

heritance of property. The laborer may use the product of his labor for present needs and enjoyment, or he may lay it aside for future use, or he may bestow it upon others. *Socialism simply forbids the private ownership of productive capital.*

The new socialistic estate would not be unwilling to reimburse the present possessors of productive capital, but *this compensation would not be in sources of income, but in useful commodities.* It is evident that the fortunes of even the Rothschilds and the Vanderbilts would thus, in time, melt away. Under the new social regime, every competent member of the social body must be a laborer, and thus a producer.

It seems to be the most literal and rigid application of Paul's doctrine, "If any would not work, neither should he eat"; or that older Scripture, "In the sweat of thy face shalt thou eat bread." Socialism believes that too many are eating bread in the sweat of other people's faces. In the new social state, money would of necessity disappear. As a medium of exchange it would be replaced by certificates issued by the state, and, as a standard of value, by the average labor day. Marx explicitly affirms that the idea of "labor power" as a standard of value is the corner-stone of his whole system.

Socialism, through certain of its leaders, has announced the startling proposition that, in the new order of things, the family will cease to be an institution of society. This was boldly set forth in the communistic manifesto prepared by Marx and Engels. The same view has also been held by many leaders of the social democracy. But it cannot be laid to the charge of all; and the subject may be dismissed, for the present, as not constituting a necessary feature of the new social revolution.

Again, it is undeniable that the present spirit of social democracy is anti-religious. August Bebel, in a speech before the Reichstag, May 31,

1881, set forth his position in these brief but unmistakable terms: "We aim in the domain of politics at republicanism, in the domain of economics at socialism, and in the realm of what is to-day called religion at atheism." But irreligion, like "free marriage" or "free love," is not a necessary feature of German or any other form of socialism.

How shall this new social revolution be met? The only sane way to deal with any revolutionary movement is to meet it fairly.

The socialistic philosophy presents its stronger as well as its weaker points.

Among the stronger points there are three, which, to my mind, are preeminent:

1. If the new social order could be made practicable, it would realize in a larger degree than the present state *the reign of the people.* Not that this idea would be perfectly realized, even by the most sanguine dream of social democracy, for the central bureau of management, which would be absolutely essential for the conducting of affairs, must represent delegated power. Yet the spoils system would be swept away, corruption and oppression would lose their grip, and the painful inequalities of society would be reduced to a minimum.

2. *It would give every man a chance.* Theoretically, most men may have a chance under the existing order; but, practically, it is too often a chance to starve, or to serve the great manipulators of productive capital at a starving wage.

3. It would avoid, in large measure, the waste caused at present by the middleman. The merchant who receives goods from the manufacturer and sells them, at fair profit, to the consumer conducts as legitimate a business, under the present order of things, as any other man. Yet it cannot be denied that, if this service could be dispensed with, it would shut off a tremendous waste. And besides, if the