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THE FALLACIES OF SOCIALISM.

By REV. C. W. TINSLEY.

This is the age of the Social question. Never before were so many people, of all classes and conditions, stirred by dreams of a better social world. There are, of course, many who do not think much (and feel less) upon these questions which so vitally affect man’s relations to his fellows—for they do not discern the “signs of the times.” But the literature of our day is saturated with the desire for social betterment. “Workmen with grimy hands and women with eager eyes are turning the pages of economic writings in search of practical guidance.” Social panaceas are offered on every hand. Organization is consolidating the fighting force of the hand-working class, while capital is doing the same on the other side. There is deep seated and wide spread disturbance. The deeper currents of our age are social, and social questions are at the front. The air is full of interrogation points which keep the thoughtful guessing and on the alert. “Are all men created free and equal; if so, what are the limitations of freedom? Has any one a right to property? Or is property theft as Proudhon declared? If man has a right to property is there a limit to the amount he may rightfully hold? Has he a right to more than will meet his needs while others have not enough for life’s necessities? If a man has a right to property has he a right to spend it as he pleases? Has any one the right to property in land? Or is the land the natural heritage of all the people? Has every man a right to live? If so, has he a right to the means of life? Has he a right to do with life as he pleases? Is it the duty of every able-bodied person to work? If so, how is that obligation to be enforced? Has every one a right to work? If so, whose duty is it to furnish employment? Is labor the source of all wealth? What are the rights of labor? What are the rights of capital? What are the relations of the two? If they have rights, have they not duties also? What are the duties of each? What are the relations of organized and unorganized labor? Has unorganized labor no rights? How is the centralization of industrial power to be harmonized with the distribution of political power? How is organized industry to be reconciled with democracy?” These questions and all others of like nature have been asked before, but never with the earnestness and even the vehemence with which they are propounded now. There is a vast and rising tide of discontent which is stirring to its depths the sea of social life. It is a significant fact also that the social question is most conspicuous in the most prosperous and best educated countries. Indeed, it is an expression of prosperity and education. There is no social question in Turkey or in Egypt. The problems of social equity, or justice, do not grow out of the worst conditions, but out of the best. It is not a sign of social decadence, but of vitality. It is the expression of popular education, intellectual liberty, and the quickened sentiments of sympathy and love and there can be nothing but good come from the agitation and discussion of the questions involved. Discussion is always a helpful thing when carried on in the spirit of fairness and kindness and with the supreme desire to find the truth. Rider Haggard, while on a visit to the United States recently, said that what most impressed him “was a growing socialistic tendency among the American masses.” No one can doubt the truth of this statement. It is manifest in the Socialist vote in the United States, which was over 97,000 in 1900, but rose to over 391,000 in the presidential election of 1904, an increase in four years of over 400 per cent. Nor does this vote reveal the total Socialist following, for many who draw the line at Mr. Debs (the last presidential nominee of the Socialist party) are yet in sympathy with the general philosophy of Socialism. If we add to this the vote of the Socialist Labor party and of the Peoples’ party cast at the same election
Cialism is a theory of civil polity that aims to secure the reconstruction of society, increase wealth and a more equal distribution of the products of labor through the public collective ownership of land and capital (as distinguished from property) and the public collective management of industries.

When we analyze these definitions (which will not be questioned as correctly defining it, by any well informed modern Socialist) we find at least four main elements.

1. The common ownership of the material instruments of production. That is, society (or the collectivity) is to take the place of private associations, or individuals, as owners of land and capital—so rent and interest must cease for they belong to private ownership. Not that all wealth will become common property under this scheme, but only that which is designed for further production. It abolishes private property only so far as it enables one to gather an income from the toil of others.

2. These instruments of production are not only to be owned in common but are to be managed in common. Production is not for the sake of private profits, but for the satisfaction of the wants of all. Of course common management must be by means of certain individuals chosen for that purpose, to represent the whole people. It would be impossible for all the people to have a direct part in such management.

3. The distribution of income by common authority. That is, all the net earnings of capital and land must be distributed among all the members of the society on an equitable plan.

4. Private property in the proportion of income (“Income” meaning use or enjoyment) so that Socialism does not propose to abolish private property, but to greatly extend it.

There are many false notions as to what Socialism really is. Some suppose it to be the mere vaporings of wild theorists. On the contrary, leading Socialists (those who have thought it out most carefully) have been among some of the best minds—Owen, Marx, Engels, Lasselle, were all great thinkers. The same may be said of the leaders of Socialism in America—Hawthorne, Theodore Parker, Emerson, Mary Fuller, Greeley, Lowell, Whittier, Thoreau, Story, George W. Curtis, were more or less in sympathy with Socialism, besides many thinkers of our own day.
who could be named. Nor is it the scheme of bad men. Indeed, criminals usually do not approve it. Criminals as a rule are conservatives in social opinion, politics and religion. A vote was taken in 1892 in the Elmira reformatory, New York, and out of 909 ballots cast, 404 were Democrats, 394 Republicans, 15 Peoples' party, 1 Prohibition, 8 defective. The Peoples' party, which is nearest in sympathy with Socialism, received only 15. Sometimes it is declared to be hostile to the family as a social institution. This is false. Socialism is purely an economic system and among its advocates are those who hold to various views of marriage and the family. Indeed, Socialists affirm that the present competitive system is destroying the family and make it one of their arguments against the continuance of our modern industrial order. Socialism is also often confounded with anarchy. But they are, theoretically at least, exact opposites, and great foes. Where one is strong the other is weak. Social Democracy drove John Most out of Germany. The weakness of anarchy in Germany is to be attributed to the efforts of Social Democracy, more than to any other force. Modern Socialism is the outcome of modern industrial conditions. Recent times have witnessed a veritable revelation in industry. Inventions and mechanical improvements of all kinds have been the chief agencies in this vast change. These have brought changes in the economic world. The industrial order under which we live is almost wholly different from that which our fathers knew. Land, labor, capital and enterprise are all new things in a new world.

The greatest change has been in regard to capital. Karl Marx showed his rare insight into this complex problem in his book on Socialism ("Das Kapital") which appeared in 1867 and which has been called the "Bible of Socialism." Capital, taking advantage of industrial changes through invention, moved out of the shop into the factory. Production became socialized. Thus wealth was enormously emmassed—but being in the hands of the individuals, vast private fortunes were piled up. These became the owners of the tools of production of all kinds, though these tools were used by the toilers (or hand workers) who created this vast wealth, yet they received only a small part of that which they created. Thus came the thought of the common ownership and use of these tools of industry and the common distribution of the product of labor.

Thus Socialism was born. Its progress has been phenomenal. It is now world wide. In our own country it has had a remarkable history of development. Edward Bellamy wrote his "Looking Backward" in 1888 (less than twenty years ago). It had a remarkable sale, selling for a time at the rate of 1,000 copies per day. This was the beginning of that form of American Socialism called "Nationalism." It exerted great influence on the public thought and even upon legislation, but has become a mere remi- niscense largely. That form of Socialististic philosophy most widely prevalent in our country now is that of which Karl Marx was the founder. It is a materialistic theory of social evolution. Marx was a German socialist writer, of Jewish extraction. He claimed that "the form of material production is the general cause of social, political and spiritual processes. It is not consciousness which determines conditions, but on the contrary social conditions which determine consciousness." He was of the philosophical school of Hegel. An eminent Socialist has said, "Socialism is a religion and Marx is its Luther." There can be no question that he was a great thinker, one of the greatest of the nineteenth century. He made Socialism a philosophy of every department of social life. He held to a materialistic conception of history as Windelband, in his history of philosophy tells us. "He found the meaning of history in the processes of social life. This collective or social life is essentially of an economic nature. The determining forces in all social conditions are the economic relations; they form the ultimate motives for all activities. Then change and development are the only conditioning forces for public life and politics and likewise for science and religion. All the different activities of civilization are thus only offshoots of the economic life and all history should be economic history."

So to this great founder of the Socialist philosophy the universe was simply a self unfolding process of material forces. Spiritual ideals were but the result of economic circumstances. Indeed, to him Socialism was a substitute for a religion. In fact it is a religion, so far as religion is a philosophy of life to which men give themselves with pas-
sionable attachment. Marx stands in about the same relation to Socialism that Adam Smith does to political economy, i.e., all going before prepared for him; all coming after him take him as a starting point. The creed of Marx (and therefore of the modern Socialist) is purely economic. "He seeks to discover the economic law that governs society. According to his philosophy modern social development is made possible only by capital. It has reached its highest point and now must necessarily be followed by another system. Modern capital exploits the laborer by getting possession of what he calls the surplus value of his services, i.e. the amount the laborer produces over and above the amount of his wages, which are regulated by the iron law which tends to reduce them to the minimum. The basis of the exchange value of a commodity is the amount of labor expended on it. In the long run this means the average amount of labor expended under average conditions. But modern labor requires capital. Marx traces the historic development of capital and shows the tendency for the instruments of labor to concentrate in fewer and fewer hands. Thus arises the capitalist class. Meantime develops also a class who have only labor to sell — the proletariat. The first is the consuming, the second the producing class. The growth of capitalism reduces the number of capitalists and increases the poverty and misery of the working classes, but also serves to bring them to self consciousness. The proletariat will finally organize and the means of production will be seized (peaceably, or otherwise) and managed for the good of all. Marx outlined no ideal future condition. He tried to show what he believed to be the course of historical development and sought to bring about the next step, the organization of all laborers for their common good. This may be taken as a brief statement of the Socialist philosophy. It involves the thorough reconstruction of society through political action. American Socialism is more Marxian than that of any other country.

It cannot be denied that the leaven of Socialism is needed at the present time, although one may reject the system itself. It reproaches present society with its small and unequal distribution of wealth. It points out the wastes of competition. It proposes to do away with such waste by abolishing competition. "The enormous waste of wealth in competing lines of railroad between the same points is manifest to anyone who will take the time to consider. This is taking place all over the United States. So with other forms of competition. The Western Union Telegraph company alone has thus wasted over $100,000,000. The milk business is often pointed out by Socialists as an example. Many milk wagons traverse our streets in all directions. They cite us the mail delivery in contrast to this. Suppose all the mail, on arrival in our city, were put in a heap and each carrier should take up an armful at random for delivery. It is clear that it would take many times the number of carriers which are now needed for this work. Each one would have to run all over the city and a dozen carriers would traverse each street. The waste under such a scheme is manifest. So with traveling salesmen. Advertising alone in this country under our competitive system will amount to one billion dollars yearly. Certainly this is waste, if some better plan can be devised. So they tell us of the waste of mistaken undertakings, waste from crises and industrial depressions, waste from idle labor and idle capital, waste, waste, waste everywhere, while men, women and children suffer for the want of life's very necessities. And one must concede that this is all true. It is a tremendous indictment against our present method of industry. It is impossible to believe that this is necessary. Indeed, it is impossible to believe that it is not criminal. Socialism deserves the thanks of all right minded and justice loving men and women in thundering against this gigantic iniquity. It cannot abide forever. Waste is wicked and something is radically wrong in any system of industrial organization which permits it on such colossal scale. Then Socialism is to be commended for its aim in trying to substitute an orderly and rational distribution of wealth. It seeks to satisfy all human wants. It would avoid the extremes of pauperism and plutocracy—not only that, but it appeals to human sympathy. The average Socialist is inspired by ethical ideals which are a credit to any man or woman who holds them. I have often heard the Socialist berated and belabored by some sleek, self-satisfied, bundle of selfishness who not only knew nothing of
what Socialism means, but who had never felt the first stirrings of that sense of humanity which animates the life of the average Socialist. A man who in his grasping greed grinds the face of the poor until he has effaced therefrom nearly all semblance of manhood and then prates of his gifts to charity, or to the church, but has only a sneer for the "Socialist," is wholly incapable of rising to the ethical plane where the sincere Socialist dwells. No study will awaken conscience or increase the sense of personal responsibility like a thorough course in sociology. It has converted many a selfish life into one of self-sacrificing toil for others. Socialism seeks to make real the brotherhood of mankind. We know, as a matter of fact, that the conduct of men in their business relations is anything but brotherly. Socialism is the one great agitator as to this condition of things. It has compelled an examination of the very social order itself. It has pointed out the alarming defects in our system. Nothing would be better calculated to improve government and business than a generous leaven of the kind of feeling which stirs the heart of the Socialist. But Socialism is not simply a spirit and an attitude toward life. It is also a proposition to reconstruct the whole social order. It is serious. It means what it says. It would begin at the very foundations and build anew.

Just here is its weakness and here are to be found the reasons for saying that its dream can never be practically realized. The spirit of Socialism is beautiful, but its economic program is built on stubble. It will not do for the Socialist to declare that Socialism has no program, for it has. It would establish by some means the collective ownership and control of all means of production. That is a program, and involves a gigantic and radical revolution—a fundamental change in our industrial order. It is just here where it meets with the disapproval of a vast majority of those who have given it most thoughtful and careful consideration. I am aware of the assumption of the average Socialist that those who do not agree with its program are of such mind simply because they do not thoroughly understand it. If this be so then the leading Socialist philosophers are unable to make clear and plain their meaning. Thousands of volumes of vast ability have been written and circulated by its propaganda. They are easily accessible in all our libraries. It is a fact of great significance that no professional economist of high standing is a Socialist, unless it be the Italian economist Loria. The Socialist, of course, claims that they are blinded by self-interest—that they could not espouse Socialism and hold their "chairs," as they are dominated by capital. It thus impugns the sincerity of those who do not agree with it. No cause will resort to such an argument, save one that is conscious of its own weakness in the realm of thought. It is safe to affirm that no ambitious scheme of social reconstruction can ever find favor with the people while those specially trained to consider economic questions reject its claims. Socialism must first win over to its view the teachers of economics before it can ever gain general acceptance. But let us further note some of the weaknesses of essential Socialism:

1. It holds to a false theory of history—the materialistic conception—Materialism (as we have seen) was the base of Karl Marx's economic thinking. No one can deny that economic conditions largely influence life, but to make everything depend upon these forces is to shut one's eyes to other forces equally great, and often greater. A careful study of history makes this manifest. Indeed, that which Marx and Engels predicted would come, has not taken place simply because other forces than the merely economic have been put forth to guide social evolution. Earnest individual effort has done great things. Shaftesbury, for example, was the cause of much labor reform in England. The Socialists themselves contradict their own philosophy, for by their individual initiative they have wrought great changes in public thought and feeling. Society is not an automaton. It has some option, some choice, some conscience to which an appeal can be made. These are facts, if there are any such things as facts. Religion is the mightiest fact in history. It is an independent force that has influenced the course of history more than any other nameable factor. It modifies and shapes even economic institutions equal to any other influence. Yet we are told by the materialistic school of Socialistic thought that even religion is the result of our material economy, and this, in spite of the fact that we find religious beliefs so diverse flourishing under precisely like
economic conditions. It is the statement of a fact to declare that materialism is an antiquated philosophy. It flourished for a time, but has now been laid away in its grave. It is no longer to be reckoned with in serious thinking.

A steamer crossing the Atlantic in stormy weather was unable during the entire voyage to get an observation of the heavens to correct the variations of its compass and so was wrecked on the coasts of Nova Scotia, when its captain supposed he was entering the harbor of New York. So any scheme for social betterment that does not look up is bound to go down.

Therefore we commend to the Socialistic propaganda the advice of Emerson: "Hitch your wagon to a star."

2. Another weakness of Socialism is that it is purely a working class movement. Thus it has tended toward narrowness and bitterness, as anything must, which takes on the nature of a distinctly class struggle. While Socialist agitation has had a beneficial influence in drawing the wage-earning classes together, and in creating among them a feeling of fraternal solidarity, it has on the other hand tended to separate them from other classes of society, depriving them of the help which they could derive from the other classes and giving them an unwarranted confidence in their capacity for political and industrial leadership. This has been the inevitable outcome of the Socialism of Marx, which treats Socialism as a purely class problem, telling the workers that their emancipation must come entirely from their own efforts, and employing the war cry, "Workmen of all countries, unite!" Socialism will become stronger when it loses its class character. The platform of the Socialist party in the last national election (upon which one of Terre Haute's citizens stood, in asking for the place of president of these United States) abounds in expressions which are direct appeals to class hatred. It talks of the "capitalist class" as trying to "root out the idea of freedom from among the people;" that these interests control our courts, "the university and the public school, the pulpit and the press." It declares that "capitalism is the enemy and the destroyer of essential private property; that it confiscates the labor of the labor class above its subsistence wage—"the class which produces nothing possesses labor's fruits." It speaks of the "class conflict." "Between these two classes there can be no possible compromise or identity of interests."

"The working class is the only class that has the right or power to be." This, of course is blatant demagoguery and false to the facts. It can only work harm. There can never be a settlement of the industrial issue upon any such basis. Violence and class hatred are not the methods by which victory for the hand-worker can ever come, and any man who seeks to arouse the class feeling of hatred is not only a demagogue, but is a foe to the true interests of labor. He does not help, but hinders the coming of the day of deliverance.

3. Socialism, again, is too optimistic with respect to the future, and too pessimistic with respect to the present. It must be remembered, of course, that Socialism has never had a practical trial; therefore we cannot see what would be brought about by its adoption, except as pure theory. "Communism" has been tried, and has failed, but that does not prove that Socialism would also fail, for they are very different. Socialism has beautiful dreams of what would take place under its regime, but taking human nature as we find it, in actual life, with its selfishness, cupidity, laziness and dishonesty, it seems highly probable that its dream could never come true—at least, not until a far better average of humanity had been attained. On the other hand, it takes too dark a view of the present social and industrial order. The evils of our present system are great enough and all efforts to lessen them should be encouraged. But even the present order has its bright side. If there is a "submerged tenth," we must remember that the very statement implies that there is also an unsubmerged nine-tenths to help the one-tenth up to better conditions. Socialism fails to take into account that each year witnesses a keener moral sensitiveness to human suffering. It does not see that there is a growing feeling of brotherhood in the world, or if it does, it does not seem to count upon its value as a future aid in the solution of our problems. This is pessimism with the eyes wide open. The sense of justice in employer is more manifest all the time. History tells us that in the French revolution if justice had not first conquered the hearts of royalty and nobility, the mob would have found force of no avail. Selfishness never waged a great crusade. Full justice must be given capital and capital-
ists for their services to society. They risk millions in opening up new sources of wealth. They thus give labor its opportunity for livelihood. They are indispensable to labor's progress in comfort and temporal well-being. Indeed, private property has not yet had a fair trial. Our rapid industrial development has made us dizzy, and there is still much of confusion in our thought. The new conditions have stimulated our ambitions for material prosperity. This has affected all classes. We have forgotten some times to be just and generous to labor, as well as to capitalists. But to say, with confidence, at this stage in our development, that the conditions present no possible hope of improvement, and that private property is a failure, and the whole order of things must be overturned before the wage-earner can obtain his full rights, is not only unwarranted by the facts, but is contrary to the signs of these times in which we live. Society is slowly but surely feeling its way toward a final solution of the differences between capital and labor. Legislation, in the interests of the manual toiler, is attempting to guard his rights in every way. The hours of labor are being shortened per day and per week. Child labor is coming under the ban of disapproval. Laws regulating the payment of wages, the protection of the health of the employe, the employer's liability for injuries to the employe are multiplying everywhere. Not only this, but labor organizations have multiplied to such an extent that nearly all forms of labor have been brought into mutual relations of helpfulness. So rapid has been this movement in recent years that a world-wide organization of hand-workers seems probable in the near future. Through this must come vast good in amelioration of the conditions of labor everywhere. Carroll D. Wright says: "Taking wages and prices together the economic condition of the wage-earner has improved vastly during the last fifty years, and is improving today."

Socialism, let us remember, proposes to abolish the principle of private business and to substitute for it the collective industrial principle. Our claim is that this would breed much dissatisfaction. Under our present order dissatisfaction is immense, but it is diffused among a multitude of persons—the milkman, because he uses the pump too freely; the expressman, because of his tardiness, or because of exorbitant charges; the gas company, because the bill is too high by at least 100 per cent. Suppose all things were done for us by some central public bureau. We could never exercise the patience we do toward the individual offender. We will tolerate in an individual what would not be tolerated in a public agency. We are more impatient with a government enterprise than with private industry. The outcome of Socialism, then, would be such an amount of dissatisfaction that the experiment would be overthrown, and a return would be made to the present social order. Not only this, but selfishness would not be cured by Socialism. Human nature must be dealt with as we know it to be. Men now take pains to fan the flames of discontent if they can only obtain personal advantage by so doing. Certainly this would continue under any other social order, as well as under the one dominant, while selfishness reigns.

5. Socialism would be a menace to liberty. Under this proposed Socialist scheme there would be but one considerable sphere of employment. We must not forget that men would administer the various departments of this co-operative commonwealth, and while human nature remains as now, oppression would ensue. Even granting that there might come longer economic freedom, there are other forms of freedom to be considered, and we must not forget that the world's history is a fearful warning against unchecked and unfettered power. What a tremendous "power" a political faction would have once it gained control of even a large part of the country. There must be government of some sort. Even if government should be reduced to the lowest terms compatible with Socialism, what power the few who govern would possess, however they might be selected or appointed. Men would combine as now. It would be quite possible for two or three parties to act together in their own interests and exploit the public, as they do in
Terre Haute today. It makes small difference which way the city election turns, certain men have pooled their interests and every turn of the political weather vane only brings favoring breezes to the combinors. Our city is absolutely governed by two or three men, and our citizens are helpless unless they also combine to command the situation in the interests of decent government. The claim that "graft" would be eliminated by such change in the social order by greater centralization of government (for that is precisely what Socialism involves) is on the face of it child's play. It would only furnish the larger opportunity for all those abuses which now rob citizenship of its rights.

6. Then there are insuperable objections to Socialism as a scheme of production. Socialism contemplates a unification of industry. It assumes the possibility of organizing every branch of industry as a great unit. We are compelled, of course, to admit that the tendency in all branches of enterprise today is toward monopoly. If this becomes universal then private monopoly must finally submit to public control. This is inevitable. Indeed it cannot be denied that this is the trend of our times. We are rapidly drifting toward a sort of socializing of industry—at least the great industries. The federal government has already taken hold of the problem by the institution of a commissioner of corporations. Thus our government is assuming the control of cooperative activity. This is well. But this is far from Socialism, which would have a common ownership and control of all industry. This we conceive to be absolutely impossible. It is impossible, for instance, to conceive how foreign commerce could be carried on under Socialism. A chief difficulty would be the adjustment of values and of international exchanges. Then, another nation, still capitalistic, could impede, if not upset, the arrangement of any Socialist scheme on a national scale. But even if this could be shown to be feasible, what of agriculture? If this is left out there can be no Socialism. Socialists themselves admit that no plan, which is at all plausible, has yet been suggested for the inclusion of agriculture. Private ownership of soil is required for the present for farming on a small scale. This is also acknowledged by Socialists. But the tendency toward the dividing up of farms goes on as the population grows more dense. The movement, in the necessity of the case, is toward intensive rather than toward extensive farming. But even if we had public ownership of land with private management this would be something very different from Socialism.

7. Not only this, but it is difficult to understand how, under Socialism, adequate motives for economic activity could be awakened. Men, as now constituted, and as we know them in every-day life about us, are spurred on by competition. Competition means the struggle of individual interests, which involves private property. Competition has been called brutal, and it must be granted that it may become so and does become so. The facts all about us daily make this painfully apparent. It crushes human beings everywhere. The vast wheels of competitive industry revolve amid the groans of millions who are being ground down under their ponderous weight. As Mrs. Browning declares, in her imprecatory psalm of the "Cry of the Children," "the blood splashes upward." The manufacturer must produce goods at the lowest price (if possible lower than others and in vast quantities). As the cost of labor is a principal item in the entire cost of the product, the first thing which suggests itself is to reduce wages; then to extend the length of the work-day (that is, get more labor for the same pay); then to drive labor more remorselessly; then to get the cheaper labor of women and children, who ought not to work away from their home at all. This is the picture of the never-ceasing tragedy of competition, and the Socialist deserves all praise for forcing the sickening spectacle upon the public's attention and keeping it there. Yet there is, at least, another side to this picture. Competition has led to numberless inventions. It has played a large part in the material progress of the age. It offers a stimulus which human nature needs, because it rewards men for achievement. It keeps us alert and active. It reduces prices, and gives the best commodity for the least money. Indeed, many of the evils from which we suffer are not the result of competition, but from the absence of it. The chief objections to trusts and monopolies today is because competition is shut out. Thus the consumer is placed within their power. If competition is brutal, we must not forget that the absence of it is monopoly.
What has Socialism to offer us as a substitute for competition? Upon what can it rely to give us the alertness, the push and enterprise that keeps the wheels of industry spinning and renders progress continuous? Will it be a sense of duty? A love of our fellows? A regard for the public welfare? I am afraid that the standard of humanity is not high enough on the social side, as yet, to warrant that if the spurs of competition were removed from man's tender sides that he would run the industrial race with sufficient earnestness, nor be able to finish his course well under a Socialist regime. But there is still further light upon this dark picture of suffering and loss under the competitive order. The Socialist fails to take into consideration that in the development of life, whether physically or in advance of the social organism composed of related humanity, the law of struggle for life, (or competition) is not the only law which operates. Drummond, in his “Ascent of Man,” has made it clear that there are two principles ceaselessly at work—not only the “struggle for life”, but the “struggle for the life of others.” Indeed that the “struggle for life” is not the supreme fact upon which life of all kinds has slowly advanced. He has demonstrated that altruism has its place in any real development of mankind and that it is slowly proceeding side by side with the competitive principle. Human evolution is not primarily along lines of human selfishness, as the Socialist philosophy of Marx and the modern school of Socialists would have us think. Altruism, (or thought for others) is one of the most characteristic facts of our times. There would be no such thing as the very impulse from which Socialism springs, if this were not true.

There is an incoming sense of brotherhood everywhere manifest in the world’s life. Each day reveals its growth in a real sensitiveness to all the things which concern the welfare of men. The world’s progress in civilization depends upon it more than upon any other one factor. The one great need of humankind is that a genuine brotherliness maintain. It will cure every ill—solve every problem—smooth the pathway for the feet of every toiler (as far as it is either necessary or beneficial for it to be smoothed) and in proportion as it comes, in practical forms, will the schemes of Socialism fade away into fond reminiscences and become things of the past.

The special peril of the present Social movement is this externalism. Progress is defined in terms of organizations, schemes, majorities and social machinery. Its program has rarely a word to say of any change of character. It makes no appeal to the wage worker to cultivate prudence, self-restraint, or patience. On the contrary these things which have usually been considered virtues, often seem to stand in the way of the workingman’s aim. He is urged to demand more pay, more comfort, better external conditions, and then these changes in the outward industrial order he is told, will of themselves develop the inward capacity to use them. Organizations are of such importance that they are looked upon as the means of solving all problems. It is salvation by means of organization. This is too deadly fallacy of the whole Socialist philosophy. It asks how can people become better in character if they are not better fed and better clad? How can the wageworker improve his conditions except through his own effort and by arraying himself in uncompromising hostility against the whole capitalistic order? It is the battle of the “classes” and that to the fatal finish. He denounces the “brutal principle of competition” so long as he thinks the capitalist is getting the better end of things, but approves it when he hopes to gain the upper hand himself. He organizes for “warfare.” He ignores any hope of help from any source, but from force, (organization to compel is “force”) It is the question as to which is the stronger and can hold out the longer. If this is to be the issue it can have but one culmination. The laborer must have his chains welded upon his limbs in perpetual slavery. Capital has the larger end of the lever and if force alone is to determine the question—(if selfishness must be the final arbiter) then the end of the conflict may already be predicted with absolute certainty.

My claim is that “he that takes up the sword shall perish with the sword”—especially the wage laborer. The word “sword,” as here used, signifying every form of selfish warfare of whatever kind. If altruism does not come in to settle this question it will never be set-
tled. Justice must be done and that is a matter of moral character. It is a personal quality. There is not a problem in the industrial world that it cannot solve. But so long as men cling to the materialistic philosophy of history as taught by modern Socialism, they can never find the better day for labor. Economics do not determine life. Character is not the product of circumstances. It is false to the very core. It belies the facts of history and is only serving today to confuse and bewilder those who are following this ignus fatuus which can only lead into the bog of despair. Most great transitions in social welfare have occurred not through mechanical, external, or economic changes, but through personal initiative, moral or intellectual leadership—mastery of circumstances comes by force of character. It was an unfortunate thing when American industrial thought ever followed the false notions of Karl Marx. It must free itself of his heresies before redemption can come. Our modern social and industrial questions are upon us simply because character itself is ascending. It is the human note that gives the question any significance whatever. It is because of the growth of pity, justice, and brotherhood that there is any question at all. It is not because the laborer has less, but because he thinks and feels more than yesterday. It proceeds not from decrease of possessions, but from increase of desires. It is manhood's demand for a more humanized life. It is the protest of character against conditions rather than the pressure of conditions upon character. Deep beneath all superficial economic matters are the ethical questions of duty, compassion, humanity and service which are the signs, (not of a degenerating social order), but of an improving social conscience. The truth of history is exactly reversed when it is claimed that economic changes must invariably precede moral progress. Changes in the character of men demand social change. That is the truth of history. The social question meets civilization, not on its way down, but on its way up. The need of the time is not so much better social machinery, as better men. The soul of the age must rule material things and bring about needed industrial changes, just as the soul of man must control his physical life in the interest of both soul and body. We must go back to sane philosophy, in accord with the deepest facts of humanity. Back from the acquisition of goods, to the need of goodness—from things to life—not Socialism, but social reform.

Social reform does not hold that an entire reconstruction of the social order is necessary, but points out that much has been done in the past and has been incorporated into the existing society, and is very good—that all real progress, indeed, to this time, has been made in this way. Social reform declares that no one panacea can become the social "cure all," but that remedies are numerous because social problems are numerous and complex. Socialism looks upon such things as mere "patch work." But a "patch" is all that is required anywhere, if it fully meets the need. There can be no question, but that monopoly should be controlled by the government in the interests of the people. The limits of this paper do not permit the discussion of the government ownership or control of our great railroads, but the movement of the times is rapid in that direction—that would work great reform in many ways. It would not be Socialism, as some suppose, but it could be shown, I think, that it would effectually cure some of the evils that now arise from the private ownership of these gigantic aggregations of power. Railroad stock gambling would cease and other abuses would be corrected. Indeed the government must either control or own the railroads, or must soon be controlled by them. So other forms of monopoly must largely be taken out of private control, if we are to remain free and if the people are to reap the largest benefit from the economic advances which the years bring. Progress is not rapid—slowly the world is moving toward its goal. But it is moving and moving in the right direction, (we are led to believe) as we take the wider outlook upon the vast stream of tendency. The eddy at one's feet may seem to indicate otherwise, but we cannot judge the course of any stream by the eddy. The light of civilization is penetrating the darkness. Even Socialism is part of that light. It has helped men onward in spite of its crudities and mistaken philosophy. But Karl Marx lived too soon. His philosophy was based on what he saw about him in the Germany of his day. Then the regime of laissez faire maintained. But we live in better days. The sleeping giant of industrialism has awakened and has come to a keen consciousness of his needs in the light of justice and humanity, and the movement of the times is
toward the realization of his desires. A new spirit is upon our age. It is the coming of the Christ. There is not a question raised by Socialism but his spirit will settle, and in a far better way than Socialism has ever yet dreamed. No Socialist can name a wrong, of which he bitterly complains today, but is directly traceable to a lack of justice in men. If so, the radical cure is to reform men. Is "modern capitalism fostered by a horde of pirates and wreckers watching a chance to entrap and despoil the unwary?" as Debs tells us. All right, let us concede it. But where is the remedy? Shall we revolutionize society, change the order of things fundamentally—well what then? After the most radical reconstruction your pirates and wreckers are still on hand, and still unreconstructed, have a new chance at their work of plunder. Here is the folly of Socialism. It imagines that one may purify dirty water by pouring it out of one bucket into another. It has never been done. It thinks that some sort of governmental adjustment can be effected in which exploiters of the ignorant and robbers of the weak can have no chance. It is the delusion of sane men. It is the colossal heresy of this age. It must be put away before it leads us into the evils that are in its program. The need of our practical age is a large supply of sane idealism—not Socialism. What is it that has created a better world in any age but the antecedent faith of the idealists? The most valuable, and at the same time the most practical thing in the world is a true ideal. Each reform in industrial conditions—in the protection of the unprotected—in the abolition of slavery (whether it be chattel slavery, or industrial slavery) has been first dreamed and then accomplished. First comes the idealist with his impracticable hope and then follow legislatures and nations with their practical measures. The ideal for our age is one of character, manhood, justice, truth, kindness in all the relations of life. Conditions for the bettering of our social life can never come until character comes. The root must always precede the fruit and flower.

Ben Tillet said: "The various panaceas for poverty are of no more value than a poultice to a wooden leg." New economic conditions are needed no doubt, but it is a new social spirit which is supremely needed. A change in form is not a change in essence. Jesus aimed at a new social order but he knew and taught that it must come from a new social life, and that this life must be inspired by Himself. "I am come that they might have life, and have it more abundantly." There can be no real progress so long as men try to substitute new conditions for newness of life. Life always makes its forms. It creates new conditions. The emancipation of the black man in America was disappointing. It was a great act of justice, but there was a popular expectation of results from new environment which could only come from a new life and a new spirit. Ideal society must grow, it cannot be created. The new social life, which came with the industrial revolution, is gaining self consciousness and a social ideal. It needs to be elevated and spiritualized. For four centuries the watchword has been "Rights," but the time is rapidly drawing near when it will be "duties". The social ideal is but dimly seen as yet. The social conscience is yet but feebly, but it is growing with each new day.

The great social questions which today are working like yeast are ethical. They can be settled only in the spirit, and according to the program of Jesus Christ. Property is the kernel of the social question. Not chiefly production, but its distribution. The question used to be how to produce goods—now it is how to divide them. Men still starve in sight of plenty. It is the question of distribution, and that is a moral question rather than one of economics. It is therefore a matter of conscience and that is always a matter of character. If character was what it ought to be on the part of both employer and employee there could never be a conflict any more than between the brain and the hand. If labor unions were formed to give more efficient service and capitalistic combinations were made for the benefit of employes and of the general public, we should never hear of strikes and lockouts. If coal operator and miner would sit down in conference together with the mutual determination to be brotherly and fair and Christ-like there would be no strike, and coal famines would be impossible. I do not think labor receives its proper share of that, which it is the chief factor in creating, but I am also clear that a larger proportion of the product would not quiet the discontent of the laborer. The average millionaire who is living to get all he can and to keep all he gets, is as dissatisfied as the average wage-
worker, only he does not blame the social system and therefore he does not agitate. Mr. Carnegie recently remarked that “Millionaires who laugh are rare.” Millionaire McQuade of New York, said: “Prosperity has turned my wife’s head—a wealthy man never can live happily.” The Chicago Evening Post suggests that a social settlement for the benefit of “the neglected rich should be established to secure for them certain things which money cannot buy”. The fundamental cause of discontent is the lack of the spirit of service—the spirit of Jesus Christ. If all the dissatisfied were to go on a strike today nearly all of us would be in the crowd. Carroll D. Wright (than whom no one in this country is better qualified to speak intelligently) says: “After many years of investigation in the social, moral and industrial condition of the people, I have come to the conclusion that the adoption of the religion of Christ as a practical creed for the conduct of business is the surest and speediest solution of the difficulties which excite the minds of men and which lead many to think that social, industrial and political revolution is at hand.” Good wages do not satisfy men. Love is the only thing which can, and love includes good wages—tho wages do not include love. Let me add, also, that Jesus Christ was not a socialist. He never condemned competition, but said on the contrary, “Unto him that hath shall be given.” He did not think that bread and good drainage would bring in the millenium. To read into His teachings, that which makes them a program of social reform, or reconstruction, is to mistake the by-product for the end sought. The Socialist program begins with the observation of economic needs and ends in an ideal of economic change. The teaching of Jesus begins with the sense of spiritual need and ends with the ideal of a spiritual kingdom. The aim of the one is to make the poor rich—the aim of the other is to make the bad good. The Socialist says character comes from economic condition. Jesus says economic conditions come from character. He builds from above—the other builds from below. The co-operative commonwealth (Socialism says) is to rise out of a new arrangement of production and distribution—Christianity says the new Jerusalem is to come down out of heaven from God. The Socialist knows that justice must in the long run produce what he demands, but he seems unconcerned as to the training of men toward justice. Socialism says abolish the capitalist—Christ says transform the capitalist. Socialism says, cleanse the outside of the platter—Jesus says cleanse the inside. Socialism is interested in the mechanical and outward—Jesus is concerned first with the moral and inward, knowing that the outward will spring from the characters of men. His social gospel is one of spirit, and of aim. He showed no concern about the organization of society or with the adjustment of social conditions. The New Testament is not a text book of political economy, or of social science. Jesus is a life-bringer. He inspires individual lives and leaves the form and order of His kingdom in their hands. “Ye are the light of the world,” “Ye are the salt of the earth,” He said. His field is the world, but the “good seed,” which was to fructify the field, was the “Children of the Kingdom,” that is—individuals who had caught His spirit and were living His life. He was confident that Christian character would bring about social consequences. It is interesting to note that, as a matter of fact, social consequences did immediately follow His teaching. His followers were thrown among the perils and problems of that age, and the new faith, planted in a few lives, gave an early harvest of social change. Jesus organized no charity, yet among his followers bloomed a charity more luxuriant than the world had ever seen. He was not a labor agitator, yet His teaching undermined the Roman system of society, gave new hope to the slave, and a new self-respect to woman. He was no Socialist and yet He has put the marvelous spell of His matchless personality upon the world’s life as none other has and all beneficient social changes leap forth in the wake of His march across the centuries. Just as in an orchestra, with all its varied ways of musical expression, there is one person who performs on no instrument but in whom all the harmony and rhythm resides. So with the spiritual leadership of Jesus Christ. Into the discordant efforts of men he comes as one having authority. All social activities must hush in His presence and then at His signal and in surrender to Him and His spirit of love and righteousness, all find their places in the splendid symphony which is more and more sounding in the world, and is bringing in the happiness of mankind.
A REPLY.

By REV. J. H. HOLLINGSWORTH.

The attempted reply to certain objections to Socialism made by Dr. Tinsley in his recently published essay in The Tribune is not given in a mere controversial spirit. We are friends. What I desire to do in this reply is rather to help throw some light on the vexing and tremendous social and industrial problems confronting us at this hour. Hence, I shall seek to be constructive rather than destructive, to indicate in as simple a manner as possible what Socialism teaches relative to those points against which the objections were lodged by the essayist.

Of the first half of the doctor's essay nothing need here be said, only so far as to give expression to our appreciation of his very kind and magnanimous statements regarding a much-misunderstood philosophy and movement. He placed the aim and spirit of Socialism as high as any reasonable Socialist could ask. But this is just like him. He seeks to be fair.

1. Dr. Tinsley asserts that "the materialistic conception of history" upon which the economic teachings of Marx, Engels and Socialists generally are based, is "false." Now, what is meant by the phrase "materialistic conception of history" as employed by Socialists? Does it mean, as Dr. Tinsley seems to imply, that they deny the existence of spirit in man and hold that matter and its motions make up the sum total of existence? Does it mean that those having this conception are "materialists," men chained to the gross things of life, with neither God in their thoughts nor humanity in their feelings; men to whose constitution any ideal or higher motive is an absolutely foreign element? It does not. Walter Thomas Mills, a prominent Socialist writer, in his "Struggle for Existence," plainly declares that the materialistic conception of history by no means implies that its advocates are materialists in the common acceptance of that term. He says: "It will be seen that this insistence upon economic causes, as of fundamental importance to economic discus-
struggle. This is the basic, the fundamental fact of all history. This, no well informed person can successfully deny. The struggle is still going on, raging furiously all around us. It is the most prominent feature of human life. Does not the struggle for food, shelter, gain, etc., consume the most of the time and energies of men even today? Isn't it the most outstanding fact of modern life? Are we not money-mad? Why? Because the possession of it gives us power, influence, the necessaries and pleasures of life—assures us an existence. This is why this is called a commercialized age. Dollars dominate us. Money is our measure of all things. Everything is born down before it. We barter truth, love, friendship, principle, even our garments of righteousness for gold. We ruthlessly trample the fairest qualities of life under foot, mock high ideals, laugh at lofty sentiments, ignore the purest motives, regard the Golden Rule as obsolete and impracticable in the realm of business, banish the Ten Commandments from our politics, in our insane desire for material gain. For material, economic, market, property interests we wage wars, adulterate foods, force women and little children to toil in unhealthy places, deny to the toiler the full product of his toil, misappropriate trust funds, graft, prey on one another, resort to questionable methods in business, indulge in political trickery and corruption, permit acknowledged wrongs and evils to exist, accept "tainted" and even bloodstained money to sustain our most sacred institutions, and practice countless other wrongs. Every war that has ever been waged has been, at bottom, an economic war, a war about material interests, and almost, if not all of our wrongs root themselves in these material concerns.

If the Socialist is a "materialist," "there are others."

The Socialist sees the wrong and senselessness of this brute struggle going on among intelligent, thinking beings. Now, since we have reached a stage in our evolution as human beings where we should know better and do better, it is time for us to lay aside jungle methods in our efforts to exist, and organize ourselves industrially so that we may live like men and not like dumb beasts; this is what the Socialist says.

But, since it is a fact that all life has a physical basis, we must deal with it as we find it—reckon with the material facts and forces of life. To ignore this basis, or to treat it as of small importance, is sure to lead us astray in our efforts to better our lot and life. Man is both soul and body, and the solution of the soul's problems can only be successfully worked out as we reckon with the concerns of the body. Disembodied "souls" are not our problem, but souls clothed with flesh and blood which need, and must have, in order to their existence here, food, fuel, clothing, etc.

The Socialist did not create this problem of providing bodily sustenance; he simply finds it as a stubborn fact and seeks to justly solve it. In substance he would say: Let us once and for all, as intelligent beings, settle this whole "bread and butter" problem upon a righteous and scientific basis, and no longer leave this physical foundation of life in jeopardy, subject to the caprice of grasping, greedy speculators, market manipulators, "captains of industry," working class, or to any other class or set of individuals. Let us, by a wise and just economic arrangement, put a solid and enduring physical foundation under all human life and thereby end the brute struggle for mere existence, release men from the continual care, and worry, and uncertainty about what they are to eat, and wear, and from the whole crushing weight of providing the material necessities of life, so that they may "take time to be holy," and attend to the higher demands of life.

This is the deliverance that Socialism seeks to bring about.

If we wish a formal and technical explanation of the materialistic conception of history, perhaps this one given by L. Boudin, in the International Socialist Review, will suffice. He says: "The materialistic conception of history maintains that the evolution of human society as a whole, and that of all human institutions, is not, as the idealists insist, the result of the changes of men's ideas relative to the society they were living in and its institutions, which changes are brought about by the inherent law of development of the ideas; but that, quite to the contrary, the development of society, including men's ideas of human society and institutions, are the result of the material conditions under which men live; that these conditions are the only ones which have an independent existence and development; that the changes of the material conditions cause the institutions of human society to be changed to suit them; and that the
ideas on all subjects relating to man in society, including those of right and wrong between man and man, and even between man and his God, are changed by man in accordance with and because of those changed material conditions of his existence."

Certainly, as an historical fact, this cannot be denied. All human history witnesses to its truth. We may not like it, we may seek to overthrow it, but history positively refuses to permit us to do so.

But let us remind the reader that interpreting history thus by no means necessarily commits one to "materialism;" for he, at least, may be an idealist in practical life, and this is far better than being an idealist in theory, and a sordid materialist in practice, such as our present social order tends to produce in "job-lots."

In his interpretation of history the Socialist looks at the world, not as he might like to see it, but as it really is; he refuses to read into it that which does not really exist, or to import from another world features we might all desire in it, but he reads the facts, coarse and gross as some of them are, and from these proceeds to construct his scheme for the betterment of mankind. If it is wrong to face facts, cold, stubborn and unsightly though they be, and from these construct a philosophy of history, then the Socialist is wrong, but if it is right to face them and reckon with them, then he is right in his materialistic conception of history.

2. The second objection made was that Socialism is "a purely working-class movement" tending "toward narrowness and bitterness, as anything must which takes on the nature of a distinctly class struggle," etc.

The doctor must not forget that "class struggle," that "purely working-class movement" which took place in Egypt many centuries ago, led by one Moses. Moses claimed (and I won't dispute his claim) that he received instructions direct from God to inaugurate that "working-class movement;" to deliver the people of Israel from the crushing industrial bondage imposed upon them by a ruling class. And, by the way, this incident confirms the truth of Marx's famous saying: "The history of all society thus far is the history of class strife."

But Socialism is "a purely working-class movement." Of course, as the doctor himself notes, the ranks of the Socialist army contains thousands of persons of the professional and other classes. It includes not only some of the most brilliant orators, writers, and thinkers, but men who have helped mould the art, the literature, the music, and the science of our age, as, for instance, Iscan, Bjornsen, Hauptman, D'Annunzio, Howels, in literature; William Morris, in art; Richard Wagner, in music; Alfred Russel Wallace, the friend of Darwin and co-discoverer of the theory of evolution, in science. Professors, ministers, merchants, and even capitalists are numbered among Socialists. The leading seats of learning, the world over, are centers of Socialistic propaganda.

This, however, is mentioned only in order to make more clear, if possible, why Socialism is a purely class movement. There has always been a struggle for existence. The struggle has gone on with increasing definiteness until today the civilized world is almost completely divided into two hostile camps, known as the bourgeoise and the proletariat, or the owning, capitalistic class, and the non-owning laboring class. As described by Noyes, the first class has built itself up on the growth of modern industry by gradually gaining possession of the means of production, distribution, and exchange, thrusting back every class handed down from the middle ages. The capitalists are the legal owners of the most of the vast sources of the wealth of modern society. They are the economic masters of the world by virtue of their private ownership of that part of wealth employed to produce more wealth.

The proletariats are those which have been gradually dispossessed of the means of production, until their labor power of brain and hand, is all they have left. This they must sell to the owners of capital in order to produce wealth both for themselves and the owners. The fact that there is still a large class, especially in America, who are both owners and users of capital, does not destroy this distinction of modern society into two classes, for these small producers, traders and farmers, are actually economically dependent on the large ones, and, moreover, are rapidly sinking into the class of actual wage or salary workers.

Now from this it is evident that Socialism did not create either these classes, or the class stripe. It simply recognizes and takes them into account as factors in the problem. It does not shut its eyes and try to persuade itself
that they do not exist; it courageously faces them, as historical facts. It does not desire the existence of either the classes or the attendant strife. It seeks to bring all men into conscious brotherhood; to have the race recognize its essential oneness and solidarity, and end this senseless and brutish strife.

To put an end then to this strife and its necessary evils, is the problem. How may we do it? Moralize to these warring classes; tell them of the beauty of brotherhood and the duty of love? Do so, by all means. But know this, that just so long as we consent that these classes remain, as classes, that long will strife continue. We may cry, Peace, Peace; we may rack our brain to devise various expedients to keep them reconciled sufficiently to carry on the world's business; we may balance the economic interests of the one class against the economic interests of the other class so as to maintain a sort of equilibrium, but we will never, in this way, find real peace so long as the classes remain.

And any plan, any scheme, any proposed remedy for this strife that does not comprehend and provide for the complete abolition of these two classes is doomed to meet with overwhelming defeat.

But if we agree to the abolition of the classes, still the problem remains as to how this is to be accomplished. How can it be done? By an appeal to the class in power to be good and divide up, to surrender "vested interests" and come down and meet the dispossessed half way? But history does not know a single instance of a social class divesting itself of power out of altruistic regard for another class; not once! Whatever is true of individuals, whole classes never give themselves away. Thus far history seems to prove that might is right; interest rules the world; only strength conquers.

Unlovely as all this appears, in contrast with the beautiful dream of mere reformers of uniting the classes by bathing them in an atmosphere of universal love, they are the stubborn facts that confront us and we must reckon with them if we would solve our problem.

How then shall we unite these two classes into one? Well, what is it that has created and maintains them? It is their opposing economic interests. It is this above all other things. So long as one class owns and controls the resources of life and uses them for its own profit and pleasures, and the other class is dispossessed of those and dependent on the possessors for subsistence, so long will the classes and the strife continue. So long as men are divided in their economic life, so long will they be divided into warring classes. Common economics will alone permit the realization of a common, a united people; brotherhood in the industrial life must precede brotherhood in the social life. So long as the cause for classes and class strife remains, so long will the evil continue. In the hour that the economic interests of these two classes are made identical, in that hour they will ground their arms and clasp hands.

But this is not all of our problem. Human society with its institutions, the whole vast social order as it exists today, is built up in conformity to this class idea; that is, built upon the idea that there must necessarily be an owning class and a non-owning class, masters and servants, rulers and ruled, producers and non-producers. So, without going back in history, we have right before us in our own society and its institutions a striking verification of the Socialists doctrine of "economic determinism." Our economics, our mode of production and distribution, has given us our present form of society. Now you see our problem is quite complex. If we end class strife, we must remove the cause therefor, which is economic inequality or opposing economic interests; but if we make the economic interests of the two classes identical, we abolish the classes by merging them into a united whole, and if we do this our present social order with its institutions built on the old economic system won't fit us any longer, so that we will be forced to take on another social form. All this the Socialist is seeking to bring about. Yes, it's a big job, but it will be worth something when it is finally done. It will make it possible then for the first time on earth for all men to actually put into practice in their every-day life the beautiful "Sermon on the Mount."

As between these two classes described, which has most to gain by a new economic system? The working class, of course. Then this class is the natural and most likely agent for carrying forward the work of social and industrial reconstruction. But I should caution the reader against the conclusion that this class seeks to accomplish this for itself alone, no; the reconstruc-
tion is intended to embrace all men.

Do you say this is a selfish movement? It is and it is not. It is self-interest that first awakened the movement and that maintains it, but it is a selfishness out of which is to ultimately spring the greatest good to all. It is a selfishness that finally, if permitted to pursue its natural course, will culminate in a new social order based on unselfishness. It is such selfishness only as has thus far in history urged man forward. Throughout all the past we see man influenced, first of all, by his economic needs. It is as though God, through our heads, the higher faculties and powers, are being developed by our very efforts to satisfy our economic needs. Through this same economic urge we are today being forced forward into a cooperative commonwealth—Socialism. For since, by our present economic system, the capitalist class is more and more coming into possession of those means necessary to the existence of all human life, and, as an inevitable consequence, the strife between the two warring classes intensifies (the very thing that is taking place over the whole civilized world) as the exploitation goes forward, it will follow, and inevitably follow, that the vast and powerful producing class, forced by its economic needs, its desire and its God-given right to existence, will be compelled to either take by brute force from this capitalist class, or to seek to organize all classes into a cooperative commonwealth, based upon economic equality, thereby guaranteeing to all the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness. These are the two alternatives. The Socialist urges that we, by all means, accept the latter.

This, in some measure, explains why Socialism is "a purely working class movement."

The third, fourth and fifth objection contained in Dr. Tinsley’s essay, I regret to say, must be passed over in this paper, for I see that already much of the space allowed me is consumed in the ground already traversed, and I am anxious to employ that which remains in treating more vital points than those included under the three numbers indicated, for those three objections do not seem to me to have any special bearing on the Socialist philosophy.

6. Coming then to the next in order, the doctor says: “There are insuperable objections to Socialism as a scheme of production.” What is its scheme of production? Is it not to produce socially? Certainly. Well, that is just the very thing we are doing today! So you see, doctor, that if “there are insuperable objections to Socialism’s scheme of production,” those objections hold equally against the present capitalistic mode of production, for it is social production. Socialists are not seeking for social production, for something we already have. They know that the day of individual production has long since passed away. The time when all manufacturing was carried on in a simple way with hand tools by the individual who owned his own tools and hence the product of them, is forever gone. The introduction of steam-driven machinery changed the method of production from individual to social. Now, under the organizing power of capitalists, the millions of laborers are banded together in great factories and all other industrial enterprises. They do not own these vast manufacturing industries, but they use them. Once the laborer owned his own tools, but these have, by the introduction of machinery, passed out of his hands, so that today he is toolless, and, since he must have tools in order to gain a subsistence for himself and those dependent on him, he is forced to sell his labor power to those who own the tools—the capitalists. So, it has come to pass, that those who hold the keys to these tools, this vast system of productive machinery, really hold the powers of life and death over the toolless laborers, for their ability to live depends upon their ability to gain access to these tools of production. This is why Socialists say that all semblance of equality of opportunity has disappeared. And this is why they also have much to say about “wage slavery,” for it certainly is true, as Bellamy remarks, that “if you own the things men must have, you own the men who must have them.”

All production, then, broadly speaking, is now social production. Not even a nail, needle, match, or any other of the thousand and one articles we use, are now individually produced. Thousands of hands are now employed in the production of a table, chair or desk. In short, we have today socialized production.

Well, you say, if we already have it, then what are you Socialists “kicking” about? I'll tell you—and I wish you would write it down—we want also
social distribution. As we have seen, we have social production, but we still have individual distribution of the products. Now, this, as you must see, has begotten a violent contradiction in our industrial system, and as Jesus said, "a house divided against itself cannot stand."

Socialism stands for the collective ownership of these tools of production and distribution. It does not think it wise or just to have such vast power vested in any one class or any set of individuals. It is bound to work harm. The Socialist will agree with Dr. Tinesley that "we must not forget that the world's history is a fearful warning against unchecked and unfettered power." This is just the reason he wants to take this vast power out of the hands of the few and put it into the hands of all the people. For in order to retain this power, that the ownership of the means of production necessarily gives to the capitalist class, it will go to any length in corrupting law and lawmakers, and courts, and political parties. That class, as one of them declared, "has no politics." It knows no "flag," only perchance as it may use it under the guise of "patriotism," to carry out its greedy designs. It will corrupt, if it can, the most sacred institutions of man, and prostitute the most sacred things of life, in order to preserve its grip upon the power inhering in the ownership of the tools of production and distribution.

Don't we see this verified today in the sickening revelations of "graft" and corruption on all sides? The startling disclosures of this character made in the past few months ought to be enough to crimson every face with shame, and it would, perhaps, if we had not all become so gross and sodden by virtue of our residence in such a corrupt environment.

Socialists wish to remove this frightful danger of "unchecked and unfettered" power by removing the cause, namely, the private ownership of a public necessity. He believes with all his mind and heart that what the people collectively need, the people should collectively own and operate, and thereby collectively share in the products.

The seventh objection offered against Socialism by the essayist is that under Socialism adequate motives for economic activity could not be awakened.

Why, we ask, would such be the case? If men owned collectively these means of production and distribution now privately owned by the few, would they not be as deeply interested and as active in business affairs as they now are when they do not thus own them? If all men were equal partners in industrial affairs, would not that fact awaken within them an adequate motive for economic activity? Would they not work for themselves as diligently as for another? It seems reasonable to presume that the very thing needed in order to awaken men's economic activity to a fine pitch would be to make them equal owners of the tools of production, thereby assuring them the full product of their toil. I think this would awaken "adequate motives for economic activity" in the average man. It certainly would do so among "laboring people," who now, under the present arrangement, must not only produce enough wealth to pay their own wages, but in addition, a good fat lump of "surplus value" for the benefit of the owner of the tools which they use. Surely in the field of economic interest any reasonable man would work harder for all he produces than for only a part.

Men, "as we know them," says the doctor, "are spurred on by competition." No, not by "competition," doctor, but by their economic interests. They compete, but not for the sake of merely competing, but for the sake of their economic interests.

The doctor's contention throughout the whole of the first part of the seventh division is that our present competitive order of society is more desirable than a cooperative or non-competitive order. Though acknowledging the inherent brutality of such a system —"the vast wheels of competitive industry revolve amid the groans of millions who are being ground down under its ponderous might"—yet he upholds it. He believes that its advantages outweigh its brutality; he would, were it in his power, cleanse it of this. Many today are defending the competitive system. They sincerely believe in it. So, let us now consider for a few moments the question of competition as applied to our economic life.

Many believe in competition because it is a system, as they see, that completely dominates the lower world, the animal and vegetable world. They reason that since it is a principle inherent in nature it is therefore good.

There are two great laws operating
in the world. Lester F. Ward, who is accounted the greatest living sociologist, defines these as the Law of Mind, and the Law of Nature. Of course the law of mind is also a natural law, but it is certainly unlike the other, and as it came forth, as Ward points out, “at a late stage in the history of the cosmic evolution, it seems to have inaugurated a wholly new order of things.” From the outset “mind took upon itself to counteract the law of nature and to oppose to the competitive system, that holds complete sway in the lower world and still so largely prevails in human society, a wholly different system based on rational co-operation.”

In the measure that the crude world of nature has come under the sway of mind, intellect, especially as expressed in man, in that degree it has lost its competitive feature, its system has been modified. This is made clear by the fact that whenever, as Ward shows, “competition is wholly removed, as through the agency of man, in the interest of any one form, that form immediately begins to make great strides and soon outstrips all those that depend on competition. Such has been the case with all cereals and fruit trees; it is the case with domestic cattle and sheep, with horses, dogs and all forms of life that man has accepted from the biologic law and subjected to the law of mind.”

From the very outset the mission of mind has been to grapple with the law of competition prevailing throughout the lower order of nature, and as far as possible, overcome and destroy it. All of our fine race and draft horses; the various grades of cattle, sheep, hogs; the numerous varieties of fruits, flowers and vegetables, are so many tangible evidences of the mind’s success in this direction. They show what human reason, when applied to the crude facts and forces of nature, may accomplish to physically advance the world, and thus indirectly, at least, elevate it mentally and morally.

Another important fact is brought out by Ward in this connection. He writes: “It is now known that the plants of every region possess the potency of a far higher life than they enjoy, and that they are prevented from attaining that higher state by the adverse influences that surround them in their normal habitat.” By selecting these out, removing them from the competitive realm, man has given them opportunity to progress, and they have done so by inherent powers with which all plants are endowed. A very interesting illustration of this is given by Ward: “Once, when herbarizing in a rather wild, neglected spot, I collected a little depauperate grass that for a time greatly puzzled me, but which upon analysis proved to be none other than genuine wheat. It had been accidentally sown in this abandoned rock, where it had been obliged to struggle for existence along with the remaining vegetation. There it had grown up, and sought to rise into that majesty and beauty that is seen in the field of waving grain. But at every step it had felt the resistance of an environment no longer regulated by intelligence. It missed the fostering care of man, who destroys competition, removes enemies and creates conditions favorable to the highest development. This is called cultivation, and the difference between my little starving grass and the wheat of the well-tilled field is a difference of cultivation only, and not at all of capacity.” This, with thousands of similar illustrations which might be given, squarely contradicts the prevailing idea that it is the “fittest” possible that survive in this competitive struggle. “The effect of competition is to prevent any form from attaining its maximum development, and to maintain a comparatively low level for all forms that succeed in surviving.”

Referring to man, our author continues: “This iron law of nature, as it may be called, was everywhere found to lie athwart the path of human progress, and the whole upward struggle of rational man, whether physically, socially, or morally, has been with this tyrant of nature, the law of competition. And in so far as he has progressed at all he has done so by gaining little by little the mastery in this struggle. In the physical world he has accomplished this through invention, from which has resulted the arts. Every utensil of labor, every mechanical device, every object of design and every artificial form that serves human purpose is a triumph of mind over the physical forces of nature in ceaseless and aimless competition. In the social world it is human institutions—religion, government, law, marriage, customs—that have been thought out and adopted to restrain unbridled individualism that has always menaced society.”

Man, the intelligent being, has from the first sought to counteract this “iron law” of competition reigning throughout the animal and vegetable
kingdoms. In the physical realm he has accomplished great results in this direction, as we have just seen. He has done much also for himself as an individual to preserve himself from the ravages of "unchecked and unbridled" competition by constructing his institutions of marriage, government, religion, etc. But all this has come far short of eradicating this deep-rooted principle that lies at the foundation of "animal economics."

Strange to say, we are not sufficiently awake to the importance of doing for society at large what we have all along been seeking to do in those other spheres just mentioned. Society still remains a prey to this iron law of nature—the competitive regime that prevails in the lower kingdoms. We still consent to and even defend, in our social and industrial life, the methods prevailing among the lower creatures. It is passing strange that intelligent beings who have done so much to eradicate competition in the lower sphere—hogs, horses, wheat, fruits, etc.—still consent to a competitive industrial system, to a society based on the competitive principle. It is passing strange that intelligent beings who have done so much to eradicate competition in the lower sphere—hogs, horses, wheat, fruits, etc.—still consent to a competitive industrial system, to a society based on the competitive principle. It is for this reason that we practice the "jungle" methods in our business life. It is for this reason that the world today is one vast arena of cruel, heartless, beastly strife, in which the weaker are trampled down by, not the "fittest," but by the stronger in their mad endeavor to further their economic interests.

And, it is here more than elsewhere, that we may find the reason for the growing spirit of "graft," of which we are so loudly complaining today; of the coarse, gross materialism permeating society that counts "things" of more value than life; of the fierce gambling mania, which has seized upon all classes from high to low; of the almost universal practice of producing adulterated foods, shoddy clothing and sham articles; of the alarmingly increasing municipal, state and national corruption; of the enormous concentration of wealth in the hands of the few, with its consequent growing poverty of the masses; of the cold, calculating heartlessness in our industrial life, which is today freezing the "milk of human kindness" in our breasts. Take as an example of this last, the report by press dispatch only this week of the scheme now being promoted in financial circles in New York, London and Paris, "for a revolution in Venezuela which will annihilate Castro and open up that country to American capital and enterprise," involving "the employment of 15,000 soldiers and the expenditure of $5,000,000." "Shares in the scheme," it is understood, "are being sold." Isn't this about the limit for cold-bloodedness?

But we are not without hope. Since mind (man) has already done much toward eliminating competition it will finally banish it from human society. Competition can't always endure. The growing intelligence of man will yet repudiate and completely annihilate it. Indeed, like all other bad things, it is inherently self-destructive. For, just as competition among individuals finally results in the formation of corporations, so competition among corporations results in the organization of "trusts," and "trusts" whose eliminate competition in the particular field of industry controlled by them; this is the claim made for them by their promoters and it is well founded.

The keen, alert "captains of industry," who operate most fully under the law of mind—organize their interests upon the principle of the co-operation rather than competition, as the "trust" people do—must inevitably drive to the wall those who continue to operate under the crude law of nature—competition. And herein lies a large measure of the hope of the Socialist, that the "trusts" will be object lessons in cooperation to the people. True, the trusts are now operated for the benefit of only the few interested in them, but it is hoped that after awhile it will dawn upon the dull minds of the masses that since co-operation is good for these few quick-witted men, it will be equally good for all, and we will all go into one big trust—Socialism.

So, we see that the competitive system, involving as it does private property, tends to destroy private property for all but the few. And this fact also exposes the falsity of the old-school economists, who teach that competition tends to destroy monopoly.

Thus, we see ourselves, shut up to, not some mere scheme of social reform as the doctor talks about, but to Socialism. It is an inevitable product of historic evolution. We can't dam it back if we would.

With all the doctor's expressions throughout his essay relative to the importance of brotherhood, and the production of character, every Socialist will heartily agree. The realization on earth
of a great brotherhood was what Jesus longed for. Brotherhood! this, as Edwin Markham would say, "is the holiest of words, the word that carries in its heart the essence of all gospels and the fulfillment of all revelations." But economic inequality and brotherhood can't exist together in the same world. So long as we consent to a social and industrial order depending for its existence on two economically unequal classes, brotherhood will remain a beautiful dream to haunt us. We may continue to preach it, and sing of its glories; we may have, as we now do, a sort of Sunday brotherhood, but until we can be brothers in our economic life, until our brotherhood extends out through the marts of trade and fields of toil over the other six days of the weeks, our Sunday brotherhood is a shame and a sham.

Of the importance of producing character too much cannot be said. But we should give it a fair chance. Men compelled to get their living by the same system in vogue among the lower creatures should not be expected to rise very high. Environment isn't everything, but it is much. "The alum babies grow like the dump-piles they look upon; the angels grow white looking on the Throne."
I count the Rev. Dr. James H. Hollingsworth one of my most esteemed friends. Many long and close interviews with him have demonstrated to me his kindliness, as well as his rare mental acumen. I am not fond of dispute, but to discuss such a live subject as Socialism with such a fair antagonist as Dr. Hollingsworth is in the interest of truth. Any debate which descends to the low level of personal wrangling can never serve the truth, but can only breed bad blood and work harm. I have no mere desire to "come out ahead" in this discussion—that would be purile and pusillanimous and unworthy of a high sincerity. But I do have a desire to combat error and to make the truth stand out in a clear light. I believe the philosophy of Socialism to be full of subtle falsehood, though I do not impugn the motives of those who hold it. Many sincere men believe it to be the greatest and most vital truth of our age. I think they are deceived. For this reason I wrote my paper for the Literary club on the "Fundamental Fallacies of Socialism." Very naturally it stirred the Socialists. I am glad it did. I am especially pleased that one so strong, thoughtful and fair as Mr. Hollingsworth has attempted to answer its arguments. I do not think he has succeeded. I want now to point out his failure and the weakness of his line of thought.

1. Mr. Hollingsworth says that "Socialism's economic interpretation of history is not identical with what is commonly understood as materialism." He also says: "Dr. Tinsley failed here to make clear distinctions." Now let us see if this is true. The doctor seems to think that because I said that "materialism is an antiquated philosophy" that I had hopelessly confused things, and that there is really no relation between "materialism" and the "materialistic conception of history." But my claim is that there is a very close and vital relation between them. Any careful study of the history of the development of modern Socialism from the writings of Karl Marx can easily trace its vagaries and fallacies back to his "materialism" in the commonly understood meaning of that word. I do not say that Socialism, in all things, has faithfully followed its master. But I do say that the externalism of modern Socialism is directly due to its inheritance from Marx. Let us trace this briefly. Dr. Hollingsworth quoted from Seligman's "Economic Interpretation of History." He did well, for he is one of the world's greatest economists. I will do the same. He shows in his chapter on the "philosophical antecedents" of Socialism that Marx was under the influence of Feuerbach's philosophy, which taught "that there is in reality nothing but nature and man, that our religious conceptions are a product of ourselves, who again are nothing but a product of nature." His famous doctrine was "man is what he eats," Seligman says "Marx was deeply influenced by Feuerbach." He was "led to the theory that all social institutions are the result of growth and that the causes of this growth are to be sought NOT IN ANY IDEA, but in the conditions of material existence." Again, "his PHILOSOPHY resulted in his economic interpretation of history." Kirkup, in his "History of Socialism," p. 142, says: "It is BASED on a materialistic conception of the world, and of human history." Rae, in his "Contemporary Socialism," p. 132, says: "Feuerbach admitted that heaven and God were nothing but subjective illusions, fantastic projections of man's own being into external spheres." "The senses are the sole sources of knowledge, the body of man is his totality and essence. Man is what he eats." That is what I would call "materialism," which teaches that matter is all. Now, this is the man who more than any other influenced Marx. MARX HIMSELF WAS A "MATERIAL-
IST,” as the word is commonly understood. He said “all religions are the opium of mankind.” He never discussed the ETHICS of the social question. Not one line in all his writings even hints of it as a factor in the solution of the social problem. He ignored it utterly. Why? Because all was matter in his philosophy. To him the UNIVERSE was simply “a self unfolding process of MATERIAL forces.” His reasoning is all upon that foundation. Now, what I claim is, that Marx has cast the spell of this deadening philosophy over those who follow his thinking. “Materialism” is woven into the whole fabric like colors into a carpet. This is the reason that modern Socialism, in its fundamental thinking, is false. IT FAILS TO THINK IN ANY TERMS BUT THOSE OF MATTER. A modern Socialist may not be a materialist, but if so, it is only because he utterly fails to carry out the logic of his master (Marx.) In other words he lacks the consistency of his master. We know, as a matter of fact, that Marx’s “Economic Interpretation of History” was the result of his materialistic philosophy. Let anyone deny it who can. Thus my use of the word “materialism” was justified.

2. The doctor argues at length for the truth of the “economic interpretation of history” which I termed “false” in my paper. My exact language was “to make everything DEPEND upon these forces is to shut one’s eyes to other forces.” I want to reaffirm the statement. Marx and modern Socialism alike make everything, in the last analysis, DEPEND upon material forces. They say that the final DETERMINING influences in all history and life are economic, or material. That is one of the great foundation stones upon which they build. Now I still maintain that it is “false.” I can save space by quoting again from Seligman’s “Economic Interpretation of History” in the chapter on “The Truth, or Falsity of the Theory.” He says: “Without the environment there can be no change, but without the ORGANISM there can also be no change.” Again, “All human progress is at bottom MENTAL progress, but what determines the thought of humanity? Advocates of historical materialism have laid themselves open to attack by seeming to claim that ALL sociology must be based exclusively on economics, and that all social life is but a reflex of the economic life. NO SUCH CLAIM CAN BE COUNTERNANCED.” Again, “We have not only economic wants, but also moral, religious, jural, political and many other kinds of collective wants. Economics deals with only one kind of social utilities or values. The strands of human life are manifold and complex.” Again, “There is not only an economic interpretation of history, but an ethical, esthetic, a political, a jural, a linguistic, a religious and a scientific interpretation.” Again, “As a philosophical doctrine of universal validity, the theory of historical materialism CAN NO LONGER BE SUCCESSFULLY DEFENDED.” Again, “In the sense that the economic factor has been of the utmost importance in history, the theory is of considerable significance.” But all this is far from the theory of the Socialist, called “economic determinism,” that is, that all history in the last analysis DEPENDS upon and is DETERMINED by economic forces. Such a philosophy is far-reaching and disastrous. Yet this is the claim of Marx and of the Socialists. It is false. IT UTTERLY NEGLECTS THE ETHICAL AND SPIRITUAL FORCES IN HISTORY. Even if one were to grant the theory of the social origin of morality, that conscience is not innate, but is the product of social forces. Yet when conscience once actually arrives it becomes the most powerful and independent force in determining human conduct and life. WHEN A MAN FEELS MOST BOUND BY CONSCIENCE HE FEELS MOST INDEPENDENT OF SOCIETY and is bound to do “duty,” even though society forbids. Conscience defies the judgment of society and may even send a man to the stake. It has played such a large part in history (and increasingly so as society has evolved) that it may be considered the most determining factor in history, and may confidently be looked to as having even a yet larger influence in the days to come. But the Socialist wholly ignores the ethical and spiritual factors in human life. These forces are moved from ABOVE as well as FROM WITHIN. GOD is in them. Religion can be demonstrated to be the MAIN FACTOR by which the higher human ideas and emotions have been evoked, and these have been the CHIEF IMPULSES OF HUMAN PROGRESS. There would have been no upward and forward movement in history without the religious aspirations and impulses,
and if one is seeking for the true "determinism" of history he must find it not in economics, but in religion. Benjamin Kidd was right when he declared that "evolution which is slowly proceeding in human society is primarily RELIGIOUS in character." Thus I totally deny the Marxian philosophy of history. BUT EVEN IF IT COULD BE SHOWN THAT HE AND HIS FOLLOWERS ARE RIGHT IN THEIR INTERPRETATION OF HISTORY, IT DOES NOT NECESSARILY FOLLOW THAT SOCIALISM IS A TRUE PHILOSOPHY. Seligman says: "There is nothing in common between the economic interpretation of history and Socialism except the accidental fact that the originator of both theories happened to be the same man." Again, "The two things have nothing to do with each other. We might agree that economic factors primarily influence progress, that social forces at bottom make history, and the existence of class struggles, BUT NO! OF THESE ADMISSIONS WOULD NECESSARILY LEAD TO ANY SEMBLANCE OF SOCIALISM."

3. Then the doctor proceeds to defend Socialism as a "purely working class movement." He quotes Marx as saying that "the history of all society thus far is the history of class strife." He says "the world is almost completely divided into two hostile camps, known as the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, or the owning capitalistic class and the non-owning laboring class." He says: "Socialism did not create these classes." What do we mean by "classes"? Those who are similarly interested and are grouped together for a common end may be called a "class." Dr. Hollingsworth says that what has created two distinct "classes" in the industrial world is "their opposing economic interests." He further says: "In the hour that the economic interests of these two classes are MADE IDENTICAL, in that hour they will ground their arms and clasp hands." Yes, BUT THEIR INTERESTS ARE NOW IDENTICAL. Just as the interests of brain and hand are identical in the human body, so capital cannot exist without labor and labor cannot move without capital. They are the two parts of a whole. "United they stand, divided they fall." Why talk of two "classes?" Such talk only tends to a chronic warfare. People who are at war never see both sides and seldom care to do so. For them there is but one side. Socialism is fostering this class hatred and class struggle by its very teaching and propaganda. He teachings of Marx was that the "classes" must exist under the present order. This is false. There need not be "two classes." When both capitalists and laborers think and talk more of duty and less of rights this class hatred will begin to die out. The true solution is one of ethics rather than one of economics. The doctor writes as if under the present order the practice of the "Sermon on the Mount," is "impossible." How strange that anyone should claim that under any set of circumstances it could be impossible to do right. Such is always possible. NOT ONLY THAT, IT IS ALWAYS IMPERATIVE. If, instead of crying, "workers of all countries unite," the Socialists would seek to bring about a better understanding of capital and capitalists, and the capitalist, on the other hand, would seek to carry out the golden rule in his relations with labor, then our present "class fight" would cease and industrial peace and prosperity would ensue for all. This whole "class" idea, with all its evils, is the legitimate fruit of the Marxian materialistic philosophy, which utterly repudiates any ethical solution of the problem.

4. The doctor omits the discussion of my third, fourth and fifth objections to Socialism. But Socialists usually object to discussing the questions they raise. They are the very objections which reveal the chief weakness of Socialism, namely, that it is too optimistic as to the future, and too pessimistic as to the present. That it would arouse great dissatisfaction in its practical workings and that it would be a menace to liberty. 5. He then deals with my objection that "Socialism is faulty as a scheme of production," and claims that social production is already here. He says: "We want also social DISTRIBUTION." Why SOCIAL distribution? The only thing needed is a JUST distribution. If equity and justice maintain and labor receives its rightful proportion of that which it produces, certainly this is all that it can ask for. Now JUSTICE IS ALWAYS AND FOREVER A MATTER OF ETHICS. But the Marxian philosophy will have nothing to do with ethics, so it holds there must be some outward, mechanical adjustment by which labor shall receive its part of that which it
creates. But it claims that labor creates the ENTIRE value of a product—therefore labor must have it all; that is, capitalism and capitalists must be abolished, and capital must be owned and operated by the collectivity. In other words, it is the bold claim that JUSTICE can never be done in the matter of DISTRIBUTION until common ownership of all means of production maintains. This is not true to the facts. It has been done. Co-operative manufacturing has been accomplished with satisfaction to labor and could be done universally, but not while the Marxian philosophy is accepted by the worker. The claim of Marx that labor creates the entire value of the product is false. Other elements enter into "value," that I have not the space to discuss, but if his philosophy is false here, then his theory of DISTRIBUTION breaks down, for it is based entirely upon his theory of value.

6. The doctor then takes up my objection to Socialism that "it would not furnish adequate motives for economic activity." But I need only refer the reader to my seventh objection, which meets the case. He disputes my contention that "men are spurred on by competition," and adds, "No, not by competition, but by economic interests." But I still claim that COMPETITION spurs men on. "It has many drawbacks, but it produces MEN and it is men we want to make, not great associations of food consumers." Competition, of course, tends toward combination, and this toward monopoly, and this in turn toward the socialization of monopoly, and this, no doubt, would solve many of our problems, but it does not imply that this, no doubt, would solve many of our problems, but it does not imply that competition is, in itself, evil, or that under any possible system it would wholly pass away. When properly restricted it is a beneficient force. Socialism, at least, can offer no adequate substitute for it.

But I need not further reply to the doctor's answer to my paper. The positions, took in it have not been discredited by his discussion. The more I think of Socialism the more I delight in its spirit of altruism, but the less I am inclined to accept its proposed remedy for the evils of industrial society. "THESE EVILS ARE CHIEFLY ETHICAL AND MUST BE REMEDIED BY THE IMPROVEMENT OF OUR ETHICAL LIFE." The strength of Socialism is found in the inequalities and injustices that obtain. IT IS WEAKENED BY EVERY ACT OF JUSTICE AND BECOMES EXTINCT JUST IN PROPORTION AS RIGHTS ARE RESPECTED. THE WRONGS COMPLAINED OF DO NOT INHERE NECESSARILY IN ANY SO-CALLED SOCIAL OR INDUSTRIAL ORDER, BUT IN MEN. THEREFORE THE TRUE REMEDY MUST BE FOUND, NOT IN REVOLUTION, OR IN THE RADICAL RECONSTRUCTION OF GOVERNMENT, BUT IN CREATING IN MEN MORE OF JUSTICE AND TRUE BROTHERLINESS, AND THIS IS A MATTER OF EDUCATION IN HARMONY WITH THE SPIRIT OF JESUS CHRIST.