

property of the people collectively, so that the people might enjoy the fruit of their labor.

Not all the great leaders of German socialism have proposed the same ideal state. But the social democracy of to-day is unanimous in declaring that the whole present competitive system of industry must be replaced by universally cooperative methods. Every qualified member of the new commonwealth must perform a certain share of labor, and from the common store each shall receive "*according to his reasonable needs*." Earlier programs declared in favor of each receiving according to the amount and the quality of the service rendered; but this would inevitably give rise to undemocratic distinctions.

In this new society no one is to be exempt from labor with the hands. The artists, the men of letters, the philosophers, the scientists, may follow their own bent in the afternoon; but in the morning they must cultivate the fields, or carry brick or mortar, or perform some other similar service for society. There is to be no aristocracy even of labor in the new Utopia of social democracy, but a brotherhood of man that shall be all-embracing and complete.

When and how these results are to be accomplished, social democracy has not been in great haste explicitly to announce, but the general program cannot be misunderstood. The leaders of the movement have been frank to confess that they do not dream of realizing their hopes in the near future, but the time required for the accomplishment of the end in view does not at all dishearten the disciples of this new philosophy.

How are these results to be accomplished? Not by bombs and riot and the violent destruction of the present social order. These things belong to anarchy, not to socialism. Anarchy and social democracy parted company during the conference at The Hague in 1873, Karl Marx presiding, when the

anarchists were expelled from the body. It is true that the manifesto which Marx and Engels prepared for the conference of German communists held in London in 1847 contained this expression: "Communists declare openly that their purposes can only be attained by the forcible subversion of all existing social arrangements"; and Herr Bebel (the present leader of the social democracy) and others do not hesitate to declare the doctrine of force. But it is not the force of anarchy but of law to secure that for which the will of the majority shall have declared.

How, then, does social democracy purpose to secure its object? Not by compelling the rich to divide their fortunes with the poor; not by obliging the industrious and the frugal to support the lazy and the improvident; not by the periodic leveling of the distinctions between the various members of society; nor by the abolition of capital; nor by the abandonment of government—that is, social order. All these and many other similar ideas have been wrongly ascribed by the ignorant or the uncandid to the socialistic philosophy.

Social democracy would proceed and thus far has proceeded along legitimate and logical lines. By the suffrage of a free people, it would increase its power in the governing body. Gradually it would absorb into the state first those institutions which are of the most universal public use, such as mails, telegraphs, and railroads (results already accomplished in Germany and, more or less, in other countries); and eventually it would bring under the control of the people, collectively, all land and means of production.

It is readily seen that this scheme, although so startling, does not present an altogether new idea in government; it is rather a universal extension of the department of public service.

Socialism does not forbid private possession, or ownership, or even in-