

activity, which may be called stateism. To be sure, the state, or, at any rate, the government in a socialistic state, is the active agent for carrying on the economic life of the people. But government activity of this kind is not truly socialistic unless the purposes and the methods of the government reflect the desires and the will of the people. An autocratic state might occupy its government quite as fully with the performance of economic functions as could be desired by any Socialist, but the resulting condition would not be one of Socialism. In short, the mere extension of government economic functions is not of itself the establishment of Socialism. Germany is commonly spoken of as a state which has gone far on the road to Socialism. Not so. Germany is an example of stateism. Her government has in a measure provided the conditions of economic welfare for all her people, but she has done so at the expense of their individual initiative and freedom. A minority—the ruling class—have determined what should be done for the rest; and that not primarily for the good of the rest, but in order that they might be more suitable, or useful, or available, for the purposes of the few. If such economic comfort were achieved as a result of the free action of the majority, it would be Socialism in the true sense. Even then, however, it is questionable whether the attainment of a larger economic comfort through Socialism would not entail a cost, in the sacrifice of freedom, that would be in the long run too great.

Whether the extension that is taking place now in the war will be socialistic, even if it is permanent, will depend, therefore, on the will of the people; for certainly the government of a democratic country cannot continue such economic activities against the will of the people. Now the great majority of the people of the country are willing to submit to inconveniences due to the extension of government functions in unusual lines to accomplish more effectively the specific purposes of the