

# COMMON OBJECTIONS TO SOCIALISM ANSWERED

A  
A  
0  
0  
0  
3  
8  
8  
7  
0  
2  
3




BY  
R. B. SUTHERS

One  
Shilling  
Net



THE LIBRARY  
OF  
THE UNIVERSITY  
OF CALIFORNIA  
LOS ANGELES





Common                       
Objections to Socialism  
                     Answered

BY THE SAME AUTHOR.

---

### **A Man, A Woman, and A Dog.**

Being the First Series of the Domestic Adventures of Jack's Wife. Price 6d. net ; post free, 7½d.

" 'A Man, A Woman, A and Dog' is one of the most amusing books that we have ever read. Mr. Robert B. Suthers sees the absurd side of things very keenly. The humours of matrimony have never been better illustrated than they have in this exceedingly clever book."—*The Westminster Review.*

### **Jack's Wife.**

Being the Second Series of the Domestic Adventures. Price, cloth, 2/6 ; post free, 2/9.

### **Mind Your Own Business :**

The Case for Municipal Management. Price 2/6 net ; post free, 2/9.

*The Daily News* says : " It is a masterly treatise."

### **My Right to Work :**

Free Trade, Protection, or Socialism. Cloth, 1/- net ; post free, 1/2. Paper, 6d. ; post free, 7½d.

### **Seventeen Shots at Socialism.**

Price 1d. ; post free, 1½d.

This is a condensation for popular propaganda purposes of the Answers to Common Objections contained in this volume.

THE CLARION PRESS, 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.

# Common Objections to Socialism Answered


BY  
R. B. SUTHERS.



LIBRARY OF CALIFORNIA  
UNIVERSITY LIBRARIES  
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
LIBRARY

London:  
THE CLARION PRESS,  
44, Worship Street, E.C.

1908.



AIRPORT LAD TO VIRU  
21.10.70 20.1 TA  
TRAVEL



To  
A. M. THOMPSON.

LIBRARY SETS

DEC 16 1940

HARDING


388558



# CONTENTS.

---

	PAGE.
That Socialism is not Needed ... ..	1
That Socialism means "Dividing-up" ... ..	6
That Socialism would Yield only a Miserable Pittance per Head ... ..	11
That Socialism is Based on the Fallacy that Labour is the only Source of Wealth ... ..	14
That Socialism would mean Confiscation ... ..	24
That Socialism would Rob the Poor Man of his Savings	30
That Socialism would Ruin the Small Shopkeeper ...	36
That Socialism would Abolish Competition and so Decrease Wealth ... ..	41
That the Prospect of Socialism would Drive Capital out of the Country ... ..	49
That Socialism would Destroy Religion ... ..	56
That Socialism would Destroy the Incentive of Gain ...	59
That Socialism would be the most Odious Form of Slavery ... ..	69
That Socialism would Involve an Army of Officials ...	80
That Socialism would be the Paradise of the Loafer ...	87
That Socialism would Destroy Home Life ... ..	95
That Socialists have no Cut and Dried Plan ... ..	105
That Socialism is an Attempt to Interfere with the "Sur- vival of the Fittest" ... ..	112
That Socialism is Impossible, Human Nature being what it is ... ..	122



# COMMON OBJECTIONS TO SOCIALISM ANSWERED.

**That Socialism is not Needed, as all  
Necessary Reforms can be Achieved  
under the Present System.**

*Answer.*

I shall put the answer to this objection in the form of a number of questions dealing with the social and economic effects of the present system.

## **WHAT WE EARN.**

Do you know that the total annual income of the population of the United Kingdom is estimated to be £1,750,000,000 (seventeen hundred and fifty millions!)?

Do you know how that income is divided?

Do you know that 1,250,000 persons (say 250,000 men and their families) receive £600,000,000 (six hundred millions), more than  $\frac{1}{3}$  (one-third) of the total income?

Do you know that Mr. Balfour says that "Individual energy can only be called forth by a system based upon the fact that what a man earns he possesses"?

Do you think that the 250,000 who receive £600,000,000 EARN IT?

Do you know that 3,750,000 people (say 750,000 men and their families) receive £250,000,000 (two hundred and fifty millions),  $1/7$  (one-seventh) of the total income?

Do you know that these two classes, 5,000,000 people, receive £850 millions, nearly *half* the national income?

Do you think it a fair division to give half to 5,000,000 people, and half to 39,000,000 people?

Do you think the 5,000,000 *earn* all that half?

### **WHAT WE LEAVE AT DEATH.**

Do you know that every year about 700,000 people die in the United Kingdom?

Do you know how much they are worth when they die?

Do you know that only about 80,000 leave property worth taxing?

Do you know that over 600,000 die leaving nothing but a few pounds or a few bits of furniture?

Do you know that in 1906-7 nearly all the property left at death was left by only 21,000 persons out of the 700,000?

Do you know that these 21,000 persons left £280 millions out of £299 millions?

Do you know that a mere handful of 4,172 persons left £218 millions out of the £299 millions?

FOUR THOUSAND ONE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-TWO.

Do you think they possessed those riches because they had *earned* them?

Do you know that Socialists say that the wealth made by the workers (by brain and hand workers) is not distributed justly?

Do you know that Socialists want to establish a just system?

Do you know that our opponents say just distribution would mean *robbery* and *confiscation*?

Do you know whether anyone is being robbed *to-day*?

### **WHAT IDLENESS GETS.**

Do you know that out of the total national income

of £1,750 millions, we pay 650 millions, *one-third*, in rent and interest?

Do you know that those who receive that 650 millions *do not earn it*?

Do you know most of that 650 millions is taken by the handful of people who leave the bulk of the riches at death?

Do you know that the middle and working classes get very little of it?

Do you think it *right* that those who earn it *all* should receive only a mere fraction of it?

Do you remember Mr. Balfour's words, as given above?

Do you know that Mr. Balfour and his Party obstinately oppose every reform designed to establish the principle that "what a man earns he possesses"?

Do you know that the monstrously unjust division of the national earnings causes intense suffering and misery to millions, and that it endangers the very existence of the nation?

## WHAT INDUSTRY GETS.

Do you know that only about 1,000,000 people receive incomes of £160, and over?

Do you know that 12,000,000 people are always on "the verge of starvation"?

Do you know that 20,000,000 are "very poor"?

Do you know that only some 30,000 people actually *earn* £1,000 a year and over?

Do you know that our opponents say that Ability receives the bulk of the wealth?

Do you think there are only about 30,000 men and women of Ability working in the country?

Do you know that 39,000,000 people are "poor"?

Do you know that the 1,000,000 who pay income tax receive nearly *half* the total national income?

Do you know that the average wages of the better-off "working classes" are only about £48 a year?

Do you know that in London alone there are 1,000,000 (one million) persons whose family income does not exceed a guinea a week?

Do you know that the wages of agricultural labourers average 10s. to 17s. a week?

Do you know a wise, economical, teetotal, non-smoking, non-letter-writing, non-newspaper-buying, non-holiday-making family of five cannot exist in mere physical efficiency on less than 21s. 8d. a week?

Do you know that the proportion of deaths in workhouses, hospitals, and asylums is *rising*?

Do you know that in London one person in *three* dies in the workhouse, hospital, or asylum?

Do you know that over 2,500,000 (two and a-half millions) persons seek relief under the Poor Law every year?

Do you know that we pay £15,000,000 a year for the maintenance of paupers?

Do you know that charitable societies spend £10,000,000 (ten millions) a year?

Do you know this is a Christian country?

Do you know that *one-tenth* of the rent and interest paid to those who do not earn it amounts to £65,000,000 (sixty-five millions) a year?

## WHAT WOULD JESUS SAY?

Do you know that in London alone 120,000 children go to school hungry?

Do you know that every year 100,000 babies under a year old are slaughtered by our unjust system?

Do you know that there is a way to save them?

Do you know that half the children of working men die before the age of five years?

Do you know that slums and overcrowding kill millions of people prematurely?

Do you know slum property is the best "paying" house property?

Do you think it pays the nation?

Do you know that the average age of working men is 20 years less than that of the rich?

Do you know there are *always* from 500,000 to 1,000,000 unemployed?

Do you know that 1,000,000 (one million) married women have to work in factories and workshops?



Do you know that the employment of married women destroys home life?

Do you know that women at work cannot bring up children properly?

Do you know that women are employed because their labour is *cheap*?

### THE REMEDY.

Do you know that a nation suffering from all these terrible evils is in a very dangerous position?

Do you know that they are due to our system of land monopoly, and capital monopoly by the *few*, and to the competition for existence?

Do you know that with the brains and labour and land and capital at our command, a decent living could be obtained for *all*?

Do you know that Socialism is a scheme for *organising* the brains and labour and land and capital, so as to obtain the best return possible in health and wealth?

Do you know that the only people to "suffer" by a change to Socialism would be the few thousands who now "own" the bulk of the wealth?

Do you know that even they would be happier, and healthier, and more useful under Socialism than they are to-day?

Do you think it right that a nation of 40,000,000 people should be bled to death by a few thousand?

Do you know that similar conditions have existed for the last 100 years, and that Liberal and Tory statesmen can find no remedy?

Do you not think a remedy is needed?

Do you know what Socialism is?

Do you know there is *no other remedy* for the present evil conditions?

Do you think you ought to find out what it is before you condemn it?

## That Socialism Means "Dividing Up."

### Answer.

Socialism does not mean "dividing up." Socialism is the opposite of "dividing up." Socialism means *collective* ownership.

Millions of people believe that Socialism means "dividing up," and this belief is so deep-rooted that it sometimes prevents those who hold it from giving any further consideration to the arguments for Socialism. That "settles it."

Socialism, they think, is impossible. Socialism, they think, means "dividing up." Is "dividing up," then, impossible?

No. Strange to say it is not "dividing up" that these people think impossible. They believe it is possible to "divide up." But a week after you have "divided up," they say, things would be as unequal as before. Some would have parted with their share to others. Some would have wasted. Some would have gambled. Some would have consumed extravagantly. Therefore, Socialism is impossible, because Socialism means "equality," or "dividing up" equally; and equality is impossible.

At the back of the "dividing up" objection we find, then, another obstacle in the way of Socialism, the impossibility of equality.

Socialists are supposed by these objectors to believe in (1) "Dividing up"; (2) "Equality."

What is the Socialist answer?

The Socialist answer is: (1) That Socialism does not mean "Dividing up"; (2) that Socialism does not mean "Equality."

As to "dividing up," no Socialist desires to "divide up," because no Socialist believes it is possible to "divide up."

What do the objectors mean by "dividing up"?

They seem to have the idea that Socialists want

first to "divide up" equally amongst the people all the wealth of the country; secondly, to allow all people to share equally ever afterwards in the new wealth produced—that is, to receive equal wages.

Now, with regard to the "dividing up" of the wealth already in existence, what do the objectors really mean?

As a matter of fact, they don't know clearly what they mean. If they had thought the matter out they would have seen the impossibility of "dividing up" the wealth of the country.

What is wealth?

Is not land wealth? Are not mines wealth? Are not buildings wealth? Is not machinery wealth? Are not railways and tramways wealth? Are not docks, harbours, piers, factories, workshops, telegraph wires, and ships all wealth?

The people who talk about "dividing up" cannot surely imagine that Socialists wish to cut up the railways into small pieces, to weigh out equal quantities of coal, to measure out the water, to apportion equally the bricks and stones in our buildings, the pictures in our houses, the shirts in our shops, the beer in our breweries, the bread in our bakeries, the crockery in our cupboards, and all the millions of material objects which are wealth!

Such "dividing up" needs only to be mentioned to prove its impossibility. Wealth of this kind cannot be "divided equally."

What, then, do these objectors mean by "dividing up"?

Do they mean that Socialists want to "divide up" the money in the country?

That is very likely the idea that exists vaguely in the minds of some of these people. Because there is a widespread delusion that capital is money, and that money (gold) can always be got in exchange for other forms of capital.

For instance, it is believed that any man who owns a coal mine or a piece of land can always exchange it for money. As a rule, a man can do so. But it is believed that if all men owned coal mines and land

they could *all* exchange them for money, which doesn't follow.

There is very little gold, silver, and copper money in the country: little over a hundred million pounds. So that if all the money were "divided up" equally we should get about £3 per head, and that would not go far, would it? Even Socialists would hardly be so foolish as to waste their time agitating for a "dividing up" which only produced £3 per head!

But the other wealth of the country—the land, iron, coal, stone, copper, railways, canals, buildings, factories, houses, and so on—is worth £11,500 millions. This wealth, as I have pointed out, could not be "divided up." That is, the much greater part of the wealth of the country could not be dealt with in the way Socialists are supposed to desire to deal with it.

Even if we could "divide up" equally all the land and the railways and the mines and the machinery and the factories and the houses and the collars and ties and bonnets, it would be impossible for every one to sell his share to some one else for money.

Why?

The total wealth of the country is valued at about £11,500 millions. Divided amongst 40,000,000 people, this would give to every person property worth about £260.

We have seen that all the money, if divided, would only yield £3 per head. How, then, could anyone sell his share, worth £260, to someone else when no one had more than £3?

It may be said that the people might barter their shares of wealth without using money.

But does anyone suppose that a man with two miles of railway lines could exchange it for a house, or a man whose share consisted of a mile of canal could swap it for a suit of clothes? Imagine John Burns staggering about with a steam organ, trying to induce Mr. Chamberlain to take it in exchange for his store of fireworks! We have only to put these

things down in cold print to show how ridiculous is the idea that Socialists could dream of desiring anything so comic. Socialists are very serious people.

Again, an intelligent objector may say, "Of course, it is all nonsense to talk about 'dividing up' the capital of the country, but a Socialist Government could issue shares in the capital of a country just as a private company issues shares. Then, if I had £260 worth of shares I could sell them to someone else, could I not?"

And the answer is, "No." That is not the Socialist idea at all. When the Socialists suggest that the whole people should own and manage the land and capital of the country, they do not mean that individual members of the nation should own parts of the land and capital. They mean that the *whole people* should own them.

For example: The nation, the whole people, now owns some thousands of acres of land known as the Crown lands. Does any single person hold shares in that property?

Not one. The whole nation owns the land and manages the land.

The nation owns arsenals, docks, ships, post offices. Do you know anyone who holds a share in them that he can sell or give away?

You don't, because there is no such person. But every person shares in the national ownership of these things.

In the same way many of our towns own property. Newcastle, Nottingham, and Liverpool, for instance, own a good deal of land. Has any person a share in it which he can sell or on which he draws dividends?

Not one. The dividends or rents are drawn by the corporation on behalf of the whole of the rate-payers.

So when Socialists propose that the land or the mines should be bought by the nation, they do not propose that shares of an equal amount should be issued to every person in the land, but that the

Government should own and manage these properties on behalf of the whole people.

When a municipality buys a gasworks, or a tramway, or a waterworks, they do not issue shares to every ratepayer. They manage the undertaking for the benefit of all the citizens. No citizen can sell his "share" of the property.

So if the railways belonged to all the people, to the nation, no single citizen could sell his "share" of the railways.

If I live in London I have a share in the public parks, museums, water, gas, streets, and other institutions owned and managed by the citizens. But who would give me a cent for all these benefits if I desired to remove to the wilds of Cornwall? No one.

Just as it is impossible to "divide up" and sell my benefits of the common wealth of London, so it would be impossible to "divide up" and sell my share in the common wealth of the nation under Socialism.

**That Socialism is not worth having, as an  
Equal Division of the National Income  
would yield only a Miserable Pittance  
of 2s. 2d. per head per day.**

***Answer.***

Socialism does not mean "dividing up equally" but if it did, 2s. 2d. per head per day would not be a miserable pittance for the bulk of the population.

The dividing up objector says it would be no use dividing up, because a week later the old inequalities would have returned. The Two and Twopenny objectors (they are generally wealthy) say: "My dear friends, how worthless as a cure for poverty Socialism is will appear when I tell you that if the whole national income were equally divided, it would yield for every person a mere pittance of 2s. 2d. a day."

Mr. Lowther used this Two and Twopenny argument. He said:

Perhaps it may surprise some of my friends—and I am talking now to Socialists—to know that an equal division of the national income amongst the population—I am taking the latest figures of the Royal Statistical Society—would yield to every person a wretched 2s. 2d. a day; and that without any allowance for taxation for the upkeep of the State.

What was Mr. Lowther's object in using that argument? Plainly to show the people that they would be worse off under Socialism than they are to-day.

Two and Twopenny per day, counting only six days to the week, amounts to 13s. per week, or £33 16s. per year.

Do you know what the average wages of the *best paid* workers are?

Forty-eight pounds a year. That is, nearly £15 more than £33 16s.

But how many working men and women are there who get only £33 16s. to-day?

Millions. And according to Mr. Lowther's own figures, these millions would be no worse off under an equal division. They are getting miserable pittances to-day. Millions earn *less* than £33 16s. per year.

But when Mr. Claude Lowther termed 2s. 2d. a day a miserable pittance, he did not know he was giving his argument away.

For observe, 2s. 2d. per day *per head* means that a man and wife would get 4s. 4d. per day, or 26s. per week.

Two and twopence per head means that a man and wife with one child would get 39s. a week.

Two and twopence per head means that a man and wife with two children would get 52s. a week.

Two and twopence per head means that a man and wife with three children would get 65s. a week.

Two and twopence per head means that a man and wife and four children would get 78s. a week.

I will stop there, and ask Mr. Claude Lowther when he is going on to the platform to explain to working men that 78s. a week for a family of six is a *pittance*?

I will go a little further with this Two and Twopenny argument. There were at the 1901 census over 16,000,000 people who were, or had been, married. There were, at the same time, 21½ millions under the age of 20. Together, over 36 million people who were probably living a family life. That is to say, all these people would, with their "mere pittance," be able to live at a much higher standard of comfort than the bulk of them live in to-day.

Now, if we assume that the remaining six millions were all living alone, an absurd assumption, we should at the worst only have six million poor, and



not one of them would be receiving as little as millions are receiving to-day.

Now, what do you think of Mr. Lowther's Two and Twopenny argument?

To-day there are twelve millions on the verge of starvation. There are twenty millions very poor. Consisting largely of families who do not get per head *half* the sum that Mr. Claude Lowther says is a "wretched pittance." There are 1,000,000 people in London alone who do not get more than a guinea a week *per family*.

Nay, more, there are 39,000,000 out of our population of 44,000,000 who do not get that average "wretched pittance" of 2s. 2d. per head per day, nor anything like it.

Nearly half the total income is taken by 5,000,000 people. A little more than half is taken by 39,000,000. If the 39 millions received 2s. 2d. a day per head, they would get £400 millions more than they actually do.

It is plain, then, that the "wretched pittance" condition of things would enable the *bulk* of the population to live in that condition of comfort only obtained by a few million people to-day. Instead of a few rich, with the bulk poor, there would be a few poor, with the bulk in moderate comfort. What becomes, then, of Mr. Claude Lowther's haughty sniff at the "miserable pittance"? His sniff can only be echoed by those who look down on 2s. 2d. a day as a starvation wage, and the possible sniffers are only 5,000,000 out of 44,000,000.

But, as I have already explained, Socialism does not mean dividing up equally.

Socialism does not hang on an equal division of the national income. Under Socialism, Labour and Ability would be rewarded as the whole people deemed *best* for the nation.

**That Socialism is Based on the Fallacy  
that Labour is the only Source of  
Wealth, whereas Wealth is mostly  
Produced by Ability.**

***Answer.***

Socialism is *not* based on the fallacy that "Labour is the only source of wealth." The statement is not a fallacy, it is a self-evident truth.

All wealth produced by man is produced by Labour, and all Labour involves the use of brain and muscle.

Some labour involves greater exertion from the brain than from the muscles. Other labour requires greater exertion from the muscles than from the brain. But every person who works *must* use his brains *and* his muscles. It is all a matter of degree.

The term Labour is often applied to that kind of labour involving more muscle than brain exertion. Using the word in this narrow sense, uneducated opponents rashly assert that under Socialism manual labour would receive all the wealth, and Ability nothing. This is a mistake.

Wealth is produced by labour, brain, and muscle. All wealth, then, should belong to labour, brain, and muscle. Do you not agree?

Now, Socialists assert that, to-day, Ability and Labour do *not* receive the wealth produced. Socialists assert that Idleness receives at least 6s. 8d. in the £ of all the wealth produced. And in support of their statements they point to the facts that 12 millions are underfed, 20 millions are very poor, 39 out of 44 millions are poor, while only 5,000,000 are well-to-do and rich.

What is the reply of our opponents?

Mr. Claude Lowther, for instance, says that "nine times out of ten Capital is the fruit of Ability."

We are also told that the manual labourers, the "working class," receive more than their just share of the national income, because they receive more per head to-day than they received 100 years ago, and all the increased wealth since then is due to Ability.

And we are told that it would be foolish and dangerous to attempt to give the poor more, because we could only give them more at the expense of Ability, and if we reduced the rewards of Ability, the clever people would refuse to use their talents, and the result would be a decrease in wealth, so making the poor man's position still worse.

Let us examine these statements. It is asserted that our increased wealth is due to Ability, chiefly to the inventor. Let us admit that.

Does the inventor get the biggest rewards to-day? Does he? Does the man of Ability?

On the contrary, the person who gets the biggest rewards is the idle Landlord or Capitalist, who never produces *anything*.

Who are these inventors who are receiving enormous incomes from their patent rights? Let us have their names.

The Duke of Westminster we know. Did he ever invent anything? Did he ever produce by his Ability a hundred-thousandth part of the wealth he takes from the workers every year for doing *nothing*? Did the Duke of Bedford? Or the Duke of Devonshire? Or the Duke of Sutherland?

We pay £290 millions a year in rent to people who do absolutely nothing for that huge chunk out of the national cake.

There is not a single inventor or genius in the country, and never was one, who receives so high a reward for his services as we pay to idle landlords for no service at all. Nay, for being hindrances to the production of wealth.

Here is the case of our opponents given away by Mr. R. N. McDougall, secretary of the Liberty and Property Defence League. In a letter on this question he said :

These men, by their inventions and organising skill, have produced the wonderful transformation scene of modern industry. Some of them have made fortunes, and others have died in poverty. But their fortunes, however great in some instances, constitute but a small fraction of the wealth created for the community. Almost any one inventor who could be mentioned, say, for instance, the inventor of the safety bicycle, has done more for the community than all the politicians of all the parties put together.

Exactly. *Some* of them have made large fortunes. Some of them have not. But the fortunes are a "small fraction," says Mr. McDougall. Who, then, gets the large fractions?

Not the mass of the people, for they are in poverty. I know where the large fractions are. In the pockets of the few rich. There are only 250,000 persons with incomes of £700 a year and over.

*One-half the land of the United Kingdom is owned by 2,500 persons. Did they invent the land?*

The Duke of Westminster is a landowner in London. A short time ago, one of his leases fell in, and the tenant, to obtain a renewal at a much higher rent, had to pay a premium of £50,000.

Fifty thousand pounds! That was a gift to the Duke of Westminster. For what? For invention? For Ability? No. For idleness.

Who has to earn that £50,000? It is earned by the hand workers and the brain workers of London, and it is paid to an idle man for doing nothing. That is an example of the way land values, created by the industry of the people, are annexed by idle individuals under a system which we are told gives the biggest rewards to Ability.

Let us, now, consider a few examples of the enormous sums taken by idle capitalists.

Furness, Withy, and Company, the shippers, have in the last six years received in dividends 75 per cent. of their capital. They have wiped off goodwill account. And workers, "worthy old salts," are so

poor they have to go round with the hat to Christian dividend hunters for the means of living.

This huge profit remained *after* Labour and Ability had been paid wages and salaries.

I have before me a list of twenty banks, whose last dividends ranged from 11 to 20 per cent.

Let us look at the balance sheet of one. For 1906 (half-year) the London and South-Western Bank made £132,000, and paid 16 per cent. per annum on a paid-up capital of £1,000,000. That is, in half a year £80,000 was paid to idle shareholders; £160,000 in the year.

What did Labour and Ability get?

Enormous office rents, rates, taxes, general expenses, *and* salaries came to £137,000. How much of that went to Labour and Ability? Suppose we say two-thirds, about £90,000. Now, mark, the total profit for that half-year was £132,000.

So that the idle shareholders took a *good deal more* than Labour and Ability together!

There are plenty of similar examples of the "earning" capacity of Idleness. Is it not plain that the contention that Ability takes the enormous rewards is so much ignorance and bluff? And what are Christian gentlemen doing when they tell the workers these fairy tales?

We pay some £360 millions a year in interest, and for *that* huge chunk out of the national cake *no work is done at all* by those who receive it.

Rent and interest take £650 millions out of a total income of £1,800 millions, and almost the whole of it is received by a few people, numbering not more than  $1\frac{1}{4}$  millions out of a population of 44 millions!

Where does Ability come in? I ask again.

Does Ability earn the enormous incomes to-day?

We can get Ability of the highest class for £800 to £5,000 a year.

Sir John Fisher, Chief of the Navy, gets £2,000 a year. We pay the head of the Post Office, an enormous organisation, £1,750. We pay the chief engineer of the Telegraphs £1,200. We pay our

judges £5,000. We pay the Prime Minister, the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary for War, £5,000. We pay Mr. John Burns £2,000 a year. We pay the permanent head of the Education Department £1,800 a year. We pay the Town Clerk of Manchester £1,500 a year. We pay managers of big gasworks and electrical works and tramways up to £1,000 or £1,500 a year. We pay the best of medical officers £1,000 a year. We can get, as I say, any kind of talent for £800 to £5,000 a year, and there is always plenty of it.

Our opponents say that Ability is rare. Genius is rare. But Ability is plentiful. There are always hosts of applicants for vacant posts, and there is often great difficulty in deciding which is the best man.

Very well. What do all the men of Ability receive out of the total national income? In a country where Ability received the biggest rewards, you would expect to find the bulk of the income taken *by* Ability. Is it?

If you consult the income tax returns, you will find that there are about 30,000 men of Ability actually at work and *earning* £1,000 a year and over.

Let us assume that there are 30,000, and let us suppose they are *all* earning £5,000 a year, which they are not.

Then 30,000 working men of Ability would take £150 millions a year.

But I have shown that Rent and Interest take £650 millions. What, then, becomes of the claim that Ability takes the highest rewards?

Some bright genius may suggest that it is men of genius who are receiving the enormous incomes from rent and interest, from investments of their past earnings.

He need only look down the lists of deaths of wealthy people to find himself in a mare's nest. He will discover brewers, landowners, stock-jobbers, bankers, financiers, coal owners, but very few inventors, or descendants of inventors.

And if all the "unearned" incomes *were* received

by idle men of Ability, our opponents would still have to prove the justice and morality of paying idle men of Ability more than men of Ability actually working.

Again, in a country where Ability was highly rewarded, you would expect to find laws and customs designed to encourage invention, would you not? Yes.

Well. What is the position with us? I wish I could quote the whole of Blatchford's pamphlet on our patent laws. Therein it is demonstrated that the laws and customs of this country might have been specially designed to *discourage* invention.

Of all forms of Ability, none has been so scurvily treated as the inventor. As regards his rights, when he could *get* them, he was only entitled to hold them for fourteen years, when his patent lapsed. (The law has been revised this year.)

Do the landlord's rights ever lapse?

If land became public property after fourteen years' ownership, where would be the rents now going into a few private pockets?

In the public purse, paying all our taxes, and leaving handsome balances for objects of national welfare.

We pay tribute to landlords and capitalists for ever and ever. We do not pay tribute to Watt, Stephenson, Arkwright, Heilman, Palissy, Bell, and hundreds of other inventors. Their genius has become public property.

The inventor's rights and the rights of the artistic genius have a very short life. I can buy the works of Shakespeare, without paying a farthing tribute. But if I want to buy a piece of land owned in Shakespeare's time by the ancestors of one of our dukes, I must pay his descendant an enormous fine.

These gentlemen who pretend to be so anxious about Ability under Socialism! They sneer at the idea of a genius receiving the same reward as a scavenger, but they have not a word to say against an idle landowner receiving more than the greatest genius that ever lived.

When did they ever propose to deal with the land-owner as we treat the inventor? Never!

Yet the inventor has not stopped inventing altogether. Browbeaten, discouraged, and often robbed, he still struggles on, striving to give birth to the ideas which rise within his brain, as he always will, under any conditions.

Now, let us consider Invention and Ability under Socialism.

We are told that as everyone would receive equal wages, there would be no incentive for the clever man to use his talents.

First, as to the question of equal wages. This is not the Socialist ideal. The Socialist ideal is, "From each according to his Ability, to each according to his needs," but I do not think any Socialist expects that we shall arrive at that ideal state of things in the first year of Socialism. It is an ideal. And a noble and worthy ideal. But it is probably a long way off. And all the present-day Socialist cares about is *putting the people on the right road*.

Let us admit, then, that for a long time it will be necessary to reward workers in proportion to their services. Let us admit that men of talent will not do their best unless they receive high rewards. Are these admissions fatal to Socialism?

By no means. Socialism's foundation principle is the ownership of all the means of production by the people and the distribution of the national income in the best interests of the whole people.

It follows, then, that if at any time it is to the best interests of the people to divide the national income *unequally*, so it will be done. And *the whole people* would decide the question.

It is clear that under such conditions the clever man would be encouraged to use his talents, and would be rewarded therefor.

To-day, the poor inventor has to go to a capitalist to get his invention put on the market. Result: very often he is tricked out of his reward. Moreover, inventors are discouraged in other ways. Read Blatchford's pamphlet (but I am afraid it is out of



print) and you will find that for every invention patented and secured here in the years 1890 to 1894, the Americans secured and patented THIRTY-FOUR. Why?

For one thing, because they encourage inventors. We, on the contrary, have a suspicion of anything new-fangled. And the American patent laws are sensible, while ours are, or were, not.

Now, under Socialism, the whole people would be educated. They are not to-day. And an educated people would naturally encourage brains. Consequently they would make a point of providing opportunities for inventive people to exercise their talents. And they would reward them justly.

You may remember that part of the argument I set out to destroy asserted that we could not give manual labour any more without robbing Ability.

But if we paid Ability all it gets now, and if the national income did not increase at all, we could still afford to pay manual labour a living wage. How? By stopping all payments for idleness.

And Socialism would set free powers and capacities which now are locked up by the evils of Competition, Monopoly, and the resultant evils, Poverty, Unemployment, Slums, and Child Slaughter.

Wealth would increase. We could afford to pay all the men of Ability from £1,000 to £5,000 a year, and I should like to ask what sort of a man or a Christian he would be who would refuse to use his talents because he could not get more than £5,000 a year.

Our friends the enemy suggest that Manual Labour ought not to be paid more, because Manual Labour's power of production is the same yesterday, to-day, and for ever. They say the manual labourer of to-day can produce no more than the manual labourer of 100 years ago, without machinery. And that machinery is due to Ability.

Well, I think I have shown pretty conclusively that Ability does *not* get all the difference between the wealth produced by average manual labour and

the wealth produced by manual labour helped by Ability.

Do our opponents propose to give Ability all this increase? When? I have never heard of a party with this reform as their programme.

I should myself object as strongly to paying a perpetual rent to the inventor of scissors, or any machine, as I do to paying perpetual rents to idle landlords and capitalists.

Assume that all increase in wealth is due to Invention and Ability. As a human being, I have still to say this to the inventor: "If your invention is going to starve me, to starve my wife and children, to doom me and them to a life of grinding toil and monotony, to rob us of sunshine and air, and all that makes life sweet and precious, I am not taking any. I claim the right to refuse your invention. I would rather dig roots and drink the rain of heaven than submit to your terms. To hell with your invention!"

What I mean is that we of the common herd, who have no invention, have the right to make a bargain with the inventor. *The inventor without workers is helpless.* Well, then, are we not entitled to fair terms?

John Stuart Mill said it was doubtful if all the machines ever invented had lightened the day's toil of a single worker. More fool the worker, say I. It would be bad enough to make a bad bargain with the inventor, but it is a thousand times worse to stand by and allow idle landlords and capitalists to rob both us *and* the inventor.

The graceful author of the annual circular of the West Norfolk Farmers' Manure Company says that "what land and labour can produce to-day is seen in Zululand or Samoa—poverty, often starvation and pestilence," and he says that "labour is no more effective now than 10,000 years ago."

This intelligent writer, whose Ability is proved by his comparison of the wages in 1688 with the wages in 1908, without any reference to prices and rents, and whose right to scoff at the accuracy of "loud-mouthed demagogues" is proved by his asser-

tion that "the average income of a working-class family to-day is £81!" may be surprised to know that in this country in 1495 "an artisan earned nearly a bushel of wheat by a day's labour, and an ordinary labourer three-quarters of a bushel."

There was not much machinery then, was there? Does an artisan earn a bushel of wheat, or its equivalent, in one day *now*? Answer, Mr. Fertiliser.

In that year "the peasant could provision his family for a twelvemonth with three quarters of wheat, three of malt, and two of oatmeal, by fifteen weeks of ordinary work; an artisan could achieve the same result in ten weeks. Such wages were regularly paid, more particularly in London." (See Professor Thorold Rogers' *Six Centuries of Work and Wages*.)

There are millions to-day who cannot provision their families in fifty weeks.

The British people live in the United Kingdom, not in Samoa or Zululand. The British people are British, not Samoan or Zulu, and I say the average Britisher could get a decent living if all the inventors and all the men of Ability were to quit the country. What our ancestors did in 1495 we could do to-day.

But we have not to deal with oppression by inventors, but oppression by a system which allows idleness and privilege and monopoly to strangle the life-blood out of the people. Let us deal with *that*. We can argue with the inventors when they threaten to become tyrannous.

The question is not "Shall Ability be paid more than Manual Labour?" but "Shall Idleness be paid more than both?" The Socialist's answer is "No. Idleness shall be paid nothing." Is he right, or wrong?



## **That Socialism would mean Confiscation, Because Compensation is Impossible.**

### ***Answer.***

Socialism would not mean Confiscation, but the stoppage of Confiscation.

Opponents of Socialism often say, "How are the land and industries to be nationalised? Are they to be paid for? If so, where is the money to come from? There is no money. The Socialists cannot, therefore, pay compensation. Consequently Socialism means Confiscation and Robbery."

Now, if you will read again the facts given in the first chapter, you will see where the fallacy of this argument lies.

The question is not "Do we propose to pay Compensation?" The question is "How long are we going to allow the present Confiscation to continue? How do we propose to reduce the amount of Confiscation until it is abolished?"

These are very different questions. As Blatchford says, "Socialism is not a burglar. Socialism is the policeman."

Robbery and Confiscation of the fruits of labour are taking place to-day. And on a grand scale, too. It is all perfectly legal. But is it moral? That is the whole point at issue.

You must either defend the present system, with all its horrors, or you must admit that it is an unjust system.

If you admit the necessity of reform, you admit the justice of *stopping the Confiscation*.

How much Confiscation are you in favour of stopping?

Your Liberal and Tory statesmen would think they deserved statues if they returned to the poor a farthing in the £ in a century.

That will not do for the Socialist. The Socialist

demands that all confiscation must be stopped. *All.*  
*ALL.* And he means all.

The present immoral system has allowed

5,000,000 PEOPLE TO ACCUMULATE £10,900,000,000  
while the rest of the population,

39,000,000, OWN ONLY £600,000,000.

These figures alone prove to an intelligent person that the fruits of labour are not being received by those who produce them.

The indignation of opponents who talk of Socialism as "sheer robbery" is like the indignation of the burglar who, when arrested for stealing a clock, said, "Why, that was five years ago—and I've kept it wound up."

We smile, but—we arrest the burglar.

Socialism is a theory of Society based on justice and the welfare of the whole people.

Very well. If all the people suddenly became vividly conscious of the injustice and immorality of the present system, and if they determined to adopt Socialism (supposing it were possible) in the tick of a clock, they, the "State," the whole people, would take over all the land and capital, all the means of production, and manage and distribute them in the light of their higher moral ideas.

Would that be Confiscation?

You may call it what you like. I contend that it would involve a change to a higher moral condition of society than exists to-day.

Socialism would Confiscate nothing but the unjust privileges which enable the very few to wrest the fruits of labour from the many, to the injury of the whole nation.

To prevent such Confiscation as goes on, Socialists are convinced that it is necessary to adopt a system of State ownership and control of land and capital.

The people is supreme. The laws under which a few rich prevent the nation from developing its assets, its men and women and children, to the best advantage, are laws which are tacitly upheld by the

people. But those laws can be amended or abolished. New laws can be made—if the people will.

The late Lord Chief Justice Coleridge said : "The particular rules by which the enjoyment of property is regulated, differing in every country in the world, must rest at last upon one and the same foundation—the general advantage."

The general advantage. Very well. I claim that Socialism would further "the general advantage."

"The life of the social organism must, as an end, rank above the lives of its units," says Herbert Spencer, and Socialists say that the life of our nation is endangered by the immoral system of to-day, which slaughters millions of children needlessly, compels millions of men and women to a miserable existence, and produces a dangerous proportion of unfit, who would, under Socialism, become strong and healthy, and moral citizens; the only real wealth of a nation.

Consequently, we say it would be folly to refrain from establishing a just and moral system of society because it would involve interference with the habits of a few units of rich men. There are only  $1\frac{1}{4}$  million rich people out of 44,000,000. So that it is a very small minority who would "suffer" by the change. And they would benefit by living in a society in which poverty, starvation, unemployment, and all the consequent misery would not exist. Everybody would benefit.

Now, no Socialist believes it to be possible to establish the new system in a week. We must go step by step. But we have a goal in view, and any reform supported by Socialists must be a step towards that goal, Socialism.

Very well. In taking these steps, in a condition of transition from the present system to Socialism, injustice would be done to certain individuals if their capital and land were taken over without "Compensation," while other individuals whose industries were not yet dealt with were allowed to enjoy their old powers and privileges.

But our opponents say "Compensation" is impossible.

I do not think "Compensation" is impossible. That is to say, I believe it possible for the State to act justly to its members. We are always tender with vested interests. We would rather kill a thousand babies than deprive a rich man of the motor cars he buys with the rents he does not earn.

For the State to take a capitalist's or landlord's capital away and give him *nothing* in return would manifestly be unjust. It is a question for arbitration.

But to give, say, an owner of land £1,000,000 as compensation for his land, and allow him to invest that million in industry, would simply be changing that landowner's unearned income from rent to interest—both robbery of the workers.

Here are a few people legally robbing the community of 6s. 8d. in the £. The problem is not "Shall the nation take the 6s. 8d. from them and give them 6s. 8d. in return, but how shall the nation get the 6s. 8d. without being unduly hard on the more or less ignorant defendants whose depredations have been winked at by the community for so long?"

To adjust the treatment fairly to the various conditions of the different defendants would require great care, and one can only hint at what might be done.

We could guarantee to pay all the rich people, to them and to their heirs for, say, two generations, incomes which would not deprive them of a single luxury to which they have been accustomed. (Poor things!) If their land and capital were used by the nation, we should at the end of that period be in a position to double their allowance, or cut it off altogether, as seemed best.

But it is not likely we shall proceed in that way. We shall most probably begin by nationalising the foundation industries of the nation, land, railways, mines, insurance, banking, and so on.

We shall also put an increasing tax on incomes

received for idleness, on rent, and interest, and monopoly.

By this means we shall accumulate national capital for starting State industries, and so solve the unemployed problem.

If we take over, say, the railways, we could give the shareholders Government stock like Consols, in return for their shares, and pay a fixed interest for a certain number of years at any rate.

This interest would be paid out of the earnings of the railways, as it is to-day, but it is probable that under State management the railways would yield higher profits, which would go into the public treasury. So with the banks and insurance companies, the mines and other industries.

A Socialist Government would naturally not desire to impoverish the poor man who happened to be a little "capitalist." The Duke of Westminster and John Smith might conceivably have, the first one million and the second £20 in the same land company.

Well, if the land company were nationalised and the dividends were reduced to a fixed rate of interest, it might hurt John Smith, while the Duke of Westminster would not feel the reduction. Such an injustice would be provided for. John Smith might have his tobacco and food taxes and his rates reduced, so that he would not lose on the whole.

The working man with £20 in the bank, or a house of his own, need have no fear. His position would certainly improve under these conditions. He would for one thing be getting an old age pension, which he could not buy for £100 to-day, and he would have regular employment, which would be worth at least £20 a year to him.

And by the time the next steps come to be taken you will be dead, and all your anxiety about your savings will be as a tale that is told.

I wonder if any of you will feel sorry, when you arrive in the next world, that you fought against Socialism for fear of losing your savings? O, my Christian friends, *what* an argument!



"I will say unto my soul, 'Soul, thou hast much goods laid up for many years; take thine ease, eat, drink, and be merry.' But God said unto him, 'Thou foolish one, this night is thy soul required of thee; and the things which thou hast prepared, whose shall they be?'"

Socialists would not be unjust or harsh. But they would not forget, when dealing out Compensation, the millions who have so long suffered from the Confiscation of the present system, and it would always be their aim to hasten the time when that Confiscation should cease.

We see, then, that Compensation in our opponents' sense *is* impossible, because it would be unjust; but Compensation in our sense is possible, because it would be just.

## **That Socialism Would Rob the Poor Man of His Savings.**

### ***Answer.***

Socialism would rob no one. The poor man is robbed of what should be his savings under the present system. Socialism would stop that robbery.

This objection is one of the many which can be refuted by confronting it with another objection.

We are told, on the one hand, that Socialism would rob the rich in order to benefit the poor; on the other hand, we are told that Socialism would take everything from the poor.

How could Socialism do both these things? It would do neither.

Here is the argument as used by Tom, Dick, and Harry all over the country. In this case the speaker's name was Claude—Mr. Claude Lowther:

But what about the savings of the poor? Your Socialist orators keep a very discreet silence on this point. But Socialism, with its terrible, implacable justice, can surely make no distinction, and will confiscate the goods of rich and poor alike. (Hear, hear.) Then what of the ten million working people who have 150 million pounds invested in the Post Office Savings Bank? What of the trade unions with their millions of workmen's money invested in houses, in building societies, in railway stocks, in land? All will be confiscated in a Socialist State; everything must go. Why, Socialism means death to trade unions. (Applause.) And that is not all. What of the many millions of money invested in the penny banks and in the trustee savings banks, I believe to the amount of over 50 millions? And I know there are over 68 millions of working people's money invested in joint stock companies and work-

men's insurance companies! All must disappear. What of our shopkeepers? What of every man who has invested his hard-earned savings—his capital—in business? All that has to go. Everything has to go, from the palace of the King to the poor man's homestead—and don't you make any mistake. (Laughter and applause.)

Everything has to go! But where *to*? The Tory orator said "Socialism" will take it. Who or what is Socialism? By Socialism he meant a Socialist State. What is a Socialist State? A Socialist State means the Whole People.

A Socialist State, then, would take everything from the people. That is to say, the Whole People would take everything from the Whole People.

The Tory orator's object was to prove that the poor man would be robbed of his £20 in the bank, or his house. But if Socialism would also rob the rich to benefit the poor, Socialism would have something to give the poor man. Let us see how much.

The total wealth of the country is estimated to be £11,500 millions.

Divide £11,500 millions amongst 44 million people. There would be £260 per head, or £1,300 worth of property for a family of five.

How many working men have £1,300? How many have 1,300 shillings? Very few.

The facts speak for themselves. Our opponents never tell the whole story. If they did, their audiences would perceive that their arguments destroy each other.

But Socialists do not want to "divide up." What, then, would be the position of the working man with £20 in the bank, or a house of his own, if Socialism were established? \*

Let us first consider the position of such a working man *to-day*. He has £20 in the bank. He gets 10s. per year interest on it. But any day he may have to withdraw some or all of it on account of sickness, death, or unemployment. How far will £20 go?

If his wages are 30s. a week, his £20 would vanish in less than three months if he were cut of work. Even if he is lucky enough to keep his savings intact till old age, what use is £20? Will it keep him out of the workhouse? For how long?

Now, consider his position under Socialism. He would have regular work, so long as he were able to work, compensation in case of accident, and an old age pension (*a real one*). His wages would be higher, his house would *be* a house, his food would be pure, his clothes would be of good quality, his education and recreations would be of the best, his health would be better, and he would have no anxiety for his own or his children's future. And his money in the bank would be safer than ever.

So that if the "State" did steal his £20, the "State" would give him in return what he cannot buy to-day for £2,000.

The same arguments apply to the man with a house. What does a man who owns a house gain by it to-day? And how many really "own" their houses out of the ten millions mentioned by Mr. Claude Lowther? One million? No; nor a half; nor a quarter. Why, if all the £400 millions of working-class savings were invested in house property, at a beggarly £200 per house, it would represent only two million paltry houses!

And how many working men who have a house "of their own" are paying interest on mortgages?

Thousands of those who buy houses through building societies have to pay 50 per cent. more than the value of the houses, because their enormous savings are so large that they can only deposit a portion of the price, and are compelled to borrow the remainder, and pay interest on it.

It would pay every working man with a house to have it "stolen" by the "State," and it would pay the State to burn a good many of them to the ground and build decent ones in their places.

A man buys a £400 house through a building society. Suppose he pays down one-quarter (£100),

and borrows the remainder at 4 per cent. What does his house cost him?

If he repays in 20 years the house will cost him £550.

So that in order to *have* £400 he has to save £550!

Now, under Socialism a man's savings would be his own, just as now. But there would be no need to buy a house, and part of what he paid in rent would come back to him in the form of reduced taxes. So that his savings could be much greater, and they would cost him less. If he wanted £400 he need only save £400, not £550.

There is the question of the funds of the trade unions and building societies. Mr. Lowther says all these will "go." Where will they "go" to?

Let us first find out how much these enormous savings amount to.

Do the workers possess property or money of the value of £100 each? If they did, what a beggarly sum!

*But they don't.* No, the savings of the working class are much less. Here are some figures:

Deposits in P.O. Savings Bank	£141,000,000
" Trustee Savings Banks	52,000,000
Consols ... ..	15,000,000
Capital of Building Societies ...	47,000,000
Funds of Trade Unions, Co-operative & Friendly Societies	72,000,000
Funds of Industrial Life Assurance Societies ... ..	23,000,000
<hr/>	
Total ... ..	£350,000,000

Those figures are six or seven years old. Suppose we add another £50 millions to cover the savings since. That will make the total £400 millions. But if ten million workers had a wretched £100 each the savings would amount to £1,000 millions. Two and a-half times as much as the whole of the working classes own.

Now, every year it is estimated that out of the

total income of £1,750 millions received by the whole population, £200 millions are "saved."

So that the working class, after years and years and years of saving, possess only an amount equal to two years' savings of the whole people!

What do the few rich own?

The total accumulation of the whole people is estimated at £11,500 millions.

The working class own £400 millions; the rest own £11,100 millions.

Thus, for every £4 saved by the working class, the well-to-do and rich have saved £111.

The workers number millions. The rich are few.

Mr. Chiozza Money, M.P., in the *Daily Mail Year Book*, estimates that

5,000,000	people own	£10,900,000,000
39,000,000	people own	£600,000,000

Or, to put it another way:

39	poor and middle class own	£15 each
5	rich ... ..	„ £2,180 „

Far from desiring to keep discreetly silent about the savings of the working class, I should like the facts shouted from the house-tops, and from Tory and Liberal platforms. *And*, the facts about the savings of the rich. It is the Tory and Liberal orators who keep discreetly silent.

What they tell the working man is that the "State" will confiscate or steal the £20 he has in the bank, and the house he has bought with his savings. They do not tell him the facts I have set out above, which prove that the working man is now being robbed yearly of more than he can save in a lifetime under the present system.

Now, what is done with the trade union and other funds of the working classes to-day? And what would become of them under Socialism?

To-day they are invested in Consols and various industries. That is to say, these funds are to a very great extent at the mercy of the capitalist class. So

long as the workers "keep their place," they are permitted to invest their petty savings along with the big capitalists, and the capitalists are wide enough to know that when the workers have a "stake" in the country they are not likely to become too "uppish."

The working man with his trade union funds is in the position of the sheep who "saved" its lambs by leaving them in the care of the wolf. He "saves" by handing over his funds to the capitalist, who, in time of trades disputes, is his deadly enemy.

The trade union and other funds of the workers can nearly all be filched from them whenever the capitalists like to put their heads together for the purpose.

Under Socialism, the industries in which these funds are invested would gradually be nationalised. They would become State industries. But would the workers suffer? Would they lose anything?

Not a cent.

The working man with £20 is implored by the millionaire to stand in with him to defeat the wicked Socialist robbers. "They are after your £20," he cries.

But when the working man understands that the present immoral system enables the millionaire to take 6s. 8d. in the £ of his earnings, and that under an equitable system his £20 might be multiplied by ten, he may begin to suspect that the millionaire is not the noble patriot he pretends to be.

*And*—when the working man understands that Socialism will abolish unemployment, slums, overcrowding, child slaughter and slavery, the degradation of women; when he understands that Socialism will ensure work and hope and health and leisure and education and recreation for *all*, then I think he will conclude that he will risk losing his £20 and his house, and work for Socialism.

A good many of him are already doing so. It is the trade unionist with savings and the man with a house of his own who makes the keenest Socialist.

## That Socialism Would Ruin the Small Shopkeeper.

### *Answer.*

The small shopkeeper is being ruined to-day. Socialism would save him.

There are thousands of small capitalists in this country—men who by individual initiative, self-reliance, and industry have made for themselves an honourable position in our social organisation. I allude, ladies and gentlemen, to the small shopkeepers, a class whose usefulness to the community is undeniable. How would these men fare if we allowed the hideous miasma of Socialism to rear its horrid tentacles in our midst?

Ladies and gentlemen, they would be crushed out of existence. Yes. The Socialists make no secret of their intention to ruin this industrious, this self-reliant, this noble body of men and women. Their shops would be taken by the State, their capital would be confiscated, and they and their families would be cast upon the world amongst the flotsam and jetsam of an effete civilisation, dependent for existence upon the crust of charity or the degrading doles of pauperism.

That is what the Tory and Liberal orators tell you. Is that a true picture of the fate of the small shopkeeper under Socialism? On the contrary, it is more like the condition of things existing *to-day*, under Freedom, Competition, and devil take the hindmost. Let us try a few facts.

In October, 1907, the London bakers, the small shopkeepers, woke up one morning and found on their doorsteps, along with the "Daily Exposure of Socialism," a little Trust.

Such a little thing. A mere baby Trust. And so quiet. But oh, how those small capitalists jumped!



The price of bread had been rising. We were told that the cause of the rise was the shortage of wheat. Flour was dearer. So the small shopkeeper had raised his price. The 4lb. loaf was sold for 6d., but even this price, it was said, did not cover the advance in flour, and profits had almost disappeared.

On the top of these troubles arrived the baby Trust.

What is a Trust?

Although there are a tremendous number of small bakers in London—little capitalists who employ a few men and bake their own bread—there are a growing number of wholesale bakers who supply shopkeepers.

One of these large bakers is the V.V. Bread Company. Suddenly the V.V. developed into a baby Trust.

The V.V. gave notice that in future they would not supply agents, but would sell their breadstuffs at their own depôts.

They began by opening sixty shops.

And they sold the 4lb. loaf at 5d. instead of 6d.

The small bakers were furious. Why? Why should they be furious?

Because they feared ruin. They couldn't afford to sell bread at 5d. Their profits were already cut into at 6d. To sell at 5d. meant ruin.

But if the public can get a loaf for 5d., will they pay 6d.?

They will not. Consequently the 6d. shopkeeper is doomed. He will be ruined.

By what? By Socialism?

No. By our glorious system of individual initiative, freedom, self-reliance, liberty. By Competition. By Monopoly.

By the Trust.

Who is trying to take the shops from the small shopkeepers? The Trust.

Who is robbing them of their capital? The Trust.

Who will turn them into the streets to find a living how they may? The Trust.

To-day the Trusts are doing all the terrible things

to the small capitalist which the Tories and Liberals tell them Socialism *would* do at some distant date.

But the small bakers will combine and fight the Trust.

Will they beat the Trust? Ah!

Of course, they may beat this little Trust. By forming a Combine, another sort of Trust, they may freeze the little baby to death.

But do they think they will always be able to keep out the Trusts? Cannot they see the writing on the wall?

The small baker employing two or three hands is doomed. He has to go. Why?

Because he is dear. Because he is inefficient. Because he is out of date.

The only question for the small baker is, "Am I to be abolished by the Trust, or by Socialism?"

Allow me to put the problem from the Socialist point of view.

Here is a community in which bread is a necessary of life. So much bread is required every day. The question is how to provide the people with the best possible bread in the most convenient and economical way.

It is plain that in a large town it would be cheaper and more efficient to have one or more central bakeries, from which the bread could be delivered by motor carts direct to customers, rather than to have a number of small shops, with a little hand-cart or slow horsed cart, each overlapping the district of half-a-dozen others. Local depôts might be necessary, but they need not be so numerous nor so large as under the wasteful system of to-day.

Bread could then be produced under decent conditions. The workers would be better paid, and work in healthy surroundings. Bread would be pure. The price would be the cost price. If the bakeries belonged to the people.

What is the alternative to Socialism?

The present system being doomed, the only alternative is the Trust.

Now, if the Trust were a moderately sensible

Trust, it would produce pure bread, in decent bakeries. But—no Trust would pay its workers as well as the community, and no Trust would sell bread at cost price.

Under Socialism, the public would be sure of pure bread at cost price, and the bread-makers would be sure of fair wages and decent conditions.

Under the Trust—there would be huge profits for the Trust. The bread might be jungle bread. The workers and the public would be at the mercy of the Trust.

Which is the better method—Socialism or Mammon?

In any case, the small baker will disappear. His methods of making and distributing bread are wasteful. If he is abolished by the Trust, what will happen to him?

Will the Trust buy him out? No. The Trust will freeze him out.

Will the Trust compensate him for the loss of his business? No. The Trust will rob him of his business. This is a free country. The Trust will only exercise "initiative" in so doing.

Will the Trust find the starving shopkeepers work?

*Will it?*

Now compare the proposals of Socialists with the actions of the Trust. Socialists propose that the State should take over industries and organise them for the benefit of the State. What is the State? The whole people. Not a governing clique. The whole people.

We want bread. We can grow or buy wheat. We can make flour. We can bake loaves. Is it not insane, then, for thousands of people to be fighting each other to the death as to who shall conduct this simple business? We have our own waterworks, gasworks, and electricity works by the hundred. Why, then, should we not organise this business of making bread, and put an end for ever to the degrading struggle for existence between rival bakeries? Would it be a denial of Christianity for the nation to make its own bread?

The same arguments apply to the provision of Milk, Meat, Boots, Drapery, and other goods supplied by small shopkeepers. Trusts are growing daily. Boots, the Cash Chemist, Lipton, the Provision Merchant, the Home and Colonial, and many other big firms have hundreds of branches all over the country. Then there are big stores who sell "everything." The small shopkeeper finds it daily more difficult to protect his little capital and his hard-earned income from the assaults of the Trusts.

The Trust, privately owned, is a terrible engine of oppression. The chief industries in the United States are owned by a few big private Trusts. The small capitalist has been ruthlessly wiped out by the thousand.

THE SAME THING WILL HAPPEN HERE, under Free Trade, sooner or later. Under Tariff Reform, which is Protection, Trusts flourish. Look at America and Germany.

Let the small shopkeeper think.

The only Trust worth having is Socialism. Why?

Because under Socialism the Land and Capital would belong to ALL the people, not to a few millionaires.

## **That Socialism would Abolish Competition, and so Reduce the Amount of Wealth Produced.**

### ***Answer.***

Socialism would abolish Competition and so increase the amount of wealth produced.

To-day we live under a system of Competition and Monopoly, and we are told that if we abolish Competition, and establish Socialism, the nation will not produce so much wealth.

Socialists, on the contrary, assert that Competition and private Monopoly are bad for the nation, and they further assert that under Socialism it would be possible to increase largely the total national income.

Let us consider a few examples of the way Competition and Monopoly injuriously affect the production of wealth.

If you were told that the head of a large family had a separate house for each member of the family, a separate baker, a separate butcher, a separate milkman, a separate tailor, a separate bootmaker, a separate draper, a separate doctor, a separate cemetery, and so on, and if you were told that he acted thus on the ground that Competition must be encouraged, you would say he was mad.

Well, we go about providing the nation with food in little less absurd ways.

Milk, bread, and meat are foods used by the bulk of the population. Forty-four million people require so much bread, meat, and milk per day. How do we set about providing the required amount? How would an educated, business-like, scientific man tackle the problem?

We have thousands of producers and distributors of bread, milk, and meat, all working and competing to supply the required quantities.

In one small street you may see more than a score

of separate bread, milk, and meat distributors, all covering the same ground, all wasting rent, materials, and labour, in the effort to obtain a meagre living.

The chaos in production is often as marked, but in bread and meat the Trusts have already begun to organise production.

Now, all this Competition involves Waste. Wicked waste. It is just as foolish as dropping buckets into empty wells, or digging holes and filling them up again, and calling it "employment."

If a man requires only one loaf, it is plain that if two bakers make a loaf for him, one will be wasted. The materials and the labour of one baker are thrown away.

Again, a baker can make one loaf, and could make two with a very little more time and labour. If there are two customers, he could supply both. But under our system, another baker sets up in business to compete with the old one for the new customer—nay, for the first customer, too. Thus wasting rent, materials, time, and labour.

As you walk along your streets count the boot shops, the drapers, the tobacconists, the milk shops, the bakers, the butchers—notice how close they are together, observe how little difference there is between many of the goods all sell, and then ask yourself whether it would not be easy to organise a system which would save a good deal of rent, material, and labour, and do the work they are doing under better conditions and at less cost.

This waste in production and distribution is rampant under our present system. Let us take another example, a large industry, our railway system.

What, in an efficient nation, should be the work of the railway system? Evidently to convey passengers and goods to their destinations in the quickest, cheapest, and most comfortable and convenient way.

Do our railways fulfil these requirements?

On the contrary, they are notoriously dear, dilatory, and inefficient.

Where they have a monopoly they treat passengers

worse than cattle, their fares are high, and there is a never-ending chorus of complaints from traders because of the high rates for carriage of goods.

Where they are in competition their recklessness and extravagance are suicidal.

Let me give an example of the waste from Competition.

Mr. W. J. Stevens, F.S.S., writing on British Railway extravagance in the *Financial Review of Reviews* for December, 1907, says of the Great Western, one of the best managed lines :

Capital expenditure has been largely directed to shorten existing routes, and so capture traffic belonging to other companies. . . . Most of these lines not only do not open up any new courses of traffic worth securing, but they duplicate existing routes of the Great Western itself. This company has not hesitated to incur many millions of capital expenditure which have merely reduced the profit derived from its existing lines, for the sake of filching a part of the traffic already within the legitimate sphere of a competitor.

And Mr. Stevens reckons that this reckless competition has, in the last ten years, wasted £5½ millions of the ordinary shareholders' capital, while the market value of their shares has depreciated £15 millions.

The same kind of throat cutting has taken place amongst London 'bus companies. The problem of supplying 'bus traffic for London is quite simple. But what a chaos competition makes of it ! A score of companies are scrambling for the traffic, with the result that millions of capital are being wasted, and the public is being badly served, thus wasting their time and money too.

Consider coal. Coal is a necessary, and the quantity required per family or factory per year a matter easy of calculation. Scientifically organised, its production and distribution would be as regular and punctual and cheap as possible.

But under our system of monopoly and competi-

tion the public is periodically robbed of scores of millions of pounds by a little gang of coal owners, who in this way "confiscate" the wealth which would buy them out many times over. Terrible suffering is caused to the poor, the prices of most commodities are raised, the public is put to much inconvenience by irregular supply, and all the time the men who *get* the coal, the workers, are wretchedly paid.

Waste, waste, waste is written all over our system. All the workers now employed in useless competition might be producing wealth. Thus Socialism, by abolishing competition, would increase the total income. And Socialism, by abolishing private monopoly, would prevent the robbery of the public by greedy dividend hunters.

You call Socialism robbery and confiscation! Do you know that every time you put 1s. down to buy an article you are being robbed by Monopoly or Competition of from 3d. to 10d.?

You want a pair of boots. You go into a bootshop and you buy a pair of boots. But what do you *pay* for?

Much beside boots. You pay for the labour employed in producing the boots at that spot for your convenience, but you also pay for the wasted labour caused by Competition, for useless advertising, for useless travellers, for useless shop rents, and fixtures, for useless employees, for unnecessary factories and machinery. Ah! The blessings of Competition.

Coal can be bought at the pit bank at from 6s. to 10s. a ton. When it arrives in London it is 30s. Who gets the difference?

Competition and Monopoly get most of it. Useless labour and legalised robbery. *Waste.*

You can travel from London to Lancashire by five different routes, all running trains at the same times. I live near a main line, and I cross the line sometimes and watch the non-stop expresses rushing past. What an entrancing sight, the mighty locomotive and the train of carriages! I often wonder



if any people are in them. If so, they must be under the seats. The blessings of Competition!

But all these competitors mean employment for the workers? Yes. *Useless* employment.

An intelligent trade union leader has actually advised the railway men not to support Railway Nationalisation because it would mean the employment of a smaller staff!

That is an admission that certain men are now wasting their time. But they are being paid. Who pays them? The public.

It is plain, then, that the public could afford to pay them for doing *nothing*, and reap all the other advantages of nationalisation.

But under Socialism, these men would not be thrown on the streets, as men are now when a Trust or an amalgamation "reduces working expenses." No. Socialism would organise work for all.

This brings me to another form of waste caused by Competition. I mean the waste of the Unemployed.

Do you know that from 2 to 10 per cent. of our best workers, the skilled trade unionists, are *always* unemployed?

Do you know that irregularity of employment, and unemployment, and the suffering and anxiety involved, cause deterioration in health and morals?

Well, we have from a quarter of a million to a million always unemployed. Suppose we say an average of 500,000. And the cause of unemployment is Competition and Monopoly.

Now, under Socialism those people would have regular employment. To-day we lose, besides the wealth that might be produced by useless competitors, the wealth that might be produced by this immense army.

Under Socialism they would all be as healthy and strong and capable as possible, and instead of costing the rest of the nation immense sums in charity, they would increase the national income by at least £100 millions a year.

There is the Waste due to sickness and ill-health.

We have 12 millions on the verge of starvation. These people cannot possibly do their best. They are always below par. We have twenty millions very poor. Their surroundings, at home and at work, are frequently vile. The result is loss of wealth by the cost of ill-health, and by consequent loss of productive power.

We pay many unnecessary millions for sickness caused by slums, starvation, underfeeding, overwork, and underpay.

Many a middle-class, aye, and upper-class, family have to mourn the loss of some dear one whose death could be traced directly to slums, or low wages, or overwork.

Think of the infectious diseases that are spread amongst all classes by the poverty of the workers. The middle classes and the upper classes do not suffer so heavily as the working class, but nine-tenths of what they do suffer in this way comes direct from the poor, and is quite an unnecessary evil. Poverty and ignorance, unemployment, slums—all these are the blessings of Competition!

The foregoing examples of the evil effects of Monopoly and Competition are the merest hints at the vast amount of Waste caused by our present system. But they may suggest to the reader to observe for himself, and if he looks, and wherever he looks, he will find ample proof of the truth of my argument. And remember that this Waste costs *you* at least 25 per cent. of your wages. If you had to pay a direct tax of 5s. in the £ you would howl. Well, you are doing it *now*.

Production of the greatest possible amount of wealth under private monopoly is impossible. The Land monopoly and the practical monopoly of Capital by a few thousand people are enormous restrictions on productive power.

Not only is the system which gives 20,000 people the bulk of the wealth in the country immoral, but the use made by these people of their wealth is a continual danger to the State.

They do not use their immense opportunities to

foster industries for the benefit of the people. They go straight for higher dividends.

The rural people perish for want of land. The great landlords shut up their property and build high walls of protection round it. The rich owners of town lands, who take enormous sums made by the people, for doing nothing, do not allow this wealth to return to the people in the form of new industries, and extensions of old industries. Not altogether. No. They export millions per year to foreign countries.

Why? *Because they can make higher dividends out of the badly paid foreigner.* They give work to the foreigner in preference to the British. Many of these are Tariff Reformers, who pretend to want to protect the British workman against foreign competition.

Do you know that nearly £1 out of every £5 owned by the British people in the United Kingdom is invested abroad?

Is that patriotism, while we have half a million unemployed, and 12 millions on the verge of starvation?

It is plain that the practical monopoly of land and capital by the few prevents the production of the greatest possible amount of wealth for home consumption.

There are the various Trusts. There are many Trusts in this country already. Under Protection they will grow like mushrooms. Look at America and Germany. What does the Trust do?

It abolishes Competition. It dismisses useless competitive employees. It reduces "working expenses." For whose benefit?

For the benefit of the shareholders in the Trust.

Now read this gem from a speech of Mr. Claude Lowther:

Mr. Bannington asks me what I would do with Trusts. I want to clip the wings of Trusts, and I would begin by smashing the biggest Trust, the

most gigantic monopoly that was ever conceived, and that is a Socialist State. (Loud applause.)

Mr. Lowther wants to clip the wings of Trusts, and he is in favour of Protection, under which Trusts flourish exceedingly.

Now observe. Knowing the public dislike of Trusts, Mr. Lowther calls a Socialist State the biggest Trust of all, and, hey, presto! loud applause. His audience have evidently discovered a "master mind."

But what a curious "master mind" it must be that finds pleasure in obtaining applause by such means. A Trust to-day consists of a few people, who (if their wings require clipping) must be using their power to make unfair profits out of the people.

But a Socialist State, or Trust, would consist of the WHOLE PEOPLE. So that we have Mr. Lowther denouncing the whole people for desiring to use their labour and ability to produce the greatest amount of wealth possible for distribution amongst themselves!

Mr. Lowther's suggestion was that a Monopoly owned by the WHOLE PEOPLE is the same as a Monopoly owned by a few people. One would think that a "master mind" knew the difference.

Under Socialism, Competition would be abolished. Waste would be eliminated. Our captains of industry, instead of using their Ability to discover ways of cutting their competitors' throats, would use their Ability in devising means of producing wealth by the most economical methods. The saving would be enormous, and the result would be an increased productive power which would very soon enable us to obtain double the wealth of to-day.

## That the Prospect of Socialism would drive Capital out of the Country.

### *Answer.*

If you are so foolish as to allow yourselves to be deluded by Socialist agitators, and if you become so numerous that there is a prospect of your putting Socialism into practice, we shall very quickly bring you back to a reasonable frame of mind. *We shall take our Capital abroad.*

Ah! Where would the misguided millions be then? Without Capital, and without the Ability to create new Capital, the plight of the masses would be a thousand times worse than it is to-day. The streets would be flooded with a workless population, who must very soon starve to death from lack of the absolute necessities of life!

Such is the terrible picture drawn by many eloquent gentlemen, whose imagination is in inverse ratio to their knowledge of the subject.

I can understand the average person, who has never given a thought to the question, thinking it possible for the capitalists to take all their Capital abroad. Capital does go abroad. Everybody knows that. Capital is always going abroad.

But when M.P.'s, bishops, and eminent financiers who are supposed to possess abnormal Ability use this argument, I am compelled to conclude either that they are humorists or that their boasted Ability is a myth.

Capital goes abroad in varying quantities every year. But does *all* Capital go abroad?

Evidently not. Then only *some* Capital goes abroad.

Why only *some*? Why is not *all* Capital driven abroad under the present system?

I think everyone will agree that some Capital goes

abroad because the owners of the Capital want to make dividends without working for them.

Some Capital goes abroad, then, because it *pays* to invest it abroad.

But Capital is invested at home. Why? Evidently because it *pays* to invest it at home.

Why, then, is not all Capital invested at home, or all Capital invested abroad?

Either it pays *better* to invest some Capital abroad, or, there is no room for further investment at home, and the surplus Capital is driven abroad.

The present system, then, drives Capital abroad.

Our opponents, knowing that Capital goes abroad in this way, argue that any amount of Capital could be invested abroad, if the owners wanted to send it; that *all* the Capital could be sent abroad.

Is this inference sound? *Could* all the owners of Capital take their Capital abroad?

First, let us inquire how and in what form Capital goes abroad now. When a man invests Capital abroad, what actually takes place?

Does he send money—golden sovereigns?

This is impossible. British capitalists have investments abroad estimated at 2,000 millions. But all the coin in the country amounts only to 130 millions, and this does not decrease.

Capitalists do not send money abroad for investment. Money is not capital. Money is the tool used for passing goods from hand to hand. In what form, then, does Capital go abroad?

In the form of goods, either raw materials or manufactures.

If British capitalists invest a million in Canadian railways, that £1,000,000 must leave the country, sooner or later, in the form of goods.

Who makes the goods, or gets the raw materials from the earth?

Workers.

Then, in order to be able to send Capital abroad, there must be workers.

Then Capital cannot leave the country unless the workers consent to use their energies in manu-

facturing, or in getting raw materials from the land.

Now, if the bulk of the people were Socialists, and a few capitalists wanted to "teach them a lesson" by taking all their Capital abroad, how if the workers refused to produce the goods for them to send abroad?

You must understand that Socialism cannot be established, nor can steps to Socialism be taken, unless the majority of the people are convinced of the justice and necessity of such measures.

If, then, you imagine a time when capitalists are all anxious to take their Capital from the country, you must imagine that, at the same time, the bulk of the population are Socialists. And if lessons were being taught, I think the foolish capitalists would receive a severe one.

The thoughtless person seems to think that capitalists can get up in the morning and decide to leave the country with all their Capital by the evening. It is not so easy.

Let us look a little further into the matter. Capital goes abroad to-day because it *pays* to invest abroad. No capitalist would send his Capital abroad if he thought he would be more likely to lose it than to keep it intact and make dividends. Would he?

It follows, then, that no Capital can be invested abroad unless the capitalists have confidence in the success of the foreign enterprise.

Now, what breeds this confidence in the soundness of a foreign investment?

In the first place (suppose it is a foreign railway), there must be a settled government in the foreign country. There must be a population to use the railway. There must be trade and industry.

Again, the foreign country must have the Capital in the form required by *it*. If the foreign country requires Capital in the form of railways, it is no use for the capitalist soap manufacturer in England to send out machinery for soap making.

Suppose, now, the brewers in this country to

become fearful of Socialism. Suppose they decided to take their Capital abroad. Where would they go to?

In the first place, they have to find a country which wants Capital, and it must be a country where the investment would be safe, and produce dividends.

Can these conditions be obtained in the tick of a clock?

But before they can send the Capital abroad they must sell it to someone. Why?

Because at present the capital of brewers consists of buildings and machinery, and, largely, of monopoly rights.

Now, if no foreign country wanted breweries and beer-making tools, the brewers would have to sell these, and buy with the money the kind of Capital the foreign country required.

Who would buy the breweries?

Other capitalists?

But we are assuming that the brewers are going abroad because they fear Socialism. Other capitalists, then, would be afraid to buy the breweries. The brewers could not sell, except at a heavy loss.

The breweries and the hotels would be worth next to nothing. The Capital of the brewers (their buildings, and tools, and hotels, and public-houses) is only valuable because the brewers have Government licences to sell beer. Take away the licence from a £5,000 hotel, and what is it worth? Simply the cost of the building.

The Capital the brewers would be able to take away would not, then, be worth much. The losses in realising would almost annihilate it.

So with most other Capital. The water pipes and plant of the old London water companies were worth comparatively little. But the people of London had to pay nearly 40 millions to buy them out! Why?

*They were not paying for Capital. They were paying the companies for their monopoly rights to draw water rents from the water users.*

If the water companies had taken their water



pipes and plant abroad, what use would they have been? Of what value? They would have been worth so much rubbish.

Capital is useless without workers to keep it in repair and customers to buy their products.

I have assumed that the brewers would be able to sell their Capital and to buy other Capital suitable for a foreign country. But we are told that *all* the capitalists would leave the country.

Now, it may be possible for *some* capitalists to sell their Capital, and buy another kind suitable for investment abroad, but *all* could not do it. Because, if *all* Capitalists want to sell at once, there can be no buyers.

It is easy enough to-day for one capitalist to take his Capital abroad, just as it is easy for a few people to draw their money from the banks in gold.

But if all the people wanted their money from the banks in gold *at once*, the banks would break.

They haven't *got* gold. So if all the capitalists wanted to take their Capital abroad at once, most of the Capital would disappear. Its value would go down enormously. The capitalists would be ruined. They would be glad to take 5s. in the £ from the wicked, confiscating Socialists, for their wealth.

As the capitalists would not be able to exchange their Capital for goods suitable to invest abroad, they would be compelled (if they still insisted on going) to take their Capital in its present form.

For instance, the railway capitalists would have to tear up their rails, and pull down their stations, and pack their rolling stock up for export abroad. The coalowners would have to dig up all the coal in the mines, and—but how could they get it to the ports for shipment without railways? The cotton manufacturers would have to break up their mills, and take their machinery to pieces and pack it, and then where would *they* be without railways? And so on.

But suppose the railways were left to the last, and all the other property, including the land and the coal mines, were dumped on the quays of our ports. What about shipping?

We export now goods to the value of 400 millions a year. The total wealth of the rich is estimated at 10,000 millions or so.

Well, 400 into 10,000 is 25. So that it would take 25 years to ship the wealth abroad!

And who would do the work?

Again, to what country would the capitalists depart with their Capital? To France, or Germany, or the United States? What! Do you think the capitalists of those countries would allow a horde of competitors to step in and rob them of their trade?

Would they go to Canada or Australia?

Where are the customers? Where are the workers to man the factories and workshops?

And what about Socialism in those countries? The poor capitalist can hardly turn anywhere without jumping out of the frying-pan into the fire. There is no escape from Socialism on this planet.

Would they go to Africa or China? Imagine Lord George Hamilton landing on the coast of Africa with Liverpool Street Station! Think of Lord Avebury dumped into the Celestial Empire with a Tramway and *The Pleasures of Life* in his pocket. Conceive the joy of Sir Christopher Furness at his escape from the wicked Socialists, to the wilds of Siberia, with train loads of blast furnaces and the Sermon on the Mount!

Isn't it a comic argument to issue from the mouths of eminent financiers, captains of industry, M.P.'s, and master minds?

*Capital, to be profitable, cannot go abroad except in the form of goods required by those abroad.* Goods are made by workers, so that Capital could not be sent abroad without the consent of the workers. Again, Capital, to be profitable abroad, must be in demand abroad, and secure; and demand and security cannot be created at a moment's notice.

The threat, then, of the capitalists is so much bluff and ignorance. I should think nothing would contribute so effectually to the sudden (and cheap) establishment of Socialism as a wholesale attempt to take Capital abroad.

Before I conclude, I should like to say a few words as to the way Capital is driven abroad by the present system.

Of the total wealth of the whole kingdom, nearly one-fifth is invested abroad. About 2,000 millions out of 11,500 millions. Roughly, £1 out of every £5 is invested abroad.

Why is so much invested abroad? Is there no need for investment at home?

Have we enough houses, enough clothing, enough of everything necessary to a healthy and decent life?

On the contrary, we are sadly lacking even in the necessities of life. Why, then, does Capital go abroad?

I will tell you. Capital is invested abroad by rich people because it *pays*. Why are they rich? They are rich because they receive a grossly unfair share of the wealth produced.

Why do they not invest more at home?

They do not invest more at home, because the workers have not enough wages to buy more goods, houses, food, coal, and clothing. Why have not the workers enough wages to buy a proper quantity of these goods?

Because they are robbed by a system which gives to a few idle people one-third of the income produced by the whole people.

Now, under Socialism, the wealth would belong to those who produced it, to the whole people, and no sane people would export heaps of Capital abroad when their own people lacked the necessities of life.

Socialism, then, would not drive Capital abroad. It would keep it at home.

## **That Socialism Would Destroy Religion.**

### ***Answer.***

The assertion that Socialism would destroy Religion is not true. And it is not true for this reason: that no man, no body of men, no nation, no human power whatever, can destroy Religion, so long as the human race exists.

Those who ignorantly make this assertion do so from various motives, but it is chiefly made in order to evoke the indignation of the people, who are told that Socialism would destroy their most cherished possession.

A man's Religion is, or should be, very dear to him. If, then, it were possible to destroy Religion, it would only be natural for men to defend it with all the passion and strength they could command.

But Religion cannot be destroyed.

What is Religion? Is it one thing or more than one?

We know, but some people always seem to forget, that there are many religions. There is the Christian religion, commonly supposed to be the religion of the people of this country.

There are the religions of Buddhism, Moham-medanism, Shintoism, Confucianism, Taouism, Hinduism. Then there are the countless religions of the so-called savage peoples of Africa and Asia and other countries. And besides the living religions, we know of many religions which have lived for a time and now are dead.

There is not one religion only, but many. We know, too, that religions rise, flourish for a time, and then decay and die.

It is plain, then, that some power is already in existence which destroys religions. Is that power Socialism?

It cannot be Socialism, for Socialism is a scheme

of society which, Mr. Balfour says, has never yet been tried.

What, then, is that power? The answer is, Knowledge, progress in science. This is the great destroyer of religions.

The religion of the savage who believes in a number of gods is said to be a lower form of religion than the religion of a people who believe in one god. The religion of the people whose only gods are their ancestors is said to be a lower form of religion than the religion of a people who believe in a spiritual god of supreme power. Religion *progresses*.

If, now, it be asserted that Socialism would destroy religions, it can only be asserted on the ground that Socialism would increase Knowledge, for it cannot be denied that it is Knowledge that destroys some religions and causes new religions to rise.

Is it, or is it not, a good thing to increase Knowledge?

If it is not a good thing, we ought to discard all modern religions and go back to the Fetish worship of our savage ancestors.

If Knowledge is a good thing, and Socialism would increase Knowledge, we ought to support Socialism, though it destroy all the religions in existence to-day.

But I said at first that it was impossible to destroy Religion! And since then I have said that religions are destroyed, and that Knowledge destroys them. What a contradiction!

But there is no contradiction, my friends. I have said that Knowledge destroys *religions*, but not that Knowledge destroys Religion.

What do I mean by that? I mean that just as it would be correct to say human races die, but the human race never dies, so it is correct to say religions die, but Religion never dies.

What is Religion?

Leaving out of account the peoples who are said to have no idea of Religion, we may say that all men

form some conception of the Powers or the Power which brought them into being, and of their relation to those Powers or that Power.

That is Religion. What men believe about the Power that brought them into existence, and what men believe are their relations to that Power.

Now, what can possibly prevent any man from forming his own opinions about the Power which brought him into existence, and about his relations to that Power? Nothing. Nothing on earth.

How does a man form his opinions on these matters? By thinking. With what does he think? With the brain?

Then so long as a man has a brain he can think about these matters. Not persecution, nor torture, nor anything short of death can prevent a man from holding what he believes to be the true Religion.

It is impossible, then, to destroy Religion, so long as the human race exists, and the assertion that Socialism would destroy Religion is pure ignorance.

## That Socialism would Destroy the Incentive of Gain.

### *Answer.*

And a good thing, too.

Of all the arguments against Socialism, this is the one you would least expect to find in the mouths of the ministers of Christ. Yet it is the one that you always find there.

They insist that it is impossible for man to work without the incentive of gain. These disciples of the poor and lowly Jesus, who, whenever He spoke of riches, denounced them, and taught His followers to find happiness in things not of this world, cling to the incentive of gain as if it were the key to the door of eternal bliss. Is it not strange?

*Did Christ approve of the incentive of gain?*

Tell me, are the actions which distinguish a man as a good Christian actions done with the hope of gain?

You will answer, No.

Then, would it not be wise to multiply such actions?

The Christian will say, the more Christlike actions the better.

Then, if Socialism would destroy the incentive of gain, Socialism would give more opportunities for the other kind of action. How, then, can you oppose Socialism on that ground?

It seems to me that if you deny the possibility of destroying the incentive of gain, you deny the possibility of Christianity. And you pray every day, "Thy kingdom come." Do you pray for the *impossible*?

Now, why do Christians fear the destruction of this motive?

In the first place, they say that as, under Social-

ism, "everything would be provided by the State, there would be no incentive to work."

This argument is based on a misunderstanding. By State, Socialists mean the Whole People. Thus, if everything would be provided by the Whole People, the Whole People could only provide everything by *working*.

There would be the same incentive to work as now. That otherwise the people would starve.

Next we are told that as "all would receive equal wages, the people would be reduced to one dead level. There would be no incentive for the clever man to use his talents."

As regards equality of wages, I have dealt with this objection in the article on Ability and Invention. Socialism does not necessarily involve equal wages. We could pay Ability and Invention as well, or better, than they are paid to-day, under Socialism. So long as it was necessary, we could retain the incentive of gain.

So that this objection falls to the ground. If the incentive of gain cannot be destroyed, if men *must* be rewarded in proportion to their Ability, then I maintain that Socialism would provide the best system for attaining that object.

Under Socialism, we could not only give everyone who possessed Ability a chance, we could guarantee to everyone of Ability the just reward of his services.

To-day, the Idle are allowed to rob both Labour *and* Ability of the fruits of their industry.

But if, when Socialism were established, it did tend to destroy the incentive of gain, would the Christian try to keep that motive alive?

I think that, in time, the incentive of gain might be destroyed. You may consider the motive from the Christian point of view, or from the point of view of evolution. In either case, it seems to me, you are bound to believe in the possibility of abolishing it.

Many of our opponents have a low opinion of human nature. They do not believe that man does



anything except from the desire of gain. For example, the Roman Catholic Bishop of Clifton, Doctor Ilsley, said at Birmingham:

The chief motive power of self-betterment being abolished, all would languish on the same dull level, forming a congregation of stunted growth and dismal mediocrities, inhabiting a huge monkery, from which the joys and hopes of religion would be banished.

Are not those remarkable sentiments to issue from the mouth of a Christian? By "self-betterment" the Bishop means "money," and he says that without this hope of "money," all would languish on the same dull level. Genius might quite die out. The Edisons and Armstrongs would disappear.

Were there any Edisons and Armstrongs in Bethlehem? Did Christ languish because He was poor? Did Christian "self-betterment" then, or ever, depend on the incentive of gain? O, my good Bishop, did you ever read the New Testament?

It is perhaps too much to expect anyone to act consistently on the principles of conduct laid down by Christ. But most of our Christian opponents deliberately adopt the principle of Mammon, the incentive of gain, and call that Christianity.

Now, the facts of history and evolution are dead against this low view of human nature. Morality progresses, and morality varies in different circumstances.

You do not expect to grow master minds, or moral teachers, or men who lead average moral lives, in a criminal slum. You do not expect your children to grow up mannerly and virtuous without education. You provide them, as far as possible, with good influences and examples.

You believe, then, that "conditions" are most important in the development of conduct.

Very well. I claim that Socialism would establish the conditions under which the higher instincts and motives would be fostered and encouraged to the

utmost. Socialism would have as notable an effect on the development of morality as steam has had on the development of industry.

Consider how, to-day, under the most unfavourable circumstances, the higher motives insist on expressing themselves.

If the dominating motive of our people is the incentive of gain, why are they so poor?

We have 39,000,000 poor people out of a population of 44,000,000. Only a very few are very rich. Only 5,000,000 are well-to-do.

Why, if avarice is the strongest motive in human nature, are the bulk of our people so careless of their rights? Why do they submit to laws which rob workers, average workers, men of ability, *and* geniuses, of so much of the wealth they produce, to hand it over to the idle?

The fact is, that only a few people are dominated by this incentive of gain. The average man is not greedy.

And if you think of it, this is a very wonderful thing. For the strongest influences are at work in our society to *make* men greedy, and miserly, and selfish.

The love of life is strong, is it not? Stronger than the desire of gain.

Well, life can only be maintained by a regular and sufficient supply of food, clothing, fuel, and shelter. Do our people obtain that sufficient supply?

Millions of our people die in the workhouse. That they will so end is a certainty. Yet their avarice, or desire of gain, is so weak that they suffer these conditions to exist for generations. They are content to scrape along on a mere pittance.

Far from being dominated by the incentive of gain, our people have not even a sufficiently strong desire for life, and their desire for true self-betterment is often killed by their environment.

It is the *present* system which destroys the stimulus to improvement.

Competition breeds strife and distrust. We are all compelled by the system to do unworthy acts

that revolt us, or go under. But Socialism would abolish these conditions. Under Socialism there would be no competition for the means of life, no monopolists with drawn swords, preventing the people from getting a living. We should, in working for ourselves, work for each other.

Again, think of the millions of actions done to-day without hope of fee or reward. Think of the thousands of people who are willing to give up their time and energies *and* money for the public welfare.

Think of the Mayors and Councillors of our 30,000 local authorities, of the members of education committees, of Boards of Guardians, of hospital managers and assistants. Think of the unpaid magistrates, the M.P.'s, the peers, the volunteers, the lifeboat men, the workers among the poor, the numerous societies and organisations of all kinds.

All this voluntary work is done in a society which is based on a system of Competition and devil take the hindmost, a society where you must get on or get out, a society whose dominant motive, we are told, is the incentive of gain!

Very well, if with so many influences against unselfishness, we can make this magnificent show, how much more unselfishness might be bred under Socialism!

The man who to-day is compelled by the system to be mean and grasping and "hard" in business, and who can only become human when he leaves the office or workshop, would under Socialism be able to give free rein to his social instincts in all his actions. In working for himself, he would be working for others, always.

We may even reach a time when it will be necessary to restrain men from giving too much, instead of taking too much.

Ah! The poor Socialist dreamer, says the reader. But soft you, my friend. Just read this:

The relation at present familiar to us will be inverted; and instead of each maintaining his

own claims, others will maintain his claims for him; not, indeed, by active effort, but by passively resisting any undue yielding up of them. There is nothing in such behaviour which is not even now to be traced in our daily experience as beginning. In business transactions among honourable men, there is usually a desire on either side that the other shall treat himself fairly. In social intercourse, too, the cases are common in which those who would surrender their shares of pleasure are not permitted by the rest to do so. Further development of sympathy cannot but make this mode of behaving increasingly general and increasingly genuine.

There you have the same ideal put forward as possible, nay, probable, of realisation, by the greatest champion of Individualism you ever had, Herbert Spencer.

The desire for true self-betterment is a worthy desire, and one that a wise people would encourage. Under Socialism that desire would have the largest possible scope, but the self-betterment which consists in getting money, or ease, or comfort, at the expense of others, by means of power, or monopoly, or privilege, would not be premitted.

Our good bishop, like many other unimaginative opponents of Socialism, fears that genius would die out. The master mind of Mr. Claude Lowther, too, tells him that under Socialism "subtle and intellectual achievements would be impossible." Why?

It is a gross mistake to assume that the genius and the inventor will not produce without the incentive of gain. There died a few months ago in France a veteran scientist, Professor Berthelot, who made numerous inventions and discoveries of enormous value. He never took out a single patent.

Luther Burbank, too, the American creator of new plants and fruit trees, will not protect one of his discoveries. He gives them to the world, a free gift. If genius will do this to-day, why not under Socialism?

Numerous inventors and men of genius have lived and died poor—and sometimes despised and rejected of the people.

Milton received five pounds for "Paradise Lost," which took him five years to write. Chatterton died of poverty. Burns died in poverty. Martin, the painter, died of starvation. Wilkie got only £30 for his famous "Village Politicians." Heilman, the inventor of the combing machine, died in poverty. De Quincey was poor. Goldsmith and Spenser were poor. Babbage was poor. Bunyan was a tinker. Tolstoy wrote his greatest works after giving up his wealth. Christ was poor.

The incentive of gain!

The genius and the inventor *must* give forth the ideas teeming in their brains, or perish in the attempt, gain or no gain; and it is a gross libel on the memories of thousands of noble men and women to assert that the incentive of gain was their dominating motive.

The nineteenth century was the age of invention. It is undoubtedly the fact that the inventors of that century did more for the increase of wealth than those of any other time. Did they all reap enormous rewards by their genius?

There was Richard Roberts, the inventor of the self-acting mule, and many other ingenious improvements in machinery. The self-acting mule had a marvellous effect in augmenting the wealth of the country. "But," said Dr. Smiles in his biography, "many have profited by his inventions, without even acknowledging the obligations which they owed to him. They have used his brains and copied his tools, and the 'sucked orange' is all but forgotten. There may have been a want of worldly wisdom on his part, but it is lamentable to think that one of the most prolific and useful inventors of his time should in his old age be left to fight with poverty."

"Sucked orange!" The history of inventors is largely a history of "sucked oranges."

In 1829 James Beaumont Neilson patented the Hot Blast, but in order to get it adopted he had to

part with all but three-tenths of the royalties. The capitalists took seven-tenths, more than twice as much as the inventor.

This invention, in 1863, was saving Scotch iron-founders alone over £1,500,000 a year, in cost of production; yet in 1839 there was a combination of ironmasters who tried to wrest the patent from Neilson, and spent £40,000 in law costs in the attempt. Happily, they failed.

Another example of the lack of that avarice which would impel a man to grab all he could was Henry Maudsley, whose invention of the Slide-rest was said by James Nasmyth to have had as much influence in extending the use of machinery as the steam engine had in extending manufactures.

"He troubled himself very little about patenting his inventions," said Dr. Smiles, "yet he had sometimes the annoyance of being threatened with actions by persons who had patented the inventions which he himself had made."

There was David Mushet, whose discovery of Black Band ironstone in Scotland caused an extraordinary expansion of the trade. He invented a process of applying Neilson's Hot Blast to anthracite coal, and at one works alone, this resulted in a saving of £20,000 a year. "Yet, strange to say, Mr. Mushet himself never received any consideration for his invention."

Strange to say! It would be more strange if a poor inventor ever did reap his just reward under our present system. Always there are capitalists on the watch, forced by the demons of competition and greed to steal by any dirty trick the fruits of another man's industry and Ability.

Earlier still there was Benjamin Huntsman, the inventor of cast-steel, who, having taken out no patent, was robbed of his secret by a rival, who entered his workshop by a ruse. Before this the trade had tried to kill Huntsman's business with the help of Government, but had failed.

There was the villainous case of Henry Cort, who died in poverty, after the trade had robbed him of

his rights by a mean trick. According to a competent authority his improvements in iron manufacture "established a new era"; and Smiles says that "he laid the foundations of many gigantic fortunes."

Who got them?

It is not because genius receives the highest rewards that it puts forth its fruit, for I have already demonstrated that not genius, but idleness, receives the biggest incomes in this country. And a Socialist State could afford to reward genius and invention better than they are rewarded to-day, if it were necessary.

What are the conditions which produce intellectual and clever men and women?

Some of our opponents say that it would be foolish to abolish poverty, because genius so often springs from poverty!

Then, if Socialism "would reduce all to one dead level of poverty," as we are told, Socialism would produce more genius than ever!

Genius, we know, always tries to express itself, under whatever conditions. There have been rich geniuses, and geniuses bred in poverty. It would be rash to conclude that either wealth or poverty was the best soil for growing great minds.

Poverty has often killed genius. Wealth has often proved helpful to inventive minds.

Would a rich man send his son to be brought up in a garret by a pound a week family, in the hope that poverty might make a genius of his child?

No. Nor anyone else. The argument, then, that poverty is necessary for the production of genius is so much wind. No one believes it.

No one troubles about genius. It comes, or it does not come. But where now poverty might stifle genius in the bud, Socialism would give that bud a chance to develop. We should gain so much. How much should we lose? Any?

But genius is rare. What about Ability? Well, I think that under Socialism Ability would be much more common than it is to-day.

The competition for a living amongst men of Ability becomes keener and keener. Doctors, lawyers, schoolmasters, engineers, journalists, authors, managers, singers, what a chorus of complaint arises periodically about the keen competition? Is it not a fact that salaries have gone down in recent years in many walks, simply because of the growing number of men of Ability? It is only your tip-top man, your *rara avis*, who stands a chance in the scramble.

Under Socialism, when all were properly fed, and housed, and educated, I think it is certain that we should discover Ability among the poor, which is now wasted. Even the inadequate school board education of the last thirty years has made a difference.

Doctors tell us that the child born in poverty is as fine a child physically as the well born: *at birth*. Deterioration is caused by bad surroundings. Now, you cannot have a sound mind unless the body is sound, and when the bodies of all were sound, their minds would have full opportunity for development.

Professor Galton, in "Heredity and Genius," says that "Civilisation is the necessary fruit of high intelligence when found in a social animal, and there is no plainer lesson to be read off the face of Nature than that the result of the operation of her laws is to evoke intelligence in connection with Sociability. . . . Among intelligent animals, the most social race is sure to prevail, other qualities being equal."

Socialism would increase sociability and by so doing would evoke the greatest possible amount of intelligence.



## That Socialism would be the Most Odious Form of Slavery Ever Known.

### *Answer.*

Socialism would be the mildest form of slavery ever known.

"Britons never, NEVER, NEVER shall be slaves."

That is a splendid chorus to a song, but it happens to be nonsense. No Briton desires to live "on an uninhabited island," and be monarch of all he surveys. But only by living absolutely alone can a man avoid slavery.

*All society involves slavery.* If two or more people form a society they must agree to do some things, and not to do others. In so far, then, they are slaves to the agreement.

But no one would assert that because the members of a society are "slaves" to an agreement, solitude would be a higher form of civilisation.

Society involves slavery, but there is slavery and slavery.

Some of our opponents wax very eloquent about the tyranny of Socialism, and they always assume that we live in a state of Complete Freedom, with a big F, and that to attain Socialism we must give up this priceless possession.

Have we got Freedom? But that is not the question. The question is, have we got the most freedom possible? Does our system of society ensure the greatest amount of Liberty to every member? Or, do the agreements of our society exact the same slavery from every member?

We must all pay away some individual freedom if we belong to a Society, and in return we receive Social freedom. Do we pay fairly, and do we receive fairly, or are some overtaxed and underpaid, and others undertaxed and overpaid?

First let us ask, "What is a slave"? I will take

Herbert Spencer's definition, and then inquire whether there is any slavery in our present society, and whether there would be more or less slavery under Socialism.

Spencer says, "We primarily think of the slave as one who is owned by another. To be more than nominal, however, the ownership must be shown by control of the slave's actions—a control which is habitually for the benefit of the controller. That which fundamentally distinguishes the slave is that he labours under coercion to satisfy another's desires."

Apply, now, that test to the present condition of society. A slave is one who labours under coercion to satisfy the desires of another. Are there any such in our country?

To live, it is necessary to work. All wealth comes from the land. To be able to work, then, one must have land to work on.

Now half the land in our country is owned by 2,500 persons, and the rest is owned in small quantities by another 1,000,000 or so. It is plain, then, that the remainder of the population are at the mercy of the landowners.

*We have no right to live without the permission of the Landlords.*

Do the Landlords give us free access to the land? No. They permit some of us to have land. But on what terms?

They force us to pay rent. Out of our total national income of 1,800 millions, we pay idle Landlords 250 millions. We have to pay or get out. Is that freedom?

But the Landlord has a twin-brother, the Capitalist or Employer, and to him, also, we are compelled to pay tribute. Before any free-born Briton can work, he must obtain the permission of an Employer, and for that permission he must pay interest and dividends.

We pay to Employers for permission to work 360 millions a year. Thus Landlords and Capitalists together coerce us into parting with 650 millions,

more than one-third of our produce. We *must* pay. Then to that extent we are slaves to a few members of our society.

But the Landlords and Capitalists do not permit all of us to work. There are always from 500,000 to 1,000,000 unemployed. These men *are* free—free to starve. They are *not* slaves.

None of us, then, is free to live. We are coerced by the whip of starvation into working for Employers and Landlords. Our actions are controlled by them, and we work primarily for their benefit.

Whom are you working *for*? is the question one man asks of another. We work *for* Employers and Landlords. The bulk of us, then, are slaves to these two small classes. We cannot live without their permission.

Now a man who may not live without the permission of another cannot be said to enjoy a high degree of Freedom. Can he? And the class who use their power to exact a heavy toll for that permission, what are they? Clearly tyrants.

We have to-day, then, slavery in a very bad form. Would the conditions under Socialism be worse or better?

In the first place, land and capital under Socialism would belong to the State.

Who is the State? You are the State. The whole people is the State.

Then, instead of having to beg permission to live from Landlords and permission to work from Capitalists, you would have the right to live and work by virtue of being a member of the State.

That would be a tremendous advance in Freedom, would it not?

Further, you would not have to pay a heavy tax for that permission. The 650 millions now taken by an idle class would belong to the whole people, and would be available for distribution as the whole people thought best.

Just imagine it. Certainty of work and wages! Such conditions are unknown to the bulk of our people. Even the most skilful workers are liable to

be dismissed on account of trade depressions, changes of fashion, amalgamations, trusts, and other evils of the present system of slavery.

Think of it! No fear of the "sack" because trade is slack; no gnawing anxiety for the fate of your wife and children; no dread of old age and penury. Nine-tenths of the burdens which make life for so many one long agony of apprehension would be removed for ever. For the first time the nation would really live.

Do you not think that would be a milder form of slavery than the system you live under to-day?

Our opponents say Socialism would be the most odious form of slavery ever known. But how do they go about to prove it?

In this way. They take in the first place, One Army of Officials, or Bureaucrats, whom they call the State. Then they take a mob of people, whom they call the Regulated Masses.

They make their Army of Officials out of wonderful beings who are half genius and half idiot, and they make their Regulated Masses out of human jellyfish.

Then they set the waxworks in motion, and call it Socialism. But let the proprietor of one of these marionette shows describe the performance himself. The following is from *An Exposure of Socialism*, by Max Hirsch:

Moreover, this bureaucracy must also determine the kind of labour which each person, man and woman, shall perform; must direct where this labour is to be performed by each of them, as well as the intensity with which each shall work. For obviously the determination of the quantity of each kind and of each quality of goods to be produced involves the power to shift labour from an occupation in which it has become excessive, to one in which there is insufficient labour. This is again admitted by Socialists. August Bebel, the great leader of the Socialist Party of Germany, in "Woman," says: "If a superfluity of workers

occurs in one branch, and a deficiency in another, it will be the duty of the executive to arrange matters and readjust the inequality." This necessary power to shift labour from one occupation to another, however, involves the further power to shift the labourers from place to place, to determine where they shall reside. For it will inevitably happen that the new occupation to which they are allotted can be carried on more conveniently, or can only be carried on, in another place than that where the worker resided so far. Nor is this all. Young men and women entering upon their industrial life cannot be allowed to choose the kind of occupation which they desire to follow. For, if they were allowed to do so, too many would go into some occupations, and too few would go into others. This tendency would be enormously aggravated by the inevitable equality of remuneration. The heavier and more disagreeable tasks, bringing no greater reward than the lighter and more agreeable ones, the latter would inevitably become overcrowded. Therefore, the young men and women entering upon the active tasks of life would not, and could not, be allowed to choose their own occupation. State officials would choose for them and determine the whole course of their life. The youth who aspires to become a mathematician might be put to boot-making; one who aspires to be an engineer might be put to raising cattle; and the girl who desires to become a teacher might be compelled to work in a jute factory. Natural aptitudes could not be considered, even if they were known to those who determine the selection. But in most cases they cannot be known at the comparatively early age of the aspirants, for special aptitudes frequently, if not mostly, declare themselves later in life. Being unknown, at the time, to the workers themselves, they cannot be known to the officials, and therefore cannot be considered. The intensity of the exertion of every person must also be determined by these officials,

for as everyone receives equal reward, all would necessarily be called upon to work with similar intensity, otherwise those who naturally would work more intensely than others would become dissatisfied, and would slacken their efforts. A dead level of inefficiency would thus be reached, all working at the stroke of the least efficient or most lazy. In order to avoid this, the officials must have power to punish the lazy, stupid, and inefficient, so as to stimulate their energies. What can these powers be? These men and women cannot be discharged; their remuneration cannot be lowered. Therefore the only punishment possible is personal chastisement or imprisonment. The knout and the jail, therefore, threaten everyone who either is naturally slow or otherwise inefficient, or on whom these faults are fastened by the ill-will of some official or officials.

There are pages of similar richness in this pamphlet, but the unhappy author is evidently quite unconscious that he possesses the rare gift of humour. Just consider his arguments about the choice of occupation.

Young men and women do not know what occupation they are fit for, says Mr. Hirsch. And the State Officials cannot know, because natural aptitudes only show themselves later. Then no one knows what occupation young people are fit for. So it is impossible to give them suitable occupation, except by chance.

Well, what then? Why, the Tyrannical State Officials would choose occupations for them. Therefore—therefore what?

Heaven knows. The gifted author is clearly anxious to prove that this would be Odious Slavery, and that it would be a worse slavery than exists to-day.

As if young persons were free to choose their occupations to-day! Are they free?

Can the son of a labourer at 16s. a week choose his occupation? Can he choose to be a navy, or a

mechanic, or a postman, or an engine-driver, or a schoolmaster, or a doctor, or a lawyer—can he be whatever he pleases?

Everyone knows that no one is free to choose. In the first place the poor man's son is shut out from many professions. And of the poorly paid occupations, he is only free to choose that one where there is a demand for his labour. All who work for employers are subject to the latter limitation.

A youth has to go to work. He must "do something" for a living. Then his "natural aptitudes," which appear "later"—how much chance do they get under our present system? Very little.

Aptitudes are often smothered and hidden by the necessity of earning a living somehow. Millions of boys are ruined and wasted. Their youth is used up by employers in search of cheap labour, who turn them on the streets at manhood, if they want a man's wages, because there are always more boys to be got. Then we talk about the unemployable as wastrels. Who made them into wastrels?

Under Socialism, the choice of occupations would be much wider and freer than to-day. Everyone would be educated. Aptitudes which showed themselves early would be given free scope. Those with no special aptitude would have to take their chance, just as they have to-day.

But all the young people would want to be doctors, and teachers, and actors, and painters! Would they? Why?

The suggestion is that they would want all the pleasant occupations. But the manager of the Genius-Idiots and the Jelly-fish forgot that there will be no disgusting occupations under Socialism. He forgot that under Socialism production would be organised, and that the result would be to give ample leisure to everyone for indulgence in what "pleasant" occupation he preferred. So that the competition for the "pleasanter" occupations in the necessary work of the State would be less keen than it is to-day.

Again, we are told that it would be a terrible

hardship for a citizen to be moved from one place to another. Awful!

Where has the manager of the waxworks kept his eyes? Are not millions of workers moved from place to place every year? A man has to live near his work to-day, has he not?

And who moves him? The Army of Employers. He has to follow the work, willing or not.

To-day moving is a hardship for thousands, and entails heavy loss and suffering. Under Socialism, moving would be a pleasant change. Instead of dodging it, the people would be more likely to welcome a transfer.

Then there is the Knout. Isn't that a comic paragraph? Knout could be funnier.

Just imagine it. An Army of Officials, who have such splendid Ability that they are competent to organise the industry of a whole nation, are at the same time such consummate idiots that they do not know how to manage the people, except by using the lash!

On the other hand, we have a people who are all "equal," all well fed, and housed, all well educated, but so weak and cowardly that they allow a parcel of their "equals" to stand behind them with Knouts and whip them to work!

What is the use of arguing with the authors of such crack-brained nightmares?

Army of Officials! Regulated Masses! The Knout! Slavery! What in God's name would the British people, with red blood in their veins, be doing when the Genius-Idiots were knotting their lashes? And how would they come to have lashes? And how did they become the Regulating Bureaucracy, with such tremendous powers, Such ponderous twaddle.

I have never yet read one of these pictures of the coming slavery in which the very evils rampant to-day were not given as reasons for rejecting Socialism.

Freedom to live, freedom to work, freedom of movement, freedom of speech, religious freedom,



political freedom: do we enjoy to the full any one of these?

Not one. Yet we are told that we do. I have already shown how we are dependent on Landlords and Employers for permission to live and work, and what we pay for it. Growing out of these tyrannies are other restrictions on our freedom.

What about our boasted freedom of contract? Lord Balfour of Burleigh made a "waxwork" speech, and after asserting that poverty was necessary to make people work, he went on, "under our system of liberty and free exchange, the number of those who need be in poverty was being reduced."

We pay Lord Balfour of Burleigh £1,200 a year for doing nothing. He is only 54. And part of that money comes out of the pockets of poor devils who cannot afford to buy sufficient food. Then he has the effrontery to get up in public and talk about the necessity of poverty, and our system of liberty!

Where are liberty and free exchange? They do not exist. But poverty exists, and must exist, while we pay idle people enormous sums for doing nothing.

There cannot be any freedom of contract between a poor man and a Landlord and Employer. The poor man *must* accept the terms of the Landlord and Employer, or starve.

Have we freedom of expression?

We are supposed to have, but if we have, why are the poor afraid to speak their minds? Why has the CLARION received thousands of letters containing sentences like this: "Please do not mention my name. I should lose my employment if I avowed my principles openly"? Why, of 600 complaints sent to lady factory inspectors, were only 153 signed by the workers, and the rest sent anonymously, or by public organisations? Why are men and women dismissed because of their political and religious opinions? Why is the CLARION circulation hindered, and why are Clarion books boycotted by newsagents, and booksellers, and "free" libraries?

The answer is that these things happen because we have not got freedom of expression.

We are told that the Press is free, and that under Socialism there would be no means of publishing opinions antagonistic to the Army of officials.

But the Press is not free to-day. The Press contains just what the proprietors care to print, and being generally on the side of the Landlords and Capitalists, the Press too often garbles and distorts the views of their opponents.

If you want your views published to-day, you have to pay for the publication. You are free to do that, *if it is safe*.

Why should you not be free to do the same under Socialism? Socialism will be what the people make it. If the people love freedom, they will have free institutions. If the people are jelly-fish, they will have an Army of Officials with knouts behind their backs.

Is there any reason why there should not be complete freedom of expression under Socialism? Suppose the State, that is, the whole people, *did* own all the printing machinery? Is there any reason why the law should not be that any person may have his books or pamphlets printed and sent out for sale, on payment of the usual costs?

To-day the Government is compelled to coin the gold of any person who takes it to the Mint. Why should not the Government, or State, print on paper as well as on gold?

Again, have we religious freedom?

No; we have not complete religious freedom. Thousands of people dare not express their beliefs for fear of losing their work. A man who is dismissed, or ostracised, or boycotted by customers, or liable to imprisonment, because of his religious views, cannot be said to enjoy religious freedom.

Have we political freedom?

No. We have not complete political freedom. Millions of adults have no vote, while privileged classes are allowed more than one vote. Many people, too, dare not avow even their political opinions. Many a man has been turned out of house

and home, or lost his work because he dared to think differently from his landlord or employer.

Now nearly all of us suffer more or less from one or other of these restrictions on our freedom, and it out of the hatred of those restrictions that the desire for Socialism has grown.

What do Socialists want? What is their demand? For more freedom all the time. We want the freedom, the right, to live and work. We want full political rights. We want complete freedom of expression. We want religious freedom.

We want these things, and we mean to have them. But we cannot have them until we have persuaded the bulk of the people to want them.

When that time arrives, we shall be a nation of people all desiring a much wider freedom than we possess to-day. And then—then, the waxwork manufacturers tell us we shall immediately invent the worst tyranny, the most odious form of slavery that was ever known! Could unreason further go?

If Socialism is not the mildest form of slavery ever known, it will not be Socialism.

**That Socialism would involve an Army of Officials who would Organise the Nation for their Own Benefit, and Reduce the ordinary Citizen to the position of a Slave.**

***Answer.***

Production under Socialism no more involves an Army of Officials than production under the Trust. If the people were fools they would naturally be imposed on by the knaves; but that is their position to-day, and it is the business of Socialism to make the rule of the greedy and unscrupulous impossible.

I have already dealt with the question of Socialism and slavery from a general point of view. The present objection is aimed at the supposed necessity of an Army of Officials to organise production under Socialism.

This Army of Officials would, we are informed, considerably reduce the productive power of the nation. There would be more officials than producers. Wealth would decrease.

But at the same time the Army of Officials would grow and consolidate themselves, and, obtaining supreme power, would enrich themselves at the expense of the Regulated Masses.

It is also contended that under the present system the production and distribution of wealth is efficient. The desire of each person to gain a living by supplying the needs of his fellows has evolved a wonderful self-acting system which needs scarcely any supervision.

Mr. Herbert Spencer said in his *Plea for Liberty*: "The quantities of the numerous commodities required daily in each locality are adjusted without any other agencies than the pursuit of profit." But under Socialism, he said, "There must be a regula-

tive apparatus everywhere controlling all kinds of production and distribution, and everywhere apportioning the shares of product of each kind required for each locality, each working establishment, each individual. Under our existing voluntary co-operation, with its free contracts and its competition, production and distribution need no official oversight."

Mr. Spencer was a great man, but he evidently did not understand either the present system or Socialism.

Mr. Spencer said that production and distribution under the present system were efficient.

Is that true? Are the quantities of commodities required by the people produced? Are the commodities produced distributed to the people who need them?

On the contrary, hundreds of thousands of men and women who have a "desire" to supply their needs cannot supply those needs because the wonderful system of competition and private ownership says, "No hands wanted."

We have from 500,000 to 1,000,000 unemployed always. In "bad times" from 8 to 10 per cent. of the aristocrats of labour cannot find work. They have desires. They cannot satisfy them. Why? Because the system is a failure. It does not do what its champions claim for it.

To talk of the beauties of our system of "voluntary co-operation and freedom of contract" to people who cannot get work without the permission of landowners and capitalists is mockery.

Besides the unemployed, there are the employed. Do they voluntarily co-operate? The truth is that the bulk of our people must accept the terms of the owning classes or starve. There are twelve millions underfed. Why has the wonderful system not "adjusted" the supply of commodities to their need for a decent living? There are 20 million very poor. There are 39 million poor. What has this wonderful system done for them?

The system has hopelessly broken down. Competition for a living inevitably involves the success

of the stronger and the more cunning, resulting in monopoly and tyranny. The bulk of the people are not supplied with sufficient commodities, a few get vastly too many, and millions have to depend on charity.

Mr. Spencer had a remarkable capacity for being deluded by appearances. He stated that under the present system production and distribution of wealth cost practically nothing for superintendence.

"The quantities of the numerous commodities required daily in each locality," he said, "are adjusted without any other agencies than the pursuit of profit." Badly adjusted, yes.

The suggestion that this alleged absence of superintendence costs nothing is absurd. There is no Army of Officials. Perhaps not. But there is the "pursuit of profit." Does that cost nothing?

It is the pursuit of profit by competitive methods that is at the root of all our poverty and unemployment. If Socialism involved one official to overlook every worker, it could not be more costly than the belauded, self-acting chaos in which we exist at present.

In the chapter on "The Waste of Competition" I gave several examples of the way in which the production of wealth is hampered and curtailed by private monopoly and competition. Herbert Spencer seems to have been entirely blind to these facts, and in every line he wrote about Socialism he swallowed his own principles of evolution.

In this very *Plea for Liberty* he said:

A cardinal trait in all advancing organisation is the development of the regulative apparatus. If the parts of the whole are to act together, there must be appliances by which their actions are directed; and in proportion as the whole is large and complex, and has many requirements to be met by many agencies, the directive apparatus must be extensive, elaborate, and powerful. That it is thus with individual organisms needs no say-

ing; and that it must be thus with social organisms is obvious.

And then he proceeds to admire a system which is the outcome of the unregulated or half-regulated activities of a mass of people fighting each other for a living. After spending a lifetime in explaining that progress consists of evolution from the unorganised to the organised, after pleading passionately for a system of education based on science, he calmly kicks science out of doors when he comes to deal with the practical work of finding the means of complete living for an organised society!

To-day we have the knowledge, the power, and the ability to produce enough wealth to nourish the body politic in all its parts. But Mr. Spencer's wonderful system results only in overfeeding a small part and starving a much larger part. It is as if he advised a man to let his instincts and passions run wild, trusting to each instinct's "pursuit of its own profit" to produce a healthy organism.

Far from adjusting supply to demand, the present system fails all along the line. There are periodical bursts of good trade, followed by gluts and "over-production," bad trade, and starvation; and always, even in good times, there are the unemployed.

What does this chaos cost? Reckon up the value of the wealth that might be created by the workers now doing superfluous work (for instance, six milk-sellers in one street, two railway companies competing for traffic). Calculate the cost of Poor Law, charity, hospitals, and asylums. Add the value of the wealth that could be produced by the permanent army of the unemployed. Do you not think there would be a vast saving if brains were applied to the organisation of a real system of co-operation—that is, Socialism?

But it would require an Army of Officials! said Spencer.

Imagine, again, the still more vast administration required for doing all that farmers, manufacturers, and merchants do; having not only its

various orders of local superintendents, but its sub-centres and chief centres needed for apportioning the quantities of each thing everywhere needed and the adjustment of them to the requisite times. Then add the staffs wanted for working mines, railways, roads, canals; the staffs required for conducting the importing and exporting businesses, and the administration of mercantile shipping; the staffs required for supplying towns not only with water and gas, but with locomotion by tramways, omnibuses, and other vehicles, and for the distribution of power, electric and other. Join with these the existing postal and telegraphic administrations; and, finally, those of the army and police, by which the dictates of this immense, consolidated, regulative system are to be everywhere enforced. Imagine all this, and then ask what will be the position of the actual workers!

To read that paragraph one would imagine that all these things got themselves done under the present system without "staffs." Who staffs the railways, and the gasworks, and the tramways now? There is a separate staff for every separate firm or company, with the result that thousands of the employees and the directors are wasting their time, not in production, but in preventing competitors from selling their products.

There are 3,000 railway directors to-day. Does anyone believe that if the railways were nationalised we should require half that number of "officials" to do the work better?

If Mr. Spencer had paid a visit to a municipal gasworks or tramway he would have saved himself and his followers a good deal of ink and breath. Are these departments overloaded with officials? Compare a municipal tramway with a private tramway or railway company and you will find that on the whole the municipal institutions supply better and cheaper services much more efficiently than the competitive "pursuers of profit."



Do not half a dozen men own and control half the industries of the United States? Do they find it impossible to organise production and distribution by means of superintendents of centres and sub-centres and sub-subcentres? What Mr. Spencer and his followers say could not be done has been done by the Trusts, but the Trusts are privately owned and their advantages are largely neutralised by the greed of the shareholders.

Under Socialism the whole people would be the Trust. If the masses were asses they would probably allow themselves to be ground down and despoiled by the few. But that is the position of the people to-day under Mr. Spencer's wonderful self-acting system.

You cannot have Socialism without Socialists, and if the people cannot rise to the demands which a Socialist State would make on their intelligence for its preservation, then Socialism is impossible. To talk as though Socialism would *bring* slavery is ridiculous. Slavery is here now. The Socialist movement is a call to the people to throw off their oppressors, to demand the opportunity for performing their duties as citizens, and to establish a just and wise co-operative society in place of the present chaotic, ill-regulated competitive scramble.

It is because we believe the people would prove equal to the task that we are Socialists. We believe in organisation, and we believe in regulation. But that does not involve a belief in useless Armies of Officials, either for production or management. An alert, intelligent people would not tolerate and support the gangs of lazy parasites who prey on their vitals to-day.

Mr. Spencer, as I said, was deluded by appearances. The present system is called a free trade system, so Mr. Spencer thought it was a system of freedom. Because no man can be coerced bodily into entering into a contract, Mr. Spencer imagined that "free contract" existed, as if a starving man and a property owner were equally "free." Because in production by private persons there are few or

no State officials, he thought that method almost costless, ignoring the immense expenditure and loss caused by the "pursuit of profit."

To the real facts he was blind; otherwise, on his own general principles, he must have seen that Socialism is an inevitable step forward in that kind of organisation which denotes true progress.

**That Socialism would be the Paradise of the Loafer, because, Everything being Provided by the State, there would be No Incentive to Work.**

***Answer.***

The Paradise of the Loafer is here now. Socialism would be the Paradise of the Worker.

It seems impossible for the average opponent of Socialism to hold two ideas in his consciousness at one time. He tells us, for instance, that Socialism would mean a grinding tyranny. That under Socialism there would be no freedom. That every man would be forced by State taskmasters to work. That life under Socialism would be slavery.

In the next breath he asserts that Socialism would encourage laziness. That only the few industrious would work. "As the State would provide everything, there would be no incentive to work." Socialism would be the paradise of the loafer.

It is plain that these two arguments are Kilkenny cats. "Grinding tyranny of State taskmasters" and "the paradise of the loafer" cannot possibly exist together. They annihilate each other.

It is only necessary to rewrite that sentence about "the State" providing everything to show the absurdity of the latter argument.

"As the People would provide everything, there would be no incentive for the People to work."

But, if the People provide everything, it follows that there would be no food, clothing, fuel, or shelter other than that provided by the people. I think that is incontrovertible.

How could the People provide everything without working? The People *must* work or starve.

Now, one of the principles of Socialism is that the wealth produced by the People should be dis-

tributed as the People think best. Do you think it likely that an educated people would consider it wise to encourage an army of spongers? On what grounds?

We have the army of spongers to-day, my friends, and our glorious system of Competition, Freedom, Liberty, and Philanthropy fosters laziness as no other system could. If you are looking for a paradise for loafers, you need not seek far. It is here, to-day, at home.

According to the last census returns there were 663,656 adult males who described themselves as of "no occupation." A large number of these are rich or well-to-do loafers, who consume wealth, but never produce any.

Then we have 100,000 able-bodied paupers on hand pretty regularly, and we have the great army of tramps and workshys. They don't cost us a tithe of the sum we give the rich loafers, but they are a heavy burden on the industrious.

Consider, first, the position of the rich loafer. A man inherits wealth from his parents. This wealth is invested in industry. That is to say, workers, brain and hand, are employed in taking care of that wealth. *They* "save" it for the rich loafer.

Not only do they "save" the inherited wealth. They improve it. They increase it, and they hand over the increase to the rich or well-to-do loafer.

It is easy to loaf to-day, if you are rich or well off. And the rich loafer is not scorned. He is by some people worshipped, *because* he can afford to loaf.

But is his position in society any different from that of the tramp or the gutter cadger?

The tramp or the cadger has no capital but his wits. To get his living, then, he must work them, and by cunning and fraud he is able to skim the cream of the milk of human kindness, and live a life that suits him, without contributing one iota to the welfare of society.

Both the rich loafer and the poor loafer sponge on the workers. Morally, there is not the slightest difference between them. If there is, it is in favour

of the poor man, for the rich has had opportunities of learning his duty to society not possessed by the poor man.

To-day, then, we have an army of loafers, and I assert that our system tends to encourage loafing, and that our methods of dealing with the evil do more harm than good.

In the first place, loafing by the rich is encouraged by a false morality which considers a life of idleness, or, as it is called, "independence," to be a mark of superiority.

It is true that this point of view is not so almost universal as it was. Not many hundred years ago, our aristocrats used to look down with contempt on people who could read and write. A century ago it was considered a frightful crime for a nobleman to enter into trade, or earn his living like an honourable man. But those ideas are dying. It is a dwindling class who admire a man who takes advantage of his riches to live in idleness. Public opinion is becoming less and less tolerant of the person whose sole claim to the benefits of society consists in his power to take, and give nothing in return. But there are still too many rich loafers.

We breed this class by upholding an immoral system, which enables a few to take an enormous proportion of the national wealth for doing nothing, and by following a false and unworthy ideal.

The poor loafer is also a product of the system. We breed poor loafers by upholding an immoral system under which work is provided and wages are fixed by a barbarous method of competition, resulting in starvation allowance for millions and chronic unemployment for hundreds of thousands. At the same time, we support unscientific, immoral methods of charity and relief, which, instead of curing the evils of the system, intensify them, and help to increase the number of loafers.

The poor loafer can live in a Paradise of a kind to-day. There never was a time when the path of the cadger was beset with so many kind-hearted fairies.

Sympathy, short-sighted sympathy, has grown enormously during the last century. The bulk of the public recognise that unemployment is not always the punishment of idleness and incapacity only. They have learned that the worthy may be out of work. Consequently they open their hearts and their pockets to the unfortunate.

"I never turn a beggar away," said an old lady to me once. "You never know. You may be refusing the Lord Himself."

This is the cadger's opportunity, and you often hear people grumbling bitterly that they helped so-and-so, and they found afterwards that he was an idle good-for-nothing.

Then there are the thousands of charitable societies, with their subscription lists. There is keen competition amongst these for the spare cash of the benevolent. They employ an army of people to collect money, and to relieve the unfortunate.

Here, again, the workshy and the cadger find a Tom Tiddler's ground. They "work" these charitable societies on a system, and do well out of them. *Can you blame them?*

I need not dwell on the universally acknowledged fact that our Poor Relief system, by its inhuman and cruel methods, also help materially to swell the army of loafers.

The paradise of loafers is *here*.

Our opponents say that Socialism would encourage loafing. I assert on the contrary that Socialism would abolish loafing.

Loafing is a physical or mental disease. Under Socialism we should try to cure the patients. To-day we do our best to spread the disease.

Under Socialism there would be work for all, and every healthy person would be expected to work.

Under Socialism it would be held disgraceful for a healthy person to sponge on others for his living. Public opinion would be so strong on this point that exceptions would be as rare as murderers.

Again, our opponents suggest that the desire to loaf is a dominant instinct. Why do not these

champions of Individualism read their Herbert Spencer?

Laziness is not a dominant instinct. On the contrary, the instinct of workmanship is much stronger. In *Comparative Psychology* Professor Loeb writes :

Human happiness is based upon the possibility of a natural and harmonious satisfaction of the instincts. One of the most important of the instincts is not usually recognised as such, namely, the instinct of workmanship. Lawyers, criminologists, and philosophers frequently imagine that it is only want that makes men work. This is an erroneous view. We are instinctively forced to be active in the same way as ants or bees. The instinct of workmanship would be the greatest source of happiness if it were not for the fact that our present social and economic organisation allows only a few to satisfy this instinct.

Anyone who has studied a healthy child knows that activity is a necessity of its being. He must be doing something. *He* doesn't object to "dirty work." He will dig drains, or make bricks, or sweep the roads, and think it "fun."

*Why does he stop thinking it fun?*

Ah! If you can answer that question you will be in a fair way for understanding the possibilities of Socialism.

Work, under proper conditions, is a pleasure. Your professional man says, "Eight hours a day! Why, I work twelve."

Yes, and he *enjoys* it. But why does he enjoy it? Because he is adapted to the kind of work he is doing, because he sees and possesses the results of his labour, because he has health and hope.

Under our immoral system, millions are compelled to *toil*, to physical and moral exhaustion. For them there is no enjoyment in work. Work is a hateful necessity. What wonder that many of them turn to loafing! It often pays as well, or better, than work.

The indignant, industrious citizen heaps scorn on

the wastrels. But what is it these shirkers shirk? They refuse a job at snow shifting for 4d. an hour. The scoundrels!

Yes, these *weaklings*, these ill-fed, ill-clothed, ill-educated *spoils* refuse a job which calls for robustness, health, and energy. Would the professional man accept it, *if he were in their place?*

An! It is easy to be virtuous on a thousand a year, said Becky Sharp.

The wonder is not that we have so many, but that we have not many more loafers. The influence of the doctrine "buy in the cheapest market," the false ideals of the rich, the pressure of toil and monotony, and vile surroundings, all speak to the people with one voice, and that voice says, "Get *your* living in the cheapest market. Shirk, idle, sponge. If you are industrious and careful, *you* will not reap the rewards. See—the landlord and the profit-monger, hungering for the fruits of your labour. Take a leaf out of their book. Prey on your fellows. Shirk, idle, loaf, but don't work any more than you can help." Isn't that so?

Well, with all those influences against them, I say it is marvellous to observe how the bulk of our people *do* work. They must have a passion for toil. Their instinct to work is evidently a bedrock instinct. Our opponents need have no fear. It is not a paradise for loafers the people want, but a paradise for workers. And Socialism would be that paradise.

How would Socialists abolish the loafer? Well, they would begin by attacking the root of the disease. They would first provide the healthy conditions necessary to give the instinct of workmanship room to grow. They would feed, and clothe, and exercise the bodies of the patients, and provide suitable food for their minds. Do you think it a crazy scheme? Listen.

In Mr. Havelock Ellis' book on *The Criminal* is described an experiment of the kind on certain criminals in Elmira Penitentiary, New York.

Eleven dullards, between the ages of 19 and 29, were selected for treatment by Dr. Wey. For one



or two years none of these men had made any progress. They had "criminal" faces, not one knew a trade, all had obtained a precarious living as common labourers, ostlers, and street loafers.

Two or three of the men had committed serious crimes. Most of them had always lived in a bad environment, many of them had drunken parents, one an insane and another an epileptic mother.

Their mental attainments were less than those of a child of five. Of general information they had none, except a knowledge of the things they liked to eat and the work they preferred.

Well, these men were put on a special varied diet, served at a common table instead of in the cells. Three times a week they were bathed and massaged by a professional trainer. After the bath the men slept till dinner time.

Dinner over, they were put through two hours or more of active physical exercise, recruit drill, and dumbbells.

"At first they were an awkward squad, slow to comprehend an order and deliberate in its execution. It was some weeks before they were able to march in line and keep step."

This programme was carried out from June to November, when the men were transferred to various employments. What was the result of the treatment ? Listen to the report :

The drill and discipline wrought an improvement in their physical condition. The baths and stimulants of the cutaneous system brought the skin to the highest degree of functional activity. The daily drill and dumbbell exercises hardened and developed muscles that previously were soft and flabby, and the entire muscular system acquired firmness and power. The setting up drill improved the carriage and conferred a rapidity of action not before indulged in. The aimless, shuffling gait gave way to a carriage inspired by elastic muscles and supple joints. The faces parted with the dull and stolid look they had in

the beginning, assuming a more intelligent expression, while the eye gained a brightness and clearness that before was conspicuous by its absence. With physical culture and improvement there came a mental awakening, a cerebral activity never before manifested in their prison life.

A year later several of the men were released on parole, and proved their ability to maintain themselves honestly, while two only, still in prison, were not doing well.

Now, if these good results can be obtained from such unpromising material, what success might not be achieved with the less degenerate?

You turn up your noses with scorn when you read that a squad of the "Unemployed" have done a job at four times the cost of ordinary labour. But what sense is there in *expecting* a ragged, half-starved regiment of the less fit to produce as much as the fit? You must first make the unemployed fit. And that will cost something.

All we want is the desire to abolish the disease. We have knowledge of the proper remedy to apply? Don't you think you would be wise to help develop that desire?

Consider the loss to the State from these evils. There is the loss of the wealth that might be created by the rich loafers, and the loss of the wealth that might be created by the poor loafers, and the loss of the wealth that might be created by the army employed in collecting and dispensing charity.

All these people are kept to-day by those who work. Consequently, if the loafers were abolished, we should save the large sums now spent in charity and poor relief, and so enable the "miserable pittance of 2s. 2d. a day" to be increased by another penny.

Also, my Christian friends, there is the loss of manhood, and womanhood, and childhood. Are not these worth saving?

## **That Socialism would Destroy Home Life.**

### ***Answer.***

The present system destroys home life for millions of the population. Socialism would make home life possible for all.

What is a home? And what is home life?

I suppose most people would answer that a home is a house, and that to have home life it is first necessary to have a house.

But what is a house?

If you reply, "A house is a self-contained dwelling," the question arises, "Is one room a self-contained dwelling because a family exists in it? Is one room a house?"

Well, that definition would not satisfy a Socialist. I should define a house for the purpose of home life as a self-contained dwelling of such a size and arrangement as to admit of a decent, orderly, and comfortable life for the average family.

Does every family possess such a house now?

On the contrary, the majority of our people, probably three-quarters, do not possess sufficient house room.

It is part of the practical programme of Socialists to destroy immediately at least a million "homes."

Why do we want to destroy those homes? Is not the desire a vicious and unholy outcome of subversive principles?

On the contrary, we assert that the desire to destroy these homes is a sign of sound instinct, of good citizenship, and a healthy patriotism.

We want to destroy these homes, and we want to do it quick, because :

- (1) They are rotten, insanitary, and inadequate.
- (2) They breed disease and cause the early death

of millions who could be made into Imperial assets.

- (3) Because they are a menace to public health.
- (4) Because the disease and poverty they cause are a costly drain on the rates and private charity.
- (5) Because home life in them is impossible.
- (6) Because even to think of them makes us sick and sorry.

These jerry-built, insanitary homes are the product of Competition, Landlordism, and Monoply.

We are told that this evil can be abolished under the present system, and that there is no need for Socialism. Are slums diminishing, then? On the contrary, page 12, *Daily Mail Year Book*, 1907, says:

The actual work of slum destruction is wretchedly slow, and the process of new "slum creation" alarmingly rapid. For every slum dwelling destroyed annually there are at least 50 new houses built under such conditions of overcrowding on land as must inevitably give trouble to municipal authorities in the future.

There you have it admitted by a true blue Tory organ which fights fiercely against all Socialistic proposals for better housing, that under the present conditions slum creation is permitted by the law. Is actually increasing rapidly. What are our opponents going to do about this?

*They are going to do nothing. They can do nothing. The only way of reform is by taking steps to Socialism.*

If the destruction of the home is one of the Socialist proposals, as Tories and Liberals assert, why is Housing Reform one of the first items in our practical programme?

Why are the most prominent agitators on municipal councils for better housing the Socialists and Labour men?

Why were several of the standard books on the condition of British homes written by a Socialist?

This part of our opponents' case breaks down badly.

Next, we are told that home life would be impossible, because all the mothers would be working in the State factories!

What is home without a mother?

The conventional pictures of this bedrock of civilisation always show us the family seated round the hearth. There is father, there is the grown-up son, there is mother's "right hand," there are the younger children, and there is mother: mother, the presiding genius; mother, the guardian angel; mother, not only mother to the children, but to father, too. Mother, the symbol.

What a pretty picture! But is it true?

There are 1,000,000 married women at work in factories and workshops to-day. There are 3½ million unmarried females working for wages.

One million mothers go out daily to earn their bread. What, then, becomes of the children? And the home life?

Where married women are employed *there is no home life.*

No home life. No home life for a million families under this beautiful system of liberty, and competition, and individual initiative! No home life *to-day.* Now.

How can Socialism destroy that which does not exist? Will the honourable and gallant Tories and Liberals explain?

Married women commonly have children. It is supposed by the gentlemen who draw fancy pictures of Hearth and Home that Mother rears her children, feeds and tends them in infancy, teaches them in childhood, watches over them, and guards them right up to manhood or womanhood.

Do the million women who work in the factories and fields perform those functions for their children? Listen to Miss Garnett, who gave evidence before the Inter-Departmental Committee on Physical Deterioration. She is speaking of the Potteries.

The results are the children are born very weakly, and, of course, they are improperly fed; they are put out to be taken care of by incapable people.

Of course. *Of course*, they are improperly fed. Ah! Where is the *Daily Express*?

*The child cries for its mother.*

*It has no mother.*

*The Tory or Liberal employer has taken its mother.* The mother belongs to the employer.

The mother, to-day, under Freedom, Liberty, and Competition, does not belong to the State. No. But she belongs to the Employer.

Hundreds of thousands of women and girls are compelled to go to work, when they ought to be at home, in order to bring up the family earnings to living point. And what about the child?

*The mother looks for her child.*

*The child is not there.*

*It has been taken from her and put in the hands of strangers.*

By whom?

By the State? No. By the system of Landlordism, Competition, Liberty, Freedom, and Christianity, which the honourable and gallant Dukes are going to defend with their blood.

The sanctity of the home!

A million mothers are torn from their children. Who, then, "mothers" these children? Let Miss Garnett say:

Elderly and infirm people take charge of them. We have one woman semi-paralysed who had four children sitting round her on a stone floor.

These incapable women are paid so little that they cannot feed the children properly. Do you know what they do to stop their wailing? They drug them. Infant mortality is "abnormally high" in the Potteries.

Not all the children die. Some of them live—girls, for instance. The future mothers of happy "homes."

There are 3½ million unmarried females working for wages. Girls in the Potteries go to work at 13. How, then, do they learn the duties of motherhood? At school? Yes, they learn "the theory" of hygiene, for instance.

The practice must come afterwards!

The practice does not come afterwards, because they have no home really to practise what they learn in school as regards domestic subjects.

No *homes*, my lords and gentlemen.

But the pigsties in which these people live are "private property." They belong to landlords. Tory and Liberal landlords. Who are those landlords? Ask Miss Garnett:

I am afraid the local authorities (that is, individual councillors) own most of the bad houses.

That is the secret of the evil. Tory and Liberal landlords on the councils, Tory and Liberal landlords in Parliament, all leagued together to prevent any improvement in the homes of the people.

Suppose all the women did work under Socialism. They would, at least, have a "house" to return to when the work was done. Have they that now?

You hardly ever find in the Potteries more than two bedrooms, and sometimes you have eight adults.

The Employers do not live in that kind of home. These kind gentlemen, who "find work" for the people.

Is it not true that the owners of factories live somewhere outside in the country, and leave the poor people to take care of themselves?

Yes. And many of the big ones do not even drive in: they leave it entirely to be managed by others.

These conditions are not confined to the Potteries. They are common all over the country, and there is

no need to go on piling up the damning evidence against the present system. There is no need for Socialistic exaggeration. The cold, true blue statistics are quite enough. Millions of people have no "home life" to-day. Millions of children are robbed of their mothers *now*.

Not by the State. Not by the wicked Socialists. By the champions of private property and Competition—and Freedom.

The Inter-Departmental Committee told the last Tory Government that "They would gladly see married women's employment diminished, if not altogether discontinued."

Did the Tory Government diminish it?

They did nothing. They don't want to do anything. They never will do anything. Nor will the Liberals. It would be interfering with the "freedom" of getting cheap labour.

What is the Socialist policy? Our policy is to carry out the recommendation of the Committee as soon as possible. Our policy is to take care of Mother, knowing that by so doing the nation will be able to take care of itself. Our policy is to provide homes for all; real homes. Our policy is to restore the children to their mothers. Our policy is to raise these degraded people to manhood and womanhood, and to save the children from their parents' terrible fate. When are the defenders of the home going to begin to help us?

Socialism would, for the first time, make home life possible for all. It would for the first time make the Mothers of the nation free, and healthy, and honoured, and happy. No nation with respect for womanhood, and with knowledge and keen consciousness of the importance of Motherhood, would permit any woman to live the life now lived by millions. Yet these vile conditions have been known to your Liberal and Tory statesmen for 100 years, and they have done nothing to remove them.

The only remedy is Socialism.

But our opponents are fortunately not gifted with effrontery only; they are occasionally amusing.



For instance, they go to the millions of people who to-day are living in wretched, ugly, monotonous, jerry-built hovels, called houses, and block dwellings, and tenements, and they try to frighten these people by telling them that under Socialism they would all have to live in "Barracks." Barracks owned by the "State," too.

Dreadful! But is anybody disturbed by this terrifying information? Not a single soul.

Why? Because a change to a well-built, roomy, nicely-furnished "Barracks" would be a welcome change for most of our people.

Our opponents are fond of that word "Barracks." They use it with great scorn. They evidently think of a "Barracks" as a sort of prison-workhouse.

*Who put the soldiers in Barracks?*

If Barracks are not fit and proper places for decent people to live in, then it must follow that our Tory and Liberal opponents do not think soldiers *are* decent people.

What should be done to these unpatriotic people who thus insult the brave defenders of the country?

Barracks! What a horrible prospect!

Come with me into the West End of London, and I will show you hundreds of "Barracks" inhabited by the well-to-do and rich. They "choose" to live in Barracks to-day, but they do not call them Barracks; they call them Mansions.

Call your Socialist Barracks Mansions, and what becomes of this bogey objection?

To-day, hundreds of thousands of people prefer to live in Flats, Dwellings, and Mansions, rather than in separate houses. Why should they not do so under Socialism?

"Oh, but Karl Marx said this, and Robert Blatchford said the other, and you will *have* to live in horrible barracks." Thus argue people who pretend to be able "to think for themselves."

Robert Blatchford suggested in *Merrie England* that it would be wise to "institute public dining halls, public baths, public washhouses, on the best

plans, and so set free the hands of those slaves—our English women.”

Whereupon, ignorant opponents build up a horrible picture of a “common kitchen in a barracks,” with the food in a trough, and the people scrambling for their share: which they say *has* to be under Socialism.

But these honest gentlemen omit to state that in the same chapter of “Merrie England” Robert Blatchford said, “I would have the towns rebuilt with wide streets, with detached houses, with gardens, and fountains, and avenues of trees.”

Detached houses! What are they for? Plainly for the people to live in. Nowhere has Robert Blatchford suggested that the people should live in Barracks.

And what is there objectionable in a common dining-hall? Dining in restaurants is becoming more and more common *to-day*. Thousands of people practically get all their meals in common dining-halls. Where does the horror come in?

Here it is. “If a man wanted his wife to make a cup of tea for him, he would not be able to get it.” Thus says Mr. Harold Cox, M.P. for Preston, one of the greatest thinkers of the age. And this brilliant reasoner claims that his brains are “saturated” with Socialist literature.

One fears it is something else.

To-day millions of workers are forced to live in dreary hovels, and because they are “free” to move from one hovel to another, the champions of Liberty are satisfied.

But they *must live* in some jerry-built horror. They are not free to live in a well-built, artistic, comfortable Barracks, or Mansions, or detached house.

Now, under Socialism there would be the widest freedom in such matters. No sane person would *wish* to lay down irksome rules for another. We should be rich enough to have separate houses, or Barracks, or Mansions, or whatever form of domicile we desired.

If detached houses involved more work than Mansions, it would be for the people to decide whether a detached house was worth the work. Is there anything awful, or horrible, in the contemplation of such conditions?

The awful thing is that one should have to deal with such piffling "arguments," and that they should come from the mouths of men who are supposed to be able to "think" for themselves.

Now, as to the work of women under Socialism. We are told that there could be no home life, because all the women would be doing "State" work.

But what is meant by "State" work? Four and a-half million females go out to work to-day. Is there any Party who proposes to abolish woman's work?

Not one. Neither Liberals nor Tories propose even to abolish the employment of mothers in factories.

A woman would be doing "State" work when rearing and tending her family? Would she therefore be any more a "slave" than she is to-day?

A woman working in a "State" factory, or office, or shop would be doing "State" work. Would it be as awful a slavery as it is to-day?

Not by miles. For to-day millions of women are underpaid, and overworked, in insanitary, stinking factories, which grind the life out of them. Under Socialism there would be no factory or workshop below the standard of Cadbury's or Rowntree's Cocoa Works. It would be the difference between heaven and hell.

There would be *more* opportunities for home life. We should not have women working in laundries for 16 hours a day, or women making heavy chains for 90 hours a week, or women making shirts and sewing buttons on cards, in dirty dens, for 5s. a week, and the glory of free competition. We should be such dreadful tyrants as to prevent that kind of freedom.

Then the "State" would take the children! How could the people take the children from the people?

The children would all be taken to State nurseries, and be brought up by strangers! Dreadful!

But who said they would be? A Socialist State would be a democratic State and the laws would be made by the people, men and women. Do you think British fathers and mothers are going to deprive themselves voluntarily of the joy and duty of bringing up their own children?

That is what occurs to-day. *But in what class?* Amongst the idle rich and the dissolute poor.

It is amusing to hear orators enlarging on the delights of home life and the presence of children in the home, when you know that they send their own children to boarding schools, and never see them for months together.

Hundreds of thousands of children dine in "common halls" at schools *to-day*. Are their parents all criminals and slaves, because they send them to be fed and taught by "strangers"?

Children under Socialism would belong to their parents more than they do to-day, but they would also belong more to the State, that is the whole people.

We should not allow any parents to use their children as slaves to increase their own comfort, to the detriment of the children. We should not allow parents to neglect their children. We should not allow parents to ill-treat their children in any way.

In short, wherever a child was short of full and proper parental attention, the State, that is, the people, would step in and supply the deficiency.

All these horrors and tyrannies that are prophesied of the Socialist state exist *to-day*. Socialism would abolish them.

You have women and mothers in factories, you have child slaves, you have a plentiful lack of houses. You have little home life, and it is getting less.

The home will never exist for all until Socialism is established.

## **That Socialism is an Impossible Dream Because Socialists have no Cut-and- Dried Plan.**

### ***Answer.***

Only the ignorant would ask for a cut-and-dried plan of a State that can only exist in its completeness in the distant future.

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN,—No one can deny that we have in our midst a terrible amount of misery. Millions of our population suffer from undeserved and gnawing poverty, unemployment, and all their attendant evils. The lot of many millions more is one of continual anxiety, and even the most industrious and sober working man can never be sure that to-morrow the wolf will not be at his door. We all know these things. We all deplore them. We are all anxious to bring about reforms. But, ladies and gentlemen, these problems must be tackled in a judicious and statesmanlike manner. (Applause.) Socialism—(groans)—Socialism is offered as a panacea for all these evils. What is Socialism? I confess I do not know, although I have done my very best to investigate the matter. Socialists draw very pretty pictures of a future when the State will provide everything for everybody, and there will be no need for anyone to exert himself; but, when you ask for a “cut-and-dried plan” of this wonderful scheme, it cannot be found. Socialism, ladies and gentlemen, is a dream. (Applause.)

Thus speak Tory or Liberal orators. These gentlemen always cause me considerable amusement. Their irritation at the absence of a “cut-and-dried plan” is so evidently honest. They are “practical” men. The Socialists have no “cut-and-dried” plan. Therefore, the Socialists are mere dreamers.

Under Socialism, who would have the champagne? What would you do with your loafers? Who would own the motor cars? What would the pay of a

muffin man be? What colour should we paint the pillar boxes? What time would the four o'clock express to Edinburgh start? How much would four ale cost? What would be done with my cocks and hens? Who would sit in the stalls, and who in the pit? These, ladies and gentlemen, are practical questions. What is the answer of the Socialist?

The Socialist answer is a rather tired smile. Because, my practical friends, when you ask for a "cut-and-dried" plan of a State under a system of Socialism, you are asking for the impossible, and the Socialist's smile is a tired smile because he feels sad that you have not the common sense to know that.

Why is it impossible to produce a cut-and-dried plan?

Simply because comprehensive prophecy of the future is beyond human power.

You ask us for a cut-and-dried plan of a State which can only be established step by step, a State which can only exist in its complete form long after we are all dead. You want minute details of that future. And you are scornful when you don't get them!

Is there a man alive who can forecast all the details of the events which will register themselves in his own single consciousness to-morrow?

Is there a man alive who will forecast with confidence the details of the career of one of his children?

Is there a business man alive who would stake his life on the price of any commodity a month hence?

Is there a politician who would dare to assert that a certain Bill before Parliament will pass into law in any given form?

Is there a statesman who would risk his reputation on a prophecy of peace or war in Europe or Asia six months from now?

Well, Socialism, which is much further in the future, can no more be described in detail than any other thing that is hidden in the womb of time. To ask for details is a mark of ignorance.

The broad principle on which the Socialist State should be built up is plain and clear. Socialists want the whole people to own and manage their own country.

Given the basic principle, the details can be worked out as circumstances require. It would be a silly waste of time for any Socialist to spend his life in drawing up cut-and-dried plans of a distant future.

For example, there is the food problem? How will England be fed fifty years from now? Does anyone know?

No one knows, and no one but a fool would draw up "cut-and-dried plans" for feeding the population fifty years hence. Hosts of unforeseeable events are sure to occur, any one of which might be sufficient to make the cut-and-dried plan so much evidence of lunacy in its author.

If a Socialist Government were likely to be in office next year, the broad outlines of our legislative plans would be before the people.

But no party goes before the people with "cut-and-dried plans." You never know what the Government actually proposes to do until the opening of Parliament. And *then* you don't get the details.

A Bill *will be* brought in. What the Bill contains you learn when it *is* brought in. And when passed as an Act of Parliament, it is nearly always different from the first proposals.

Plans have to be altered as circumstances alter. The object of the British Navy is to defend the Empire from invasion. To achieve that object the Navy is supposed to be kept up to a certain standard, but the standard varies with circumstances.

So the object of Socialism is to build up a healthy and prosperous people, and to achieve that object we have first to get the principle of Socialism understood, and its realisation in practice desired by the people. Plans? We shall not be short of plans when the time comes.

Even to-day, plenty of Socialistic plans for immediate practical legislation have been published.

Old Age Pension Bills, Right to Work Bills, Child Feeding Bills, Taxation Bills, Minimum Wage Bills, and others may all be found in the literature of Socialism.

Cut-and-dried plans! Why, *You*, you contemptuous Tories, where are *your* cut-and-dried plans? You are Tariff Reformers. You say that without Tariff Reform social reform is impossible. Where was your cut-and-dried plan of Tariff Reform ten years ago? You never breathed the word.

Where is your cut-and-dried plan of Tariff Reform *to-day*? You expect to be in office in a year or two. Your plans ought to be very dry. Where are they?

Why, you have none! You ask the people to "trust you." You ask for a "mandate" for Tariff Reform—particulars when you are in power. Here is a reform supposed to be close at hand, and you have the effrontery to ask for details of Socialism, whilst refusing to give details of your own reforms. Cut-and-dried plans, indeed! Read this, my Tory friends, and then for ever hide your diminished heads.

I may say, incidentally, that I am not going to be bullied by our opponents into doing what they never think of doing, which is to give an account of the precise details of their procedure some years ahead.

Who said that? Your great leader, Mr. Balfour. *He* said that. Cut it out and dry it, and pin it in your hat the next time you are going to speak on Socialism.

Cut-and-dried plans! Mr. Balfour is so uncertain of the future that he is afraid of saying any night when he goes to bed a Free Trader that he will not be a Tariff Reformer when he wakes up! Or *vice versa*.

Socialists have no cut-and-dried plans of the distant future, but some of our writers have spread their



wings in the illimitable atmosphere of imagination and have journeyed to the visionary lands of the ideal, and they have come back and written down their impressions. We call them Utopias. Plato, Bacon, Bellamy, Blatchford, Wells, Morris, Gronlund, and others have greatly dared in this way.

And what do the critics say of these? They complain that "one says one thing and one says another!"

God of brains, what else do they expect? Of *course* one says one thing and one says another. Does Mr. Chamberlain see eye to eye with Mr. Balfour about Tariff Reform? Does Dr. Clifford see eye to eye with the Archbishop of Canterbury in religion? Does Archie Maclaren see eye to eye with Lord Hawke in matters of cricket strategy? Do any two people agree in all things?

If you send two reporters to describe a public meeting do they write exactly the same account? If you go to the theatre with a friend do you see all the things he sees? If you take your child to the circus do the jokes that tickle him tickle you?

Is a thing impossible because people differ about details? Your wife likes red carpets and you like blue. Is it, then, impossible to have carpets? You like beef; I hate it: must one or both of us starve? One says one thing, one says another.

Of all the inept objections to Socialism!

Akin to it is the argument that if Karl Marx believed this thing, then all other Socialists must believe it. If Blatchford said so and so, every Socialist in the land is bound by it. If Hyndman repudiates Magna Charta, then all Socialists must repudiate Magna Charta.

Father Adderley is a Christian and a Socialist, Blatchford is a Humanist and a Socialist, Levi is a Jew and a Socialist. One Socialist believes in sending children to school; another believes in home training. One Socialist believes in military service for all; another will have none of it. One Socialist believes in Free Trade; another believes in Protection. But they are all Socialists, and there is

not a Socialist in the land who considers himself bound by a single opinion of any leader.

The essence of Socialism is individual freedom of thought and expression. It is not Socialists who want to coerce the people into certain beliefs. It is our opponents. What we want is a thinking people, not a flock of sheep.

There are no keener critics of Socialist leaders than Socialists. If Blatchford, or Shaw, or Webb says a thing, we do not adopt it because he says it. We say, if Blatchford, or Shaw, or Webb says a thing, it is worth considering. It is more likely than not to be wise advice. But we don't swallow views blindfold like the Churches and the Liberal and Tory leaders expect their "followers" to do.

Our leaders or advisers have to make their recommendations clear to the whole body of Socialists, and they have to be backed by sound reasons, or they are treated with no more respect than the worthless views of Tom, Dick, or Harry.

With all these different opinions, how is Socialism to be established? asks the bemuddled opponent.

Well, how are things done to-day? The present Cabinet is composed of men who hold widely opposed views on many questions of practical politics. How do they compose their differences?

They come to a compromise, or the majority carry their views.

So with the views of the whole people. We take a vote. We hold general elections, and the majority carry out their policy; or try to do.

The methods in use for ascertaining the desires of the people are very inadequate, and one of the first things Socialists will have to do will be to reform the machinery, so that the will of the people may be registered clearly. To-day nobody knows what the will of the people is on certain "burning questions," because there is no means of getting to know it.

What is done under Socialism will be decided by the Whole People. Leaders and advisers may give advice, but no one will be bound to take that advice and vote for it. Everybody will be educated, and

Socialists have faith in the sound common sense of an educated people.

It is because we distrust the prevalent system of relying on clever leaders, who are subject to swelled head, ambition, and other temptations, that we wish to make every citizen capable of thinking and acting for himself. Leaders then would take their proper place. They would advise. The people would follow the advice if they saw fit. To-day they have practically no control over the leaders. They carry the people in their pockets.

**That Socialism is Impossible Because it is  
an Attempt to Interfere with the Natural  
Law of "The Survival of the Fittest."**

***Answer.***

Socialism could not interfere with a natural law, but Socialism would change and improve the conditions through which the natural law expresses itself.

How many people know what the phrase "survival of the fittest" means? How many people think they know what it means? How many people use the phrase and build arguments on it without having a glimmering of an idea of the meaning of the term?

"Survival of the fittest." What a simple phrase! But how fruitful of complicated and muddy reasoning. When the successful huckster wants to hocus his conscience and blot out from his mind the accusing shapes of the victims of his greed, he murmurs, "Survival of the fittest." When the shareholder in a plundering foreign expedition reads of the massacre of the natives he sighs and says, "The survival of the fittest." When a glib and ignorant politician wishes to dismiss Socialism from the universe, he makes an oratorical sweep with his arm and observes, "Socialism is impossible. You cannot 'go against' the law of Nature, 'the survival of the fittest.'"

Is "the survival of the fittest" a law of Nature? And, being a law of Nature, does it make Socialism impossible?

My answer to the first question would be "Yes." To the second, "No." "The survival of the fittest" is a law of Nature, but that law in no way makes Socialism impossible.

What does "the survival of the fittest" mean?

There is a struggle for existence amongst all organic beings. As more individuals are born than can possibly survive, there is competition for the means of existence, and the weakest go to the wall. That is the theory.

First of all, let us ask what this struggle for existence is. Who struggles with whom, or what?

Take a species of animal, say the wolf. With what do wolves struggle for existence?

They have, as all living beings have, to struggle with Nature. With their physical surroundings. Even a solitary wolf cannot escape this struggle. If there is no food within reach of the wolf the wolf must die. Nature "survives." The wolf is not "fit." It dies.

Then there are other enemies—other species of living beings competing for the same food as the wolf. There are enemies hunting the wolf. There is Man. If the wolf is "fit" it survives the struggle—for a time.

As a member of a pack the wolf will also have to struggle with others of its own species. There will be competition for the food killed. The fittest will survive and produce offspring.

Take the case of a plant. You sow a few grains of wheat in your garden. The seed germinates, the plants grow. But there are weeds; there are birds. And your wheat plants succumb in the struggle for existence. They bear no seeds. They produce no offspring. They die. They are not "fit" to survive.

Two men are wrecked on a desert island. One is big and strong and lazy. The other is little and feeble, but industrious. The industrious man collects shell-fish, devises snares for animals, builds a hut with trees and stones. The lazy man does nothing, but demands a share of the industrious man's produce. They quarrel, and the industrious man is killed. The lazy man survives. He is the "fittest."

Now, would the farmer whose sheep had been killed think the wolf the "fittest" to survive? Would the gardener whose wheat crop had been

ruined think the weeds and birds the "fittest" to survive? Would public opinion think the lazy man the "fittest" to survive?

Everyone will answer, "No." But there are many people who pretend to understand this law of Nature who say that the unemployed are unemployed because they are not "fit" for employment; that the poor are poor because they are not "fit" enough to procure a living; that the 100,000 babies slaughtered every year die because they are not "fit" to survive; and that we ought not to interfere with this "law" of Nature.

How do these people go wrong? Where is the fallacy in their reasoning?

They go wrong just as they would go wrong if they said the lazy man on the island was more "fit" to live than the industrious one. They are right from a "natural" point of view. They are wrong from a human point of view.

The industrious man dies because the lazy man is not civilised. He is a brute, a wolf.

Are wolves, then, more "fit" to survive than human beings?

All the misunderstanding arises from ignorance of the correct meaning to be attached to the word "fittest." In the phrase "survival of the fittest" the word "fittest" does not mean "best" from a human and civilised point of view. It means "fittest" from a natural point of view.

Nature is not moral. Nature kills the prophet and the moralist as ruthlessly as she slays the murderer and the thief. An earthquake or a storm does not discriminate between the man after God's own heart and the vilest criminal. The criminal is often saved and the good man taken. The criminal survives. He is the "fittest."

Christ died. His executioners survived. Were they more "fit"?

Certainly. From the scientific, "natural law" point of view Christ was no more "fit" to live than the thieves by His side.

But from a human point of view you would say

that Christ *was* more "fit" to live than His executioners. In this case you would be using the word "fit" in quite another sense.

If it were true that all organic beings which survive were the "best" from the highest human point of view, we should have to admit that all wild animals, all disease germs, all diseased and criminal people, are desirable survivals. These classes exist in immense numbers. Are they the "fittest"—that is, the "best"?

No. But they could not survive unless they were "fit" to survive; because it is a law of Nature that in the struggle for existence the "fittest" shall survive!

How explain this seeming contradiction? The intelligent reader will already have divined that the law of the survival of the fittest is a law relating to certain "conditions."

The wolf survives because the conditions are favourable. The wheat succumbs because the conditions are unfavourable. The industrious man dies because industry is less useful than strength in the given conditions.

But the farmers could defend their sheep and exterminate the wolves. The gardener could sow wheat in a field instead of a garden, and obtain a crop. The feeble industrious man might have had a pistol or appealed to the lazy man's sense of honour, and so survived.

That is to say, "conditions" or circumstances alter cases and affect the result of the working of the law of the survival of the fittest.

A burglar struggles with a householder and kills him. He survives. He is the "fittest" in those conditions! But the burglar is captured later by the police, tried, and hanged. He succumbs in the struggle for existence. He is *not* the "fittest" in these conditions.

Conditions are always changing. Every moment the survivors in the struggle are different. But at any given moment those who are alive are the "fittest" to survive under the conditions existing at that moment.

You have a healthy, upright, intelligent son. He goes out for a row. A storm comes on, the boat is capsized. Your son is drowned. He is not "fit" to live. That is how the law of the survival of the fittest works.

You have another son, healthy, upright, intelligent. He is at work. Trade becomes slack. He is discharged. He cannot get work. Enforced idleness and lack of the usual sustenance undermine his health. He grows dejected. When trade revives he is not so fit. He loses "time." Misfortune dogs his footsteps. He is out of work again and again. Ill-health pursues him. He dies young. He is not "fit" to survive.

Your rich neighbour has a son. He is strong, healthy, but unintelligent. He has no "need" to work. Bad times or good times, he always has enough to live on. He travels; plays at literature or painting; lounges through life and survives to a good old age. He is "fit."

There are two boys in a criminal slum, both equally low in physique and intelligence. A rich man sends a subscription to Barnardo's to pay for the saving of a waif. One boy is taken. He is washed and clothed and fed and educated and emigrated to Canada. He becomes a prosperous farmer. He survives. He is one of the "fittest."

The other boy grows into a thief, spends his life in and out of prison, and dies in poverty before he reaches manhood. He is not "fit" to survive.

Faced with concrete examples like this, no one dares assert that the victims of the struggle were not "humanly" fit to survive. Had circumstances been favourable, the boy might have reached the shore alive. Had circumstances been favourable, the young man might have lived a long and healthy life. Had circumstances been favourable the young criminal might have developed into a prosperous farmer, like his more fortunate companion.

Socialism would provide favourable circumstances for all.

I am not denying the law of the survival of the



fittest. The fittest do survive. But I deny that the "fittest" are always the "best" worth preserving from a human standpoint.

Who survives depends on the conditions in which the struggle takes place. Can conditions be altered?

At a theatre where the pitites are allowed to struggle for admission the strongest and most cowardly will get the front seats. They are the "fittest" to survive. But at a theatre where the pitites are compelled by the police to form in line in order of their arrival, the fittest to survive will not be the strongest, but those who get to the doors earliest.

Altering the conditions changes the character of the survivors.

At Huddersfield, in 1906, the infant death-rate was 138 per 1,000. These 138 were not "fit." They died. Alderman Broadbent instituted a scheme for teaching mothers how to feed their babies. Twelve months later the infant death-rate was 85. That is to say, 53 more babies were "fit" than would have been the case under the old system. Change of the conditions affected the result of the working of the law of the survival of the fittest.

It is needless to multiply instances. Everyone knows that we can save life by altering conditions, and that we can change character by altering conditions. If it were not so, nine-tenths of our actions would be idiotic.

How comes it, then, that people accuse Socialists of wishing to "tamper" with a law of Nature? We are told that it is useless to try and help the unemployed, to abolish the slums, to save the children. The "fittest" survive. There must always be a struggle, and the weakest must go to the wall!

I have already exposed the loose thinking which uses the word "fittest" first in one sense, then in another. But there is another common error. It is assumed that because there is competition for the means of existence between different members of one species, there must always be competition between man and man.

Wolves struggle with wolves as well as against all other enemies. Man with man as well as with Nature.

But these short-sighted people forget that every man does not struggle with every other man even *now*. Have they never heard of Co-operation? Or Society? What is Society? What makes Society possible?

Society is impossible without Co-operation. If two or more people want to form a society and live together, they must agree to do certain things and not to do certain things.

Two men on an island could not live together if one always attacked the other and tried to rob him of his food or other possessions. They must recognise each other's rights, and in so far the struggle for existence would be modified.

Is, then, the law of Nature the law of the survival of the fittest "tampered with" by Co-operation, or Society?

Not at all. The struggle for existence is still a fact. Only, instead of the two men struggling with Nature *and* with each other, they abolish the struggle with each other and *unite* to struggle with Nature. The "conditions" of the struggle for existence are changed.

Ignorant people assert that progress has been caused by the weeding-out of the unfit, and they say that Socialism, by abolishing the struggle for existence, would prevent the weeding-out process and so stop progress.

But the "unfit" (that is, undesirable) *have* survived. It is the unfit (the undesirable) we wish to make "fit." They have not been weeded out. They are very much alive. They survive. They are "fit" to survive in the conditions existing.

Progress has not been caused by weeding out the unfit, but by the partial restriction of the struggle for existence between man and man.

Is not the history of progress the history of Co-operation? The development of the Social instincts? The evolution of Society?

Just so far as mankind have abolished the struggle for existence between man and man, just so far have they progressed. If man had always fought and struggled with man, as the wild beasts fight and struggle with each other, there never could have been any progress.

All the laws on the statute book are evidence of our power to modify the brute struggle for existence. All our churches, schools, hospitals, asylums, reformatories, humanitarian societies, have been established with the same object. All "interfere" with or change the conditions of the natural law of the struggle for existence.

But the struggle for existence still continues and must continue. Socialism could not abolish it. But Socialism could modify it still further.

How? *By completely abolishing the brute struggle for existence between man and man.*

Socialism would abolish competition for bread between man and man. Just as to-day two or twenty thousand people co-operate—that is, abolish competition amongst themselves for some purpose—so Socialism would effect the Co-operation of the whole population. The struggle for existence with Nature would still remain, but instead of being hindered in that struggle by the present necessity of fighting each other, we should *all work together*.

Here is another example of loose thinking on this question. A short time ago the Rev. Lord William Gascoyne Cecil said that "if the survival of the fittest is the principle on which the world is to be developed, then the 'bottom dog' is being too well treated. He ought to be shot. We ought to shoot all persons in the casual wards, all in the lunatic asylums, all 'out-of-works,' those who fail in examinations—in fact, everybody except the successful people."

It is plain that his lordship does not understand the meaning of the law of "the survival of the fittest." He says we ought to shoot the bottom dog. On what grounds? The bottom dog survives *because* he is one of the "fittest" to survive. He is fulfilling

the law of Nature by surviving. *Under the present conditions.*

If all "unsuccessful" people were shot, the "fittest" would survive, and the law of Nature would again be fulfilled. Under *those* conditions. But would you consider people who shot bottom dogs "fittest" from a human standpoint?

Why, in his lordship's opinion, is the bottom dog not "fit" to survive? Simply because he understood the word "fittest" in the wrong sense. He attached to it the meaning of "successful" from a worldly point of view. But Nature knows nothing about worldly success. Nature allows millions of bottom dogs to "survive" because they are adapted to certain conditions. They can exist in those conditions. Nature asks, "Can you *live* in these conditions?" Not "Can you be 'successful'?"

His lordship cannot "go against" a law of Nature. The world *is* being developed on the principle of "the survival of the fittest," and if every man and woman were as moral as Christ, the law of the "survival of the fittest" would not be affected one jot. The *conditions* of the struggle for existence would be changed. That is all. But that "all" would make a tremendous difference to human Society.

So Socialism would change the conditions of the struggle. Who are "the fittest to survive" from a human point of view? That is the question. If we want a society where the strong, cunning person of low instincts, the worshipper of riches and power is "fittest" to survive, we shall try to provide the necessary conditions. But if we want a society where the healthy, upright person, the lover of mankind and all noble pursuits may be "fittest" to survive, we shall endeavour to provide the conditions suitable for that kind of person.

We *know* we can change conditions. But we cannot tamper with the law of the "survival of the fittest." The bottom dogs and the weedy survive *now* because they are the "fittest" to survive. Socialism would also enable them to survive, but

besides being the "fittest" they would also be the "desirable," from the higher human point of view. Socialism would raise the *quality* of the survivors. Just as a gardener can improve the flowers which grow in his garden by weeding and fertilising the ground and protecting them from enemies, so could we improve human flowers by providing the right conditions. Socialism would provide those conditions.

## **That Socialism is Impossible, Human Nature Being What it Is.**

### ***Answer.***

Socialism is possible because human nature *is* what it is.

We meet the denial in two forms. On the one hand we are told that Socialism is impossible because the people are too good for Socialism. They are so free and independent and happy that they will never exchange the present-day heaven for the grinding tyranny and dead level of Socialism.

On the other hand, we are told that Socialism is impossible because the people are not good enough for Socialism, and never can be. When brought face to face, these two arguments annihilate each other, but it is not uncommon to hear them used by one and the same master mind.

As regards the first argument, I think that has already been adequately answered in the chapter on "Socialism and Slavery." The bulk of the people are *not* free and independent and happy.

Turn we now to the second one. The argument usually takes this form: "You cannot alter human nature."

It is first assumed that Socialism demands a population of angels. Then it is asserted that we do not know how to make angels. The conclusion follows that Socialism is impossible.

The fallacy lies in the first assumption. Socialism does *not* require a population of angels. Socialism can be established by men and women. Therefore Socialism is possible.

You cannot have an ideal State until you have an ideal people, say our opponents.

And we might reply, with as much sense, You cannot have an ideal people until you have an ideal State.

This method of arguing gets us "no forrader." It is arguing in a circle. By the State, Socialists mean the Whole People. And of course it is true that you cannot have an ideal people until you have an ideal people.

Socialists have an ideal. And they have a principle which, if acted upon, would, they think, in time realise their ideal.

Many of our opponents admit that the ideal is a noble ideal. They look at the top of the hill and they say, "It is beautiful, but it is impossible to get there. We have no wings. Only angels are capable of reaching that."

But Socialists do not propose to fly. They propose to climb.

The question is, "Do you *want* to reach the top?"

So soon as you *want* to reach the top, you will begin to think of ways and means of mounting the hill. If we *all* wanted to reach the top we should all begin to climb. We should be on the way to Socialism.

But, "You cannot alter human nature!"

That is the most astounding error ever uttered. The man who utters it does not believe the statement. If there is one thing which we all believe it is that human nature can be altered, has been altered, is being altered, and will be altered.

What do people mean when they say human nature cannot be altered? They appear to believe that the characteristics of human nature are fixed, and they tell us that human nature is "the same all the world over."

That is another astounding error.

Human nature is not the same all the world over. Human nature is not the same in any two people. Human nature is not the same in the same man at twenty and at fifty years of age.

As Blatchford says in *Merrie England*, human nature "is a complex and an awful thing." Human nature is as various as the shapes of clouds. Human nature is as changeable as the sea. The one sure thing about human nature is that it can be altered.

What is human nature?

Let us compare average human nature in this country with average human nature in other places with regard to morals. Are they alike?

The uncivilised Tongan may commit almost any crime against man so long as he respects the gods. Here a man may ignore the gods so long as he refrains from injuring his fellow-man.

To honour father and mother is by us accounted a duty. A Dakotan boy "at ten or twelve openly rebels against all domestic rule, and does not hesitate to strike his father; the parent then goes off rubbing his hurt and boasting to the neighbours of the brave boy whom he has begotten!" In East Africa, says Burton, "when childhood is past, the father and son become natural enemies, after the manner of wild beasts."

A man who commits a murder in this country stains his memory for ever, and at the same time brings disgrace on his relations. Amongst the Fijians, the Bushmen, the Ugandas, and the Pathans, to kill a fellow-man is the most honourable action one can perform.

In this country it is immoral to commit adultery. Amongst many peoples unchastity amongst the married is regarded with entire approbation.

"Thou shalt not steal" is supposed to be one of our moral laws. Amongst numerous uncivilised American, Asiatic, and African tribes the most dexterous in theft are the most highly honoured.

We punish the perjurer and scorn the liar, but in Blantyre, says Macdonald, "to be called a liar is rather a compliment."

And so one might go on. Far from being "the same all the world over," human nature differs in different peoples as widely as the poles. The very opposite of what is moral in one place is entirely right in another.

One has only to look round in one's own neighbourhood to discover infinite varieties of human nature. Here is a Christian who believes, like a Mahomedan, that it is immoral to drink alcohol.



There is a Christian who drinks "to the greater glory of God." Here is an Infidel who believes it immoral to kill and eat animals, or to hunt animals for pleasure. There is a Christian who considers both righteous. Here is a man who thinks it immoral to strike a child. There is another who worships the rod. Here is a man who thinks it moral to tell "white" lies. There is a man who would not lie to save his life. Here is a Christian who believes in physical force. There is another who believes in non-resistance.

Human nature the same? What an extraordinary delusion!

As great a delusion is the idea that human nature cannot be altered.

The people who say "So long as human nature is what it is" generally know little about human nature. The only human nature they have studied is the lower activities of that nature. They seem to live in a petrified world, where what we call the evil instincts are triumphant. They have never travelled beyond the first chapter of Genesis. Man fell and will fall for ever and ever. Amen.

It is useless to strive. Human nature cannot be altered.

And yet they live in the twentieth century in Great Britain, and Darwin can be bought for a shilling!

When I meet this argument I am almost persuaded to believe in the reincarnation theory. Surely those who use it must have been on earth before.

Let us go back a few thousand years. Our progenitor, the Ape-Man, is roaming the primæval forest at the head of his family group, consisting of his wives and the young ape-children. The naturalist of the period, had there been one, would have observed that in these family groups there were never any grown-up male offspring. So soon as the ape-child arrived at the age when he might become a possible rival to his father he was cast out of the band to fend for himself. If fit, he survived, to become the despot of a family of his own. If unfit,

he perished of hunger or in combat with his natural enemies.

Now, imagine at some period the existence of an ape-woman with rather more maternal love for her offspring than usual. She dreads parting with her male child, and, being inspired by this excess of love, with more than usual courage she pleads with her lord against the enforcement of the ape-youth's expulsion from the band.

You can imagine that she used and would need all the arguments and artifices she could command. If he were a delicate ape-youth she might appeal to the despot's feeling; if he were strong she would have to *invent a new idea*. She would suggest the idea of co-operation between males for the common defence of a group.

Now, imagine our Tory-Liberal ape-man's reply: "Two males in one band! Beautiful in theory; but while ape-man nature is what it is you never will get two males to agree. To have an ideal group you must first get ideal ape-men."

And so that first poor mother failed. But the idea did not die. Later on another mother was successful. An ape-man, one perhaps who felt his vigour to be waning, dimly discerned the possible advantages of having a young ape-man to help in the protection of the group, and, stifling his hereditary instincts, with a tremendous struggle, yielded to the solicitation of his ape-wife.

But would the observant naturalist have noted anything extraordinary in the general behaviour of ape-men? Would he have announced to the world that ideal conditions existed in Ape-land? Would the ape-men themselves think much of the change after it was accomplished?

It is very unlikely. Yet the change was tremendous, and the effects far-reaching. Out of it grew society, and morals, and law.

Let us now take a glimpse at primitive man. Able to obtain but a scanty livelihood by means of the poor tools and weapons at their command, the family group would preserve a selfish isolation. Their

only thought would be how to procure enough food for themselves, and they would never scruple to rob another group by force or cunning, nor think it wrong to do so.

Imagine, now, a number of groups who have simultaneously discovered a tract of country teeming with game, and settle down therein. Their hereditary instincts impel them to rob each other at every opportunity, with the result that the constant wars leave them so little time for hunting that their condition is as bad or worse than when they roamed in less fruitful districts.

Then arises a thoughtful young man who suggests that an agreement between the groups not to steal each other's goods would be mutually beneficial. Imagine the reply of the human-nature-can't-be-altered fossil of that time. "Not steal from each other? A beautiful plan in theory. But it is impossible. While human nature is what it is you will never get groups not to steal from each other. To abolish stealing you must first have honest men."

Yet it was *done*. Stealing is not yet entirely abolished, but the difference between those primitive conditions and our conditions is immense. Millions of people can walk abroad by day and night and a very small percentage suffer from the survival of that once dominant instinct.

Now take a big jump down the corridors of time. A few hundred years ago exchange of goods was made by means of metal coins. Paper money was unknown. Commerce was hampered and much distress was caused for lack of an adequate medium of exchange.

Then it occurred to some bright genius to suggest the issue of paper money. "Paper!" exclaimed the barnacles. "A beautiful theory on paper. But it wouldn't work. So long as human nature is what it is men will demand solid coin in payment for goods. To establish a paper currency you must first have men with perfect confidence in each other's integrity."

To-day 90 per cent. of our trade is done with paper money.

One might fill a volume with similar illustrations. In every sphere of life the croakers are always ready with their wet blankets to quench the desire for progress. Within the last hundred years especially they have been confounded innumerable times, yet the genus still persists, and will possibly live to rival in antiquity that quaint animal the duck-bill.

Human nature can't be altered? Can it not? What, then, is the meaning of your religions, and your laws, and your schools, and your prisons and reformatories, and your societies for this, that, and the other?

Why do you "train" your children? Why do you teach them morals? Why do you surround them with good influences? Why do you keep them from bad companions? Why do you send them to Sunday schools? Why do you educate them?

Because you are *certain* that human nature can be altered.

Why do you send criminals to prison? To punish them. Yes. And to *reform* them. You believe human nature can be altered. Why do you subscribe to the Salvation Army? To reclaim the lost. You believe human nature can be altered. Why do you take the waifs and strays out of the slums and send them to Barnardo's? To make honest men of them. You believe human nature can be altered. Why do you send drunkards to inebriate homes? To make them sober. You believe human nature can be altered.

Why do you reason with people, preach to people, appeal to people, denounce people, praise people, and blame people?

Because you are *certain* human nature can be altered.

If human nature cannot be altered, we are simply mad to spend so large a part of our time and energy as we do in these various activities. What is their object? To alter human nature. Everyone knows

it. Everyone believes we can alter human nature. Everyone believes we *do* alter human nature.

And yet—when some solemn, pompous orator gets on his legs and says, "Human nature cannot be altered," there are people who cheer him!

This, too, is a proof that human nature can be and has been altered. Our wild ancestors would have heaved rocks at such a freak.

Having shown that human nature is not the same all the world over, and that human nature can be altered, let us ask if the change required to establish Socialism is impossible of achievement.

How much alteration in human nature would Socialism necessitate? But that is not the question. Socialism cannot be established suddenly. It must come by degrees. We must take steps, and the real question is, "How much alteration in human nature is necessary to enable us to take the first steps towards Socialism?"

Any?

If people are to be judged by their professions, not much. For when you investigate the matter you find that most people admit the evils we want to remedy. "We don't agree with your methods," they say. "Socialism can only be established by angels."

Well, what *are* our proposals?

We want to feed the hungry children, to provide work for all, to pay all justly. And we say that only when the people own their own country can they have full control over their lives and happiness, and only then will they be able to ensure a decent livelihood for all. We want Britain for the British.

To-day some hungry children are fed, some unemployed are provided with work, some workers are paid justly. But millions go hungry, and unemployed, and unjustly rewarded. We want *all* to receive justice.

This can only be achieved by the organisation of the people. Socialism is the *science* of society. To-day life is a chaotic scramble. Order is heaven's first law. We want more order.

We want Co-operation. We say that the People,

the State, have as much right to stop competition for bread as they have to stop a drunken fight in the streets. That they have as much right to prevent Capitalism from driving people to early graves as they have to prohibit any other kind of murder.

We have Co-operation to-day amongst the stronger. We have Trusts and Co-operative Societies. We say it is the duty of the State to establish Co-operation amongst the weaker. To establish Co-operation amongst the whole people.

Does that programme require an enormous change in human nature?

Not at all. Our practical immediately possible proposals are simply extensions of methods already in use.

Socialists want work for all, food for all, houses for all, teaching for all. We want national railways, national mines, national banks, national insurance. We want municipal bread, and meat, and milk, and houses, and land. We already have national dockyards, national post offices, municipal water, gas, electricity, and trams. Why should we stop there?

There are those who say that our methods are too "material." That we trust too much to "environment." That society can only be improved when the individuals become more moral.

We do trust environment. So does every sensible person. What is environment?

All your reformers trust environment. What does the Salvation Army do with a drunkard? Do they leave him amongst his evil surroundings? Do they merely tell him to be sober? Do they preach to him, and trust to something inside him making him more moral?

Of course not. They take the drunkard to a home in the country. They feed him well. They give him fresh air and exercise. They surround him with good influences. In short, *they change his environment* as completely as possible. And they talk to him, and appeal to his conscience and his self-respect.

What are all your schools, and churches, and

societies, and libraries, and art galleries, and parks but "environment"? Would a man who says human nature can't be altered send his child to a criminal slum for a twelve-month and expect him to return unsmirched? Why not? Because he believes such an environment would be *certain* to have evil effects.

"If 'environment' were everything, all the well-to-do ought to be most moral," say our opponents.

Well. Don't the bulk of the criminals, and the drunkards, and the wastrels belong to the poor class? Isn't poverty more often the cause of drink than drink the cause of poverty? Isn't it the same with crime?

Everybody believes in the efficacy of good material environment. Every sensible person chooses a good material environment. But no person believes that material environment is sufficient of itself to produce moral men and women.

Well, Socialists want to give *everyone* a chance. They want a good environment for all, material and moral. We would even improve the environment of the well-to-do.

To-day there are innumerable institutions for altering human nature and reforming people. But they are bound to fail because they neglect material environment or moral environment or both. You cannot grow angels in slums. You cannot grow moral men and women in a system of Competition and grab. We teach children to be good, and then we turn them loose into a horrible immoral system, which shouts at them all the time, "Do unto others as you would be done by, and you will go under." What can we expect of such contradictory methods?

To put a man amidst a million temptations and then tell him he deserves his punishment if he falls is inhuman cruelty. It is not Socialists who expect people to be angels. It is our opponents.

And we do not trust entirely to "material" things. We believe as strenuously as any one of our opponents in the saving power of higher instincts and emotions. In love, and self-sacrifice, and generosity, and honour, and self-respect, and responsibility, and

freedom. But we know that these higher qualities are often blighted or destroyed by evil material environment, and we know that they flourish best in the soil of health, and decency, and hope, and just reward for industry, and it is the aim of Socialism to provide that soil in such abundance that every British child shall have room to root itself firmly therein, that it may grow into manhood or womanhood, and bear those sweet blossoms of humanity which gladden the hearts of gods and men.



## ROBERT BLATCHFORD'S BOOKS.

**THE SORCERY SHOP :** An Impossible Romance. Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d.

A fascinating forecast of Manchester under Socialism.

**GOD AND MY NEIGHBOUR.**—Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d. Paper covers, 3d.; post free, 4½d.

This book has created more interest and controversy in the religious world than any book published during the last ten years. The author considers it still unanswered.

**NOT GUILTY :** A Defence of the Bottom Dog.—Cloth, 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d. Paper covers, 6d.; post free, 7½d.

**DISMAL ENGLAND.**—Cloth and gold, 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d.

The Home Secretary and Mr. Ritchie should arrange a loan of this work from Sir John Gorst, who reads every thing and understands most that he reads. *It is an excellent disturber of official complacency.*—*The Star*.

**A BOHEMIAN GIRL.**—An Up-to-date Love Story. Cloth and Gold, 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d.

**MY FAVOURITE BOOKS.**—Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d. With Portrait of the Author.

Instinct with generous and eloquent appreciation of what is brightest and best in our literature, we have only to complain that there is so little of it after all. Again we feel the spell of old times in the charmed garden; the breeze blows fresh, sweet is the odour of the roses, and we wander with our guide wherever it pleases him to lead us. We can give the author no higher praise. May his book prosper as it deserves.—*The Christian Globe*.

**A BOOK ABOUT BOOKS.**—Eleven more Literary Essays. Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d.

**JULIE :** A Study of a Girl by a Man.—Nunquam's Story of Slum Life. Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d. Paper covers, 1s.; post free, 1s. 3d.

"Julie," unlike "The Master Christian," is beautiful inside as well as out. Nunquam, like Corelli, has a mission to perform—to utilise romance as a finger-post to indicate social wrongs; but unlike Corelli, he succeeds in his purpose. And why does he succeed where she fails? Because he goes at his task sympathetically, with a warm heart; whereas she goes at it sourly, with a pen dipped in gall. It is all a question of temperament. If you want an object lesson in the effect which temperament has upon artistic achievement, read "The Master Christian" and follow it up with "Julie."—*Liverpool Record*.

**THE BOUNDER :** The Story of a Man by his Friend. Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d.

**TALES FOR THE MARINES.**—A New Book of Soldier Stories. Price 2s. 6d. net; post free, 2s. 9d. Paper covers, 1s. net; post free, 1s. 3d.

This volume contains a batch of stories ("cuffers," we understand, is the correct technical term) supposed to be told by soldiers in the barrack-room after lights are out; and capital stories they are. If we were to call them "rattling" and also "ripping" we should not be saying a word too much. For our own part we never want to see a better fight than that between the bayonet and the sword in "The Mousetrap," or to read a sounder lecture on social philosophy than that delivered by Sergeant Wren in "Dear Lady Disdain." Mr. Blatchford knows the barrack-room from the inside, and obviously from the inside has learned to love and to enjoy it.—*Daily Chronicle*.

# YOU MUST READ

## “Merrie England,”

By ROBERT BLATCHFORD.

Paper Covers, 3d.; post free, 4½d.

This is a new edition of the book which a dozen years ago was bought by over 1,000,000 people in the United Kingdom, and as many more in America.

---

## “Britain for the British,”

By ROBERT BLATCHFORD.

300,000 Sold.

This is a further exposition of Socialism.

Price: Cloth, 2/6; post free, 2/9.

Paper Covers, 3d.; post free, 4½d.

---

The Clarion Press, 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.

# PASS ON PAMPHLETS.

Every Fortnight.  
One Penny.

PASS ON PAMPHLETS are designed to enlighten the inquirer into Socialism. They will inform you why Socialism is needed, what Socialism is, and how Socialism may be attained. The date of the first issue is September, 1908. Amongst the early numbers are the following:

John Bull and Doctor Socialism.  
John Bull and Doctor Free Trade.  
John Bull and Doctor Protection.  
Why Women Want Socialism.  
Nationalisation of Inventions.  
Stop the Strike.



ORDER FROM YOUR  
NEWSAGENT.

READ and  
PASS ON.

# Have You Heard of THE CLARION?

The CLARION is a Socialist and Literary Journal edited by Robert Blatchford. Perhaps you have heard of Robert Blatchford. He is the author of two of the most widely circulated books on Socialism ever written—"Merrie England," of which over 1,000,000 copies were sold in the United Kingdom alone, and "Britain for the British." of which 250,000 have been sold. He has also written a score of other books—soldier stories, novels, sketches; and two important works on Christianity and Morals, viz., "God and My Neighbour" and "Not Guilty." You may have heard of the two latter. They have caused a great commotion in religious circles.

Over twenty years ago Robert Blatchford's passionate pleading of the cause of the poor brought his writings into prominence in the North of England. Sixteen years ago, 1891, the CLARION was founded. A dozen years ago his "Merrie England" was in every hand, and gave a tremendous fillip to the cause of Socialism. To-day Socialism is in everybody's mouth. It is discussed in Parliament, preached and denounced from the pulpits, from thousands of platforms, in newspapers, magazines, and books by the million. Socialism is the question of the day and the CLARION has, more than any other influence, made it the question of the day.

## What Is Socialism?


Do you know what Socialism is? If you do not, do you not think is your duty to find out? Before long you will have to take sides. You must either be with us or against us.

You may have heard Socialism denounced as immoral or ridiculous, the dream of unpractical fools. Have you investigated the question *yourself*. Do you think it fair to swallow the verdict of interested opponents?

## Judge for Yourself.

Read the CLARION. One Penny Weekly.

*Order from your Newsagent. Specimen Copy post free from  
The CLARION OFFICE, 44, Worship Street, London, E.C.*



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA LIBRARY  
Los Angeles

This book is DUE on the last date stamped below.

AP 10 1989

Form L9—15m-10,'48 (B1039) 444

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA  
AT  
LOS ANGELES

3 1158 00748 76

UC SOUTHERN REGIONAL LIBRARY FACILITY



**AA** 000 388 702 3

