part in politics—is possible only when these employees are a small fraction of the whole working force. Extend the system, and you disfranchise the nation. When everybody is a civil servant you cannot take the service out of politics.

*The growth of public ownership does not, as frequently imagined, imply socialism or the in-
ment plan. Its growth is limited to a definite field,
and is relatively small.*

Government regulation of industry, again, is undoubtedly increasing. But it does not follow that its net result is to lessen competition. The state referees the game, but the game is none the less strenuous because played under rules. Government intervention is not necessarily wise, governments as a rule, being merely human, but neither is it necessarily hampering. A child labor law, prohibiting the employment of children under fourteen, does not do away with competition, but, as we have seen, simply raises it to a higher plane. Employers may compete in organization, in opportune buying and selling, in quickness to seize new methods and new openings, but they must not compete in callous disregard of childhood weakness and childhood needs. A Railway Commission, forbidding one competitor to crush another by secret rebates, gives competition new lease of life. It was the lack of regulation of railway rates that permitted the Standard Oil Company to crush its competitors; under regulation, the rivals of the Steel Trust and the Sugar Trust are wrestling yearly a larger share of trade.

So with state provision of common needs, in free schools, free parks, free playgrounds. Such state activities can fairly be said to make for socialism only where it would be reasonably possible for the individual to provide the service himself, and where the net result is to weaken self-reliance. Free public parks supply a need which the average dweller, in our congested cities can no longer meet himself; free hoots for school children supply a need he could meet, or if not, the trouble is too deep-rooted to be cured by any such tinkering.

Does the help given lessen the initiative, the self-reliance, the independence of the recipients, or does it enable them to