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SOCIALISM.

THE MALLOCK-WILSHIRE ARGUMENT.

WHEN I heard that Mr. W. H. Mallock, the well-known English writer, had been engaged by the National Civic Federation to deliver a series of public lectures against Socialism in the various large cities of this country, I at once scented a fine opportunity for Socialist propaganda, and began devising ways and means to take the best advantage of it. Mr. Mallock is a graduate of Oxford University and a noted opponent of Socialism. On his arrival in New York, therefore, I lost no time in sending him the following challenge through the columns of the New York "Sun":

OPPORTUNITY FOR MR. W. H. MALLOCK.
To the Editor of "The Sun."

Sir:—I notice in the columns of your paper an announcement that W. H. Mallock, the distinguished English writer and lecturer, is in this country to deliver a series of lectures before our universities.

As I understand that his lectures are to be directed against Socialism, I would suggest that it would be very educational for the general public if we could induce Mr. Mallock to appear before us here in New York City in Carnegie Hall some evening. I think that this would be doubly interesting if he could be induced to meet some Socialist in debate upon that occasion.

I might add that I myself will be so much interested in such a debate and the privilege of joining in it that I will pay Mr. Mallock, in addition to the regular lecture fee that he usually receives, the sum of $500 if he will meet me in such a debate.

GAYLORD WILSHIRE.

New York, February 12.
Mr. Mallock replied as follows:

Hotel Savoy, New York City,
February 15, 1907.

Dear Mr. Wilshire:

The substance of my observations on Socialism will most probably be published in revised form, in one of the New York monthly reviews, and if, during the course of their publication, you would either send to me, through the editor, any private criticisms of your own, which you regard as representative of the Socialist position generally, or having published such criticisms, you would let me have copies of them, I should be glad to discuss them fairly when the various articles are re-issued in a volume; but the fewness of the days which are left me in New York would render my presence impossible at any such meeting as you suggest, even if I thought—and myself I do not think—that oral discussion before a large audience facilitates the elucidation of complicated scientific problems.

Faithfully yours,

W. H. MALLOCK.

In the meantime, the New York "Times" made a most unusual offer, viz., to allow me space to answer Mr. Mallock’s argument day by day until his lectures concluded. It may be imagined that I lost no time in accepting the offer, which I believe was the first of its kind ever made to a representative Socialist by a great metropolitan paper. This in itself, indeed, is to me a most significant sign of the extent to which Socialism has invaded public thought. Unless there were a public demand for both sides of the question, the offer of the "Times" would certainly never have been made.

My first reply was written upon the publication of Mr. Mallock’s preliminary address, and after noting the untenable position from which his argument obviously developed, I saw at once that it would be no very difficult matter to answer him.
Mr. Mallock Defines Socialism.

In his opening address Mr. Mallock stated his purpose to be an examination of the theory of Socialism, which he declared to be exceedingly vague and illusive. He admitted that Socialism has for its general object the betterment of the majority of the human race, but this laudable intention ignores the practicability of its realization. It is not in harmony with the character, the faculties and the limitations of human beings, and its investigation must not be a question of feeling but of dry scientific fact. At first Socialism was Utopian even according to Socialists themselves. It had no scientific basis until, as the Socialists claim, Karl Marx, a great German thinker, raised it and placed it firmly upon a scientific foundation.

The essence of Marx' doctrine, he contended, might be given in the words, “All wealth is due to labor: therefore all wealth ought to go to the laborer.” To the objection that capital may have something to do with the creation of wealth, Marx replied that as capital, the machinery of production, is itself but fossilized labor, and is used by labor to create more wealth, labor after all remains the sole agent in production.

Mr. Mallock then proceeded to give a fairly correct outline of the historical process as applied to wealth production; the ever more minute division of labor; the introduction of machinery and its constant improvement; the subsequent concentration of wealth and the struggle between large and small capitalists. Finally he reached the conclusion of Marx that from the play of these social forces the situation would eventually become intolerable and the capitalist integument would burst. Then the workers would possess themselves of the implements of production and expropriate the expropriators.

The principal theory which he desired to combat was the false contention of Marx that all wealth is due to the labor of the average worker, "to that ordinary manual labor exertion which in all cases is so equal in kind that an hour of it on the part of any one man is approximately as efficacious as an hour of it on the part of any other." This doctrine, he declared, has been, and still is, the gist of Socialism as a working appeal to the majority, enabling the Socialist agitator to say to the manual workers, "You and you alone produce all the wealth of the world. Each of you, hour for hour, contribute an equal share to it; and each of you is consequently entitled to an equal share of the dividend." But, while this has until now been the basis of the Socialist appeal, many intellectual Socialists are beginning to shift their ground, and no longer adhere to the doctrine expounded by Karl Marx.

Having thus outlined what he regarded as the principles of Socialism, Mr. Mallock proceeded to disprove the alleged contention of the Socialists that manual labor alone produces all wealth, and to enforce his position quoted Tolstoi as declaring that the test of a laborer is to ascertain if his palms are hardened by manual toil. He blamed the political economists, Adam Smith, Ricardo and others, for promulgating theories that partially sustained the Socialist view, and again scored the "manual labor" theory of Socialists in the following concluding words:

If labor be taken to include industrial effort of all kinds, to say that labor is the source of all wealth is a platitude, and to say that all wealth ought to go to the laborers is like saying that all wealth ought to go to the human race. We have no foundation here for any of the distinctive doctrines of Socialism. Socialism becomes a definite and distinctive doctrine only when the word labor is taken in an exclusive sense, and
stands exclusively for those ordinary manual efforts by which, as Count Tolstoi says, the palms of the hands are hardened; all other forms of effort, and the claims based on them, being ignored. So soon as labor becomes definitely understood in this sense, and is in this sense appropriated by Socialism as a militant school of thought, it is impossible to argue with them, and ask whether their theory be true or false, so long as we persist in using the same name, and considering under the same category, the kind of effort which the Socialists mean by the word, and which they recognize, and those other kinds of effort which they definitely ignore and exclude. The truth of the matter is, as I shall point out when I next address you, that the varieties of human effort involved in the production of modern wealth, are not one, but two; and that these differ not only in degree of productivity, but in kind—in the very nature of their operation; and that economists who attempt to explain the production of wealth to-day, while giving a single name to two different kinds of effort, are like a man who insists on putting his hands into boxing gloves, as a preparation for taking to pieces the delicate works of a chronometer.

**Labor and “Ability.”**

In his second lecture Mr. Mallock combatted the theory that wealth is produced solely by manual labor. He declared that there are two different forms of human effort and that the production of wealth is due to both. The increased production, that marks the present age, however, was in no sense produced by average manual labor, but rather by a very great development of individual mental powers which took for their field of effort the direction of the process of labor, and capitalism was the means by which this direction was effected. To the men of exceptional mental ability, therefore, is due the tremendous increase in production. But Socialism denies that these men should be remunerated, and utterly ignores their contribution to production. Mr. Mallock, on the contrary, asserted that modern wealth is due to their in-
creased mental development applied to the directing of labor. The master mind behind the machine is the dominant factor in the wealth production of modern times, and it is inconceivable that a time will ever come when this ability shall be subject to the average manual labor which it directs. Socialism merely means "the emancipation of the average mind from the guidance of any mind that is in any way superior to itself, or is able to enhance the productivity of an average pair of hands."

The Post Office Fallacy.

When Socialists, continued Mr. Mallock, are asked for a sample of the system they would like to see introduced they invariably refer the inquirer to some state institution like the Post Office. This, he said, was sheer folly, for it was apparent that the Post Office employee was no more economically emancipated than the employee of the private capitalist. The wage system, moreover, could never be abolished except by a return to the corvee (forced labor exacted by a feudal lord), or slavery, and as a matter of fact if the ideas of Socialism were possible of realization it would simply mean an escape into economic slavery. Capitalism, he concluded, "is essentially a device for imposing, by means of wages given or withheld in accordance to the industrial obedience of the wage earner, the intellect and the knowledge resident in an exceptionally gifted minority, on the manual operations of the average majority of mankind, and when Socialists talk about emancipation and economic freedom, the only meaning which their language can really bear is the emancipation of the average man from aid and guidance of any intellect that is in any way superior to his own."
Socialists Shifting Ground.

In his third address the lecturer reiterated his assertion that the increased production of wealth is due mainly to the men of exceptional ability and directive power, and declared that the views of Marx were being abandoned by the most thoughtful Socialists. He claimed that Mr. Sydney Webb and others of the more intellectual Socialists were now shifting ground on this matter, and admitting that, while ability must be recognized in wealth production, nevertheless these able few, though they produce more than the many, should be shut out from any unequal claim on the product. He declared, moreover, that inventions were not in any sense due to the social environment, but rather to the inherent talent of the individual inventor.

The remainder of the address was given to refuting the views of Herbert Spencer, Benjamin Kidd, Lord Macaulay, and others, whom he charged with having laid the foundation upon which Socialists have built the theory that exceptional ability, directive and inventive genius, and unusual talent of all kinds, is a product of the special society in which it appears, and that therefore society could not allow the claims of these exceptional persons to a preponderating share in the product of labor.

An example of Mr. Mallock's reasoning is herewith given verbatim:

A Sample Argument.

"If man, for man, the industrial population of a country always produced the same total output of wealth, if, relatively to its population, the country never got richer, and future laborers and the directors of labor followed always the same routine, the two causes being unvarying, and the effect unvarying also,
it would be, as Mill contends, at once impossible and unmeaning, to say that one of the necessary causes contributed more to the total effect than the other. But the principal feature of the modern world which the economist has to consider is not what Mill calls the effect, or a product which annually repeats itself, but is a series of different effects, or outputs of wealth, which, relatively to the amount of average labor involved in them, has, decade by decade, been increasing for the last hundred and fifty years. Now the capacities of the human being, in point of manual strength and dexterity, have hardly increased since the days of the Greeks and Romans.

"The handicrafts of the ancient world—as we see by the work of the masons who built the Parthenon and the Coliseum—were not inferior to the handicrafts of the best manual workers of to-day. The average labor, therefore, of any thousand men has certainly not changed its quality in the course of the past five generations. But within that time, in the civilized countries of the world, the output of wealth per thousand of the men engaged in industry is from three to five times as great as it was at the beginning of the period in question. Now, however this augmented effect is produced, even the new Socialists, such as Mr. Sidney Webb, admit that it has two causes—namely, ability and average labor; and that it is not due, as Marx said, to average labor alone. But since the average manual power of the average man's hands has undergone no change during the short period in question—since the mere manual labor of a thousand men to-day is not different from the labor of a thousand men in the days of our great-grandfathers, and since, on the other hand, it is no less obvious that the ability by which labor is directed has undergone changes of a very important kind—among these being its increased concentration on the processes of productive industry—it is obvious
that the excess of wealth produced per head of the industrial population now over that produced some five generations ago is due to the cause that has undergone a marked variation, and not to the cause which has practically remained unaltered.

"Let me give you a simple illustration. If there were only one shipyard in the world, and this always contained 1,000 workmen, always working under the direction of the same master, and if it always took these men one year to build a vessel of a given size and class, we could not divide the vessel into so many separate parts, and say that so many were produced by the laborers, and so many by the men directing them. But if a new master builder for one year took the place of the old, and if the same workmen, working under the new master, produced in that year not one vessel, but two; and further, if in the year following the new master disappeared, and the old master came back again, and the year's work once more resulted in the production, not of two vessels, but of only one as before, then we should be able to say, as a matter of common sense, with regard to the year during which the two vessels were built, that the second vessel, whatever might be the case with the first, was due wholly to the ability of the master by whom the labor of the workmen was directed.

**Cause of Increased Production.**

"For similar reasons, and in a similar sense, the able minority of men who direct the labor of the majority are the true producers of that amount of wealth by which the total annual output, in any given community, exceeds what would have been produced by the laborers if left to their own devices, whether working as isolated units or in small self-organized groups, and controlled by no knowledge or faculties
but such as are possessed in common by any one who can handle a spade or lay one brick on another. The action of the average laborers is no doubt as essential to the production of the increment, as it is the production of a minimum product such as this; but it is not the cause of the increment, or of the difference between the two products, in any practical sense; for while the product changes the labor remains the same, and there is no question of its ceasing unless the laborers cease to exist. There never can be a question of the directing faculties of the few being left alone in a world where there is no compulsory labor—for nature, our eternal taskmaster, is always present with her unrelenting lash, but there is constantly a question, where the security of social institutions is threatened, of labor’s being withdrawn from the efficient guidance of ability; or, in other words, of the action of ability being temporarily suspended altogether. The application or the non-application of the directing faculties to the labor of the majority, which is bound to continue in any case—these are the sole alternatives. When these faculties are thus applied, the output of wealth increases; when their application is interfered with or ceases, the output of wealth declines; and in the only practical sense of the words, cause or producer, these faculties, or the persons who exercise them, are the true causes or producers of the whole of that portion of the wealth of any community which comes into being with their activity, and disappears or dwindles with their inaction.”

The Socialist State Impossible.

The fourth address was devoted to showing the difficulties with which Socialists would have to contend in setting up their system. It would be impossible for them to secure the services of men of unusual
directive ability by compulsion. It might be difficult to secure the manual labor needed in that manner, but it would be wholly impossible to secure genius under such conditions. Furthermore, under Socialism there would be no means whereby a genius could be discovered. Such a one could conceal his talent so long as he did not choose to employ it, and unless circumstances supplied him with an adequate motive he might not only be unaware of his possession of talent, but in any case would not be likely to exert it. Under these conditions the Socialist State might at first compel the men known to be possessed of unusual ability to exert themselves for a few years, but they would leave no successors, and society would be doomed to mediocrity, then stagnation, and finally degeneracy.

The Socialist's contention that there would be sufficient incentive in the joy of creative effort alone to induce the men of ability to place their talents at the service of society is only partially true, or at best insufficient. The examples quoted by Socialists to confirm this theory apply to five spheres of action only—heroism in battle, artistic creation, the pursuit of speculative truth, what theologians call works of mercy, and lastly the propagation of religion. There is nothing to show that effort in the industrial field can ever be inspired in the same manner.

Greed the Incentive.

What Socialists called "greed" is after all the incentive to success in the industrial world. This is used in a vituperative sense by Socialists, but he accepts it as the dominant motive. Mr. Mallock concluded his fourth address as follows:

"Those countries or races have advanced fastest which, besides being prolific in men of exceptional powers such as these, offer them the greatest inducements to develop their
powers, and the greatest facilities for applying them in the widest and most efficient way. And what are these inducements?

"I have no reluctance to adopt once more, for the moment, the word used by Socialists as a term of contemptuous invective, and say that they consist of the prospect, secured by the constitution of society, of satisfying the exceptional man's economic greed in proportion to his economic productivity. In speaking of the desire here in question as 'greed,' we need in reality no more to discredit it than we do by speaking of a man whom we happen to dislike as 'this fellow.' The vituperative meaning of the word is due to its derivation from greedy, which implies an inordinate desire for the sensual gratifications of eating; and the common opinion of men unable to produce great wealth, as to men who, because they produce it, desire also to possess it, is that they desire to possess it first and foremost in order that they may constantly gorge themselves with the richest and most unwholesome food, or revel to excess in luxuries of a like kind.

"It is impossible here to go into this interesting subject minutely—a subject closely connected with the economics of the modern world; but the facts of the case may be generally summed up in saying that the motive which stimulates the producers of great wealth to demand a proportionate amount of their great products for themselves, is not a desire for pleasure, but a desire for the realization of power; and when this fact is understood, the psychology of the question becomes perfectly intelligible."

In his final address of the series Mr. Mallock undertook to show, from the premises ascribed to the Socialists, that the essential fallacy of their theory lies in the assumption that society possessed powers which in reality it does not possess. Laws prescribing impossible things might be enacted, but they could not be enforced. Society would simply disregard them. In this connection he severely criticised an article advocating the progressive taxation of inheritances, which had appeared in the North American Review, and accused the writer of basing his argument on Socialistic premises. Society might be compared to an electro-magnetic engine which works by the pull of magnets, the magnets being the needs and am-
bitions of men. Take away these magnets, said Mr. Mallock, and the engine stops.

**Useful Idlers.**

The one passage wherein the lecturer gave even the slightest recognition of the existence of an idle rich class in society is as follows. It will be observed that their ambitions are also magnets which serve to keep the engine going:

"Let us suppose that the main desire which moved exceptional men to devote their capacities to the augmentation of their country's wealth was the desire, by retaining at least a considerable proportion of their own products, to retire from the business of production at a certain period of their careers, and to join a class which, whether idle or active otherwise—whether devoted to mere pleasure, or to philanthropy, or an enlightened patronage of the arts, or to speculative thought and study—was itself in an economic sense altogether unproductive. Now, in order to join such a class, and to work with a view of joining it, society must be so organized that such a class can exist, and the fact of its existence would constitute the main moral magnet which, on our present hypothesis, would be essential to the development of the highest kinds of economic power. Such being the case, the following conclusion reveals itself, which, though at first sight it may seem a paradox, will be found on reflection to be self-evident—the conclusion, namely, that a class which, if considered by itself, is absolutely non-productive, may, when taken in connection with the social system as a whole, be an essential and cardinal factor in the working machinery of production, supplying, as it would do, by the mere fact of its existence, the magnetic or attractive power by which the machinery was kept in motion."
The Family Blocks Socialism.

A portion of this address was devoted to the failure of socialistic colonies, which Mr. Mallock explained by asserting the existence of the family unit to be in direct contradiction to the socialist idea. Socialists, moreover, recognize this and have deplored the fact that the family constitutes the most formidable obstacle to the realization of their theories. The impression intended to be conveyed was that Socialists sought the destruction of family life.

Masses Destructive, Not Constructive.

The lecturer then touched on the popular illusion of the power of the masses, asserted that after all their only power was destructive, and cited various examples to prove this point. A ship's company could murder the captain, and destroy the charts and instruments of navigation, but in so doing would only bring destruction on themselves. A company of soldiers could easily shoot their general, but that would simply deliver them into the hands of the enemy. A mob might destroy a picture gallery, but they could not restore the paintings. The French Revolution serves as an example both of the destructive power of the masses and of the reconstruction that must inevitably follow. A chemist who was condemned as an aristocrat tried to induce the Revolutionary Committee to spare him on account of his scientific attainments. He was told that the Republic had no need of chemists, and was guillotined. But had not France been compelled to restore conditions that made the lives of chemists safe?

Henry George declared society to be a pyramid standing on its apex, implying that it was in danger of toppling over. That view might seem absurd on a superficial examination, but dynamically speaking,
it was correct. Society was dependent on its men of exceptional ability; it moved under their direction, and in that fact lay its safety. The control of the many must forever remain in the hands of the few. He believed he was right in saying that the more practical and hard-headed representatives of labor realized that, given the possibility on their part of making a reasonable bargain with the employers, their own prospects are good, bad, or indifferent, according as their labor is directed, by the intellect, the knowledge, and the strenuous and keen sagacity of the picked men of the day.

The series of addresses concluded with the above statements. I have incorporated in the foregoing synopsis the principal positions taken by Mr. Mallock and every point which he apparently regards as essential to the refutation of Socialism.

My Reply to Mr. Mallock.

I.

Mr. Mallock's argument against Socialism is based upon a misstatement of the Socialist's position. He sets up a scare-crow of his own imagination; then proceeds to demolish it, assuring the public that he is demolishing Socialism. I cannot conceive how a man so well read in Socialist literature as Mr. Mallock can state that the Socialist proposes that the manual laborer shall receive all the product to the exclusion of the intellectual laborer.

By a cursory examination of Socialist literature one discovers that the Socialist makes no complaint about the division of the product between the intellectual and manual laborer, inasmuch as he knows perfectly well that in many instances the latter is better paid than the former. The ordinary college professor today often receives less than the bricklayer or car-
penter, and the bookkeeper less than the plumber. It is very doubtful, indeed, considering the cost of education, the loss of time involved, the necessary expenditure in conforming to a certain standard of living, etc., if the average lawyer or doctor receives more of the good things of life than the ordinary member of a trades-union.

No, the Socialist has no complaint against any existing inequality in the division of the product between the intellectual and manual laborer, because he knows that each is paid upon the basis of what it costs him to live. The Socialist's complaint against the present competitive system is rather that the man who owns the implements of production, and does not necessarily work at all, secures the lion's share of the product. Even the highest paid toiler under our industrial system—say Mr. Paul Morton with his seventy-five thousand dollars a year—gets less than certain individuals who do nothing at all.

Ability vs. Service.

The other day the press reported that Mr. Vanderbilt had settled one hundred thousand dollars a year upon his daughter, the Duchess of Marlborough, and a like amount upon her husband, the Duke, yet it would be difficult to find any intellectual effort upon the part of either justifying such a reward. Take, also, the instance of the young man now so prominently before the American public, Harry Thaw, with his eighty thousand dollars a year. Mr. Mallock would have great difficulty in showing that it is on account of Thaw's ability, or any work that he does for society, that he gets this income. There are probably one hundred wealthy lunatics in this country, with from ten thousand to two hundred thousand dollars a year, whose estates are managed by guardians. Will Mr.
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Mallock attempt to prove that this is the reward of their ability or of their intellectual superiority?

Then consider the enormous incomes of certain of our great capitalists, such as Mr. Rockefeller with his twenty million dollars a year. Even granting that he gives us a certain return for this enormous income, it is very doubtful if any jury of American citizens would decide that his services to the public are worth such a sum. The Socialists object to Rockefeller’s income both on account of the amount and because of the manner in which it is fixed; that is, they object to Mr. Rockefeller’s fixing his own income. For, of course, he charges all that the traffic can bear. If his income today is twenty million dollars, ten years hence it may be fifty million, and the public will have nothing whatever to say about it. Or if they do decide to interfere and do diminish that income, it will be by means directly opposed to the wishes and judgment of Mr. Rockefeller, which would be contrary to Mr. Mallock’s theory of how we should reward our industrial directors. He would say that Mr. Rockefeller’s income is the measure of his intellect and that the mob should not assume to interfere with the wishes of an intellectual giant.

Where the Defect Lies.

The Socialist has two tasks set before him: first, to expose the defects of the present system; second, to show the perfection of the Socialist system.

Not many years ago there were very few people, and especially very few Americans, who would admit of any grave defects in our industrial system; today scarcely anyone denies that it possesses many features which are radically wrong and must be remedied. They recognize, for instance, that in a country as rich as the United States it is absurd for poverty to exist.
I should like to ask Mr. Mallock if he is satisfied with things as they are, and if not, how he proposes to remedy the defects that he sees. The fundamental defect in the existing system, to the Socialist, is that the laborers, through competition among themselves, are forced to accept the merest subsistence as their daily wage. I include in the word laborer anyone who works, whether by his brain or by his hands, whether he be a country parson drudging along on his five or six hundred dollars a year, or a bricklayer in San Francisco getting his eight dollars a day. If it be objected that a bricklayer getting eight dollars a day is receiving more than the actual amount required for subsistence, I would reply that this is due to a purely ephemeral condition and that sooner or later the same bricklayer will be out of employment and, possibly, at the soup-kitchen. It so happens that for the time being there is an enormous demand for labor throughout the country, the result of which is that labor, like any other commodity, has risen with the increasing demand and sells, temporarily, for more than cost; i.e., what it costs to subsist. If I had been in one of the boats which got away from the ill-fated Larchmont the other day, I would have been willing to pay one thousand dollars for an overcoat; but that does not mean that an overcoat would be worth more than twenty dollars to me if I were on Broadway, instead of freezing in an open boat.

Ownership, Not Ability, the Factor.

Competition, generally speaking, reduces wages to the minimum of subsistence, and the surplus product is handed over to the capitalist, not because of his superior ability, but because he holds a monopoly of the implements of production. As said before, Harry Thaw and the Duke of Marlborough do not receive their incomes on account of their ability, but simply
because they own the stocks and bonds that represent the implements of production.

The Socialist says further that no matter how much ability may contribute to the general product, or how much it may increase it in the future, the result will be merely that the owners of the earth will reap the increased production, and neither those who labor nor those who possess ability. To make this perfectly clear, let us suppose that every man in the United States were suddenly endowed with the genius of an Edison. Is it not self-evident that the Rockefellers and Vanderbilts and Goulds would be the recipients of by far the larger part of the increased production as the result of all this increased ability? It is true, as long as geniuses are limited in number, they are in a position to sell their ability to Rockefeller for an extra compensation. After all, however, it rests purely with Mr. Rockefeller whether he will or will not buy their superior ability. But if the whole world were suddenly endowed with superior ability, and each of us were willing and anxious to sell our ability, competition would at once reduce all to the same dead level and Mr. Rockefeller would be able to buy us at the same price that he now pays for ordinary human clay.

The reason that the genius of today gets any superior compensation is not so much because of his superior ability, as because of his monopoly of that ability. The reward of genius is a reward to scarcity, not to abundance. Melba gets five thousand dollars a night, but if every woman were a Melba, neither voice nor name would bring thirty cents.

**The Socialist Remedy.**

We Socialists propose to remedy the unequal division of the fruits of labor by substituting the cooperative for the competitive system; that is, we
would pay the laborer upon the basis of what he produces, rather than how little he can live upon. And by laborer, let me repeat, I wish to be clearly understood as meaning anyone connected in a useful manner with the industrial process.

It is self-evident, however, that if we are to introduce the co-operative system of paying the laborers, it will be necessary for them to own the machinery of production. The co-operative system could not be established while Mr. Rockefeller and the Vanderbilts own the machinery of production. Therefore as a basis for the co-operative system it is necessary to have the co-operative ownership of the means of production; in other words, public ownership. Hence Socialists are in favor of Government ownership of railroads and trusts and of the implements of production.

**That Post Office Argument.**

This brings us to the question of the Post Office to which, as Mr. Mallock says, we point as an example of what the Government can do in the way of public ownership. But it is quite a mistake for him to assume that Socialists think that employees of the Post Office today are any better off than if they worked for a private corporation. The Post Office pays its employees exactly as a private corporation would, namely, upon the basis of how little they will take, which means a bare living. Therefore, while the Post Office is an example of Government ownership, it is by no means an example of the co-operative system. The Post Office, in fact, simply exemplifies co-operative production, not co-operative distribution; and the Socialist points to it, not as an example of Socialism, but merely as an evidence that the Government can and does own and operate a public utility.

Mr. Mallock asks: "In what conceivable way, then, has a postman employed by the State any more eco-
nomic freedom than the messengers of a private firm? Nor, again, does the manner in which the laborer or the State employee is remunerated, and by which the performance of his duty is secured, differ in any way from the ways and system which prevail in a private firm."

I would say that there is a theoretic difference, at any rate, between the condition of the Post Office employee and that of the private employee, in that the Post Office is a publicly owned concern, and that the public can determine what the wages of a postman shall be. That is, they can elect a Congress and a President who can, if they so choose, double the wages now prevailing. The postal employee, in a manner, may be considered as a man employing himself. One of Mr. Gould's employees in the Western Union Telegraph Company, on the other hand, is not working for himself in any degree: he is working to create profits for Mr. Gould, and has no vote by which he can increase his wages. To this extent, therefore, the postman has an advantage over the telegraph employee, but I am quite willing to admit that under existing conditions this amounts to practically nothing, especially in view of the fact that President Roosevelt has given distinct orders that postal employees shall not organize for the purpose of influencing Congress to increase their wages.

As said before, however, the Post Office as it is run today under the capitalist system is offered by the Socialists not as a criterion whereby to judge Socialism, but merely as an example of the possibilities of Government ownership. It must be remembered that a great many people do not think that the Government could own and operate any public utility, so that it is a valid argument for the Socialist to show that the United States Government does own and operate one great public utility, namely, the Post Office.
Many people, moreover, are scarcely aware of the fact that the United States is the only Government which does not own and operate its own telegraph system, and that in Europe the government ownership and operation of the railroads is the rule, rather than the exception, while Japan and Mexico have recently decided to transform all their private railroads into a government system.

Mr. Mallock's Baseless Assumptions.

One would think that Mr. Mallock had discovered something in the writings of the Socialists to indicate that they do not believe in remunerating the man who is the director of the organization. Socialists, apparently, would say that a ship could sail across the ocean with no captain, or if there were a captain, that he should not receive any remuneration. It seems to me that it is up to Mr. Mallock to give chapter and date for this extraordinary assumption, as well as for our alleged belief in the non-necessity of organization, and in the manual laborers' exclusive rights to remuneration, etc.

It is true that a Socialist says that the exchange value of a commodity, under the Socialist system, would be determined by the average useful labor time spent in producing it. The value of an engine, for instance, compared with another, or with any other product of human labor, would be determined by the average labor cost. But as part of the work of producing the engine is necessarily brain work, this brain work must be rewarded.

"If two yachts," says Mr. Mallock, "were built for a race between America and England, the trouble of an actual race might be spared. We could discover which was the more valuable boat beforehand by discovering which had taken the longest time to build."
This is such a foolish misstatement of the Socialists' position that it hardly seems necessary to refute it. Such a theory could be held only by an idiot, and Mr. Mallock certainly does not consider Socialists as idiots or he would not spend so much time in answering their arguments. Marx himself repeatedly stated that he meant normal, useful labor, and the time normally required in useful labor, as being the criterion of value. Mr. Mallock mixes up the theory of value with the question of the remuneration of labor, and I deny emphatically that he has any authority to state the Socialists' position toward labor as he does. To quote him again:

"Labor is taken in an exclusive sense and stands exclusively to those ordinary manual efforts by which, as Count Tolstoi says, the palms of the hands are hardened; all other forms of effort and the claims based on them being ignored. As soon as labor becomes definitely understood in this sense, that is, in this sense appropriated by Socialists, it is impossible to argue with them."

I ask where Mr. Mallock gets his authority for this statement? I emphatically deny either that the Socialists hold that the product of labor should go only to the manual laborer, or that any Socialist of standing ever said such a thing. Socialists above all others see the necessity of organization, the necessity of minds directing this organization, and the necessity of remunerating the bodies which carry the minds which direct the organization.

The Socialists are also well aware that where there is a man of superior intellect, he is in a position under any system to command a superior price for his labor, by the simple method of refusing to serve the community unless he is so paid. For instance, suppose under a Socialist system Melba should refuse to sing unless she received ten times the remuneration of the ordinary woman. Would we put her on bread and
water until she came to terms? Or would she not rather be allowed to take a hall and charge admission? This unquestionably would be her privilege under Socialism, and, furthermore, there is little doubt that her remuneration would be far greater than it is under the present system. The Socialist, in fact, does not object in the least to the large reward going to the genius; what he objects to is that the man who gives nothing to the community should receive the greatest rewards or, indeed, any reward at all.

Mr. Mallock, I repeat, is basing practically his whole argument against Socialism upon a misstatement of the Socialist position.

**Wage System Nullifies Genius.**

II.

Mr. Mallock, in his last lecture reiterates his assertion that the Socialists are on record as declaring that the product should go to the manual laborer irrespective of his ability or industry. I again deny this either as a correct statement of the Socialist position, or of that of Marx. The Socialists, instead of bothering about the division of the product among those who contribute to the production, concern themselves rather about the exclusion of those who admittedly produce nothing.

We declare that the capitalist class to-day are the recipients of an enormous income irrespective of their contribution to the production of wealth, and simply because of their ownership of capital. The real producing class, on the other hand, whether they contribute of their muscle or of their brain, whether possessing average ability or genius, are paid by this capitalist class not according to how much they produce, but to how little they may be bought for. As I pointed out, if every man were as great a genius as
Edison, and owing to this increase of ability the world's product per capita were one hundred times what it is to-day, the net result would be that the average wage-earner—even though a genius—would get no more than he does now: the whole of the increased product would go to the capitalist. Indeed, it is quite possible that the increased output would result in a state of over-production, which would cause such a decline in the demand for labor that wages, instead of increasing with the increased product, would actually decrease. Wages depend not upon the product of the laborer, but upon the cost of feeding him. Hence the more it costs to feed the laborer, the more he gets and the less it costs to feed him, the less he gets.

Wages in China are three cents a day, because a man there can live on three cents. In the Klondike wages are ten dollars a day, because that is the cost of living. Wages are higher in New York than in Milwaukee, because the cost of living in New York, especially rent, is higher.

The Western Union Telegraph Company increased the wages of its employees this week by ten per cent. Why? Was it because the employees had become ten per cent. more productive? No. It was because the employees found that the cost of living had so increased that they required this extra ten per cent. to keep them alive, and Mr. Gould practically admitted their contention to be correct.

Is the Present System Perfect?

Mr. Mallock does not make it entirely clear as to just what he wishes. Does he think that we are to-day dividing the product in such a way that a man is paid according to his ability? Does he not forget entirely the share that goes to the capitalist and the landlord who in no way contribute to the production of wealth?
Mr. Mallock, indeed, seems to be more concerned about the future method of distribution, that he alleges to be upon the Socialist program, than about the defects of the existing system. One would think, to read his lectures, that he were in fear of leaving a present Utopia for some dreadful form of economic slavery to be imposed by the Socialists. So far, there is not one word from Mr. Mallock that hints at dissatisfaction with the present system. One would suppose we were now living under the perfect system that he describes, in which ability receives the highest reward, and is delightedly served by the average laborer, while the loafer and shirker, be he rich or poor, gets nothing.

How Genius Would Fare Under Socialism.

Let us leave the present system for a moment, however, and consider that proposed by the Socialists. Mr. Mallock alleges that the Socialists would pay an equal wage to all, irrespective of their contribution to production. Let me repeat that even if the Socialists wished such a thing, which they don’t, it would be quite impossible for them to achieve their end, inasmuch as the artist, by simply refusing to work at his art unless paid his price, could always successfully demand his comparative worth. Suppose a Michael Angelo, in the Socialist state, should say, “Give me what I demand or I will refuse to paint my pictures: I will whitewash fences instead.” What would the Socialist state do about it? If certain members wished this latter-day Angelo to paint a work of art and chose to give him part of their earnings, does Mr. Mallock think that anyone would object? Why?

The Socialists’ idea is that under their method of distribution, about two hours’ labor a day would be sufficient to give a man a fair living. The remaining
twenty-two hours would belong to him to do with as he pleased. I might use four out of my twenty-two hours' leisure in whitewashing Michael Angelo's fence in return for, say, one hour of his time in painting me a picture. Does Mr. Mallock think that the Socialist state would intervene to prevent our trade? My working for Michael Angelo in return for his working for me would be a purely private matter: for each of us would use his own time.

Socialism means equality of opportunity. It means that every man shall have a chance to paddle his own canoe, and it likewise means that a man shall have an opportunity of "owning" his own canoe. If he does not choose to paddle, and therefore receives nothing, it is his own fault. The idler under Socialism will starve if he does no work, whereas the man of superior ability will be absolutely certain of his reward. He will always be in a position, indeed, to command the full value for his monopoly of talent, if he should demand it.

To-day he is really uncertain of any reward at all, inasmuch as the capitalist may not deem his ability worth buying. Did not Morse fail to interest private capital, and have to fall back upon the Government for funds to build the first telegraph line? Did not the capitalist shirk putting his capital in our New York Subway, and then, when the City itself built it, step in and appropriate the profits without having encountered the risk? Who built the fastest electric railway in the world? It was the Government of Germany.

Equal Opportunity for All.

The Socialists contend that the present system, by placing the ownership in the hands of the capitalist class, gives them an unfair advantage over those who own nothing. We would abolish this inequality by placing the ownership of the means of production in
the hands of the State, so that every man would have an equal opportunity to use them. Everyone, as I say, would have his own canoe, and it would be up to each to do his own paddling.

If a genius should use these instruments of production to much greater advantage than the ordinary man, he would be in the position of demanding as his reward an increased product pro rata with his superiority. I may say, however, that the Socialists do not think that the genius would demand such an increase, because of his superior efficiency in production. They hold that while economically there would be no method whereby society could prevent the genius from securing this larger share, should he demand it, it would be recognized that his true reward would lie not in his receiving a larger product, but in the exercise of his ability to produce it. In other words, the greatest reward that Melba could receive under a proper system of society, would be the opportunity of singing to a cultivated audience. The greatest possible reward to a Michael Angelo would be to allow him to paint for an appreciative public. Does anyone think that he would prefer a social system which would give him, say, ten million dollars for one painting, allowing him a magnificent palace, automobiles, steam yachts, diamonds for his wife, champagne for his table, and entrée to the society of America's "Four Hundred," rather than an opportunity to live in a society where everyone would be well educated, cultured, and appreciative of art, and where all live happily on a substantial equality?

The fundamental mistake that Mr. Mallock makes is in considering labor as necessarily a drudgery. The Socialist says that the true joy of life is found in work; the joy of the artist in painting a picture, not in getting paid for it. If we should pay the artist so much that by painting one picture he should be free
from the necessity of ever painting another, and should, indeed, actually prohibit him from painting another during his whole lifetime, that surely would be the worst punishment that we could inflict upon him. The true artist looks forward to a life spent in the painting of pictures, and his only request of society is the opportunity to express his genius. His art is his play: it is the laugh of the child through pure joy of living.

Directive Ability, Ancient and Modern.

Referring to the enormously increased production of the present day, Mr. Mallock would have us believe that this comes from the superior ability of the men who direct the forces of labor. He would have us believe that if these superior directors had lived two thousand years ago, the Greeks and Romans would have had just as productive a system of industry as is ours. In other words, the gain in production to-day rests upon the superior ability of our Goulds, Vanderbilts, and Morgans, instead of, as the Socialists say, upon our superior machinery. Mr. Mallock admits that the Greeks were as intellectual in other things as we are to-day, but he seems to think that they were lacking in one point, namely, ability to direct labor. He would admit, of course, that their artists were greater than our modern artists. He would also admit, I presume, that the military genius of Alexander was at least equal, if not superior, to the military genius of to-day. It is merely on the question of directing industry where-in he thinks the modern excels the ancient. He would have us believe that the reason the modern workman produces one hundred times as many shoes a day as did the workman of fifty years ago, is due to the fact that God has given us a superior genius to direct our
Douglas shoe factory. The Socialist, on the contrary, claims that we make more shoes in an hour than we could in a day fifty years ago, merely because we have better machinery: and that this machinery is becoming so increasingly automatic, and requires so little ability to direct, that little boys and girls are supplanting adults in the factories. The Socialist says that if all the directive genius of the world were swept away and the machinery left, it would not be six months before those who are now being directed would develop the ability to produce fully as much as we do to-day.

Some Samples of Exceptional Ability.

Mr. Mallock pictures our capitalists as always possessing the necessary ability, and always so directing labor, that it produces wealth to the best advantage, and for the benefit of the public in general. I noticed an item in the newspaper the other day, telling about a Miss Crocker, in California, who spent thirty-five thousand dollars upon a dancing pavilion in which to entertain her friends for one single night. Next morning the workmen were set to tearing it down. I also recently heard of a man who died, leaving an estate of ten thousand dollars, the whole of which, by the direction of his will, was to be expended in building a monument to him. Now here are two instances in which labor is directed by capitalists to produce something of practically no value to society, yet Mr. Mallock would have us understand that it is owing to our recognition of their ability that we allow our labor to be so directed.

Ownership Confers Power.

The capitalist of to-day, it is true, does direct labor, not by means of his ability, but through the power conferred on him by his ownership of wealth. His
power, in short, is derived autocratically, not democ-
tratically. The Socialist objects to the present system
because it does not justly compensate either the la-
borer or the man of genius. It gives practically the
entire surplus produced either by manual or intel-
lectual labor, above and beyond what is necessary for
its keep, to the capitalist class, simply as a tribute due
to them because of their ownership of the means of
production. The Socialists propose to introduce a
system whereby an equal opportunity to produce is
afforded to all, and whereby each producer may
demand the full value of his labor. We say, more-
over, that this system is possible only when the means
of production shall become public property, and are
managed democratically.

**The Trust—A Symptom of Capitalist Collapse.**

There is one more point which I must take up
with Mr. Mallock, and that is, that owing to this turn-
ing-over of the surplus product to the capitalist there
is a constant danger of "over-production." This con-
dition, it is true, is not in evidence just at present in
the United States, although it was so a few years ago;
but I have every reason to believe that it will be with
us again in the very near future. Society is produc-
ing goods at such a rapid rate that the present system
cannot distribute them, so that we are constantly
menaced with starvation simply because we produce
too much. This is the economic evolution which
Marx said would make Socialism an absolute neces-
sity. I hope that Mr. Mallock will take up this phase
of our subject in one of his subsequent lectures. Marx
declared Socialism to be an economic inevitability, and
it would seem to me much more important to discuss
such a vital point than merely to review the various
alleged opinions of Socialists upon the division of the
product under the future Socialistic state.
The Trust seems to have no significance to Mr. Mallock. To me it foreshadows the death of capitalism, for its continuance means the end of competition, upon which the capitalist system rests. Even President Roosevelt, in his last message, assents to the Socialist theory—the Marxian theory—that monopoly is here to stay. If, then, the President is right, it means that our directors, or "men of ability," as Mr. Mallock considers them, have become the hereditary autocrats of industry, and that no amount of "ability" among the public outside the pale can ever successfully compete with them, since, by the President's own confession, competition is dead.

Mr. Mallock presents to us a foreboding picture of America's future—an aristocracy of wealth.

Machinery the Cause of Increased Production.

III.

Mr. Mallock's indictment of Socialism is that the man who possesses a peculiar faculty for directing industrial affairs will gain no superior reward. He alleges that all the increased production to-day is due to the superior "directive ability" of a few men, and that Socialism will provide no compensation sufficient to retain these valuable directive faculties. He admits, so far as mere geniuses are concerned—great artists or great military commanders—that glory may be an adequate remuneration; but these would be the exceptions. He goes back to Tyre and Sidon, and shows that even in those ancient times the directors of industrial affairs insisted upon a superior material reward, and were never satisfied with mere honor or the "joy of work."

The inference continually to be drawn from Mr. Mallock's lectures is that his "men of ability," his "directors of industry," have from time immemorial been
different from other men, not only in their superior faculties, but also in their demand for an exceptional reward. He would have us believe, furthermore, that society has always complied with this demand, and rewarded them as they have wished. I should like to ask Mr. Mallock, however, if this were true in the case of Tyre and Sidon, why those cities did not develop the productivity of modern times? If they had the directors, and if the directors were properly rewarded, why was the effect not manifested in increased production? It seems to me that the increased productivity of the present day is due to our machinery rather than to the heaven-born geniuses on the Boards of Directors of our various railroads, insurance, and other companies.

Would Mr. Mallock have us believe that we go from New York to Liverpool in five days because of the genius of either the Board of Directors of the Cunard Steamship Company or of a certain Captain in charge of the boat? If we should put these same directors and the same Captain in charge of the "Santa Maria," in which Columbus sailed to America four hundred years ago, does he think that the trip could be made in five days? It seems absurd for him to come before the American public and declare that our superior productive ability is due to the services of such men as Mr. James H. Hyde, Jr., or Mr. Chauncey M. Depew, who happen to be directors in some twenty or thirty of our railway and industrial companies.

As a matter of fact, the very conditions which Mr. Mallock declares necessary to develop human productivity, namely, large material rewards for superior directive ability, have been a fact in the world's history for the last two thousand years, and yet he does not seem to have noticed that it is only in the last one hundred and fifty years, or since the invention of the steam engine and of labor-saving machinery, that man has increased to any great extent in productivity.
Genius Always a Monopoly.

However, as the Socialist is not entering any particular complaint against the reward given to the man of industrial ability under the present system, and as Mr. Mallock thinks he is properly compensated, we will pass on to the question of the future Socialist state, wherein Mr. Mallock seems to think that the man of directive ability will not be properly rewarded. As I have before pointed out, however, it is just as plain to the Socialist as it is to anyone else that if a man have a monopoly, whether of his own particular talent or of a material necessity, he is in a position to demand a superior reward from the public for the use of what is exclusively his. Caruso values his voice upon a monopolistic basis, and gets the highest price because there is no one to compete with him. He finds New York to be a very rich community, and therefore gets one hundred thousand dollars a year. If he had come with the same voice twenty-five years ago, he could not have made twenty-five thousand dollars. Had he come one hundred years ago, he probably would not have received one thousand dollars a year, simply because the community could not have afforded the money. On the other hand, if he could visit us one hundred years hence, we might have so increased in wealth as to be able to pay him a million dollars for his voice. Caruso sells his voice on the truly monopolistic plan of "all the traffic will bear."

Under Socialism, a man possessed of exceptional talent for directing industrial affairs will still be able to demand a high price for his services, just as a singer, like Caruso, will for his voice. Indeed, as the people will be much richer under Socialism than they are to-day, since productivity will be greatly increased through the better organization of industry and the increased use of machinery, Caruso could probably get very much more for his services than he does
to-day or ever could get under our competitive system.

Mr. Mallock and the Socialist both recognize that under the capitalist, as well as under the Socialist system, the man of superior ability will always be in a position to demand, should he so desire, a proportionate compensation. A monopoly of brains can always command its price, just as well as a monopoly of land on Broadway. The only difference between the Socialist and the capitalist régime is, that in the former the land on Broadway would be owned by the public, and no one would enjoy an income of one hundred thousand dollars a year through the ownership of a particular lot.

But while the Socialists say that the public have no option in the matter of compensation for a man's superior ability, they very clearly recognize its right to an option upon his real estate. If they should refuse to pay Mr. Astor, for instance, his twenty million dollars a year rent for the Island of Manhattan, he could not take the island away. We are, therefore, in a position to force Mr. Astor to give us the use of his land without pay, whereas we could not force Mr. Harriman to direct the running of our railways. The man of genius, in fact, would be safe from Socialist spoliation, but the idle land owner would be at our mercy.

How Equal Opportunity Will be Preserved.

The Socialists, however, disagree with Mr. Mallock in thinking that the man of superior talent, whether that talent be exhibited in the painting of a picture or the directing of a factory, will demand superior pay under Socialism. The great aim of everyone to-day is to make a living, and the more money a man accumulates, the more certain he is of accomplishing that object. Accumulation of money wherewith to secure
a living has resulted in men's being drawn into the pursuit of money-making as a mere game, and many are now so absorbed in the pleasure of this game that they have entirely forgotten their original object. No one supposes that Mr. Gould and Mr. Vanderbilt are engaged in business in order to secure a better living for their families. They are simply playing the game of business exactly as two men would play at chess or poker, or as our society people play bridge.

Mr. Mallock replies that since Socialists admit the possibility of a gradation of the rewards under Socialism, we would soon get back to the same position that society occupies to-day, namely, a great inequality of wealth. But it must not be overlooked that while the superior man might enjoy a greater income under Socialism he could not invest this income in, say a lot on Broadway, or in stocks, the ownership of which would place not only himself, but also his descendants in perpetuity as a charge upon the community. Under Socialism, a man might have the equivalent of fifty thousand dollars a year for his superior ability, but he could not invest one cent of this money in income-bearing property. All the Broadway lots, all the railroads, would be owned by the public, and could no more be alienated than Central Park could be to-day. He could buy all the automobiles he wanted, all the diamonds, and all the champagne, or he could build a palace. In other words, he could spend his income in consumable goods, but he could not invest either in productive machinery or in land. To put it in a homely way, suppose we were all engaged in growing potatoes, and should discover that one of our number displayed a very superior talent in directing the others. The community might agree to give him ten times the quantity of potatoes that the ordinary laborer receives as compensation for his ability, but no matter how many potatoes we might pay him, we would never surrender the title to a square foot of the potato patch.
Baer, Roosevelt and the Public Coal Lands.

Some time ago Mr. Baer recorded it as his opinion that the reason certain individuals had possession of the coal supplies of the country, was because God had chosen them as most fit to distribute coal to the people. We now have the President of the United States recommending that in the future any coal lands that may be discovered on the public domain shall not be owned by Mr. Baer and his divinely appointed associates, but shall continue to be owned by the public. I would ask Mr. Mallock whether he approves of Mr. Roosevelt's act in thus interfering with what Mr. Baer considers the wisdom of God. Does he agree with Mr. Baer that the latter, through his divine ability in the distribution of coal, should be given possession of the remaining coal lands, or does he think that the public will be better served by reserving these deposits upon the policy suggested by Mr. Roosevelt? Furthermore, if Mr. Mallock believes President Roosevelt to be right, and that we should hold these lands for the public under Government ownership, would he think it possible for us to get any divine living genius to direct us in distributing this coal to the public, or must it lie in its natural bed until we hand it over to Mr. Baer?

Ability Easily Secured.

How does Mr. Mallock account for the fact that a country like New Zealand finds by actual experiment that when the public owns its railways, they get along a great deal better than they did under private ownership? Seemingly New Zealand has no difficulty in operating her system without giving the titles away to the directors in payment for the directing. "Men of ability" seem to come cheap in New Zealand, not to
mention other nations which have Government ownership of railways, such as Germany, Italy, France and Belgium.

Mr. Mallock pictures to himself a future under Socialism, in which men are threatened with irons unless they work according to the demands of the Socialist state. The Socialist, on the contrary, thinks that labor would then be far more voluntary than it is to-day; in fact, that it would be completely voluntary. For there will be two motives to impel a man to work under the Socialist state: one, in order to get a living; the other, because the laborer will feel that his work is benefiting all humanity. The latter motive does not come into play to-day to any great extent because the conditions of work for the wage-earner are so disagreeable, and because he feels that when he does work he is not benefiting humanity as a whole, but merely his employer. Under the Socialist state, the worker will not only get the full value of the product of his labor, but at the same time will feel that he is benefiting the community. There will be no more necessity, therefore, of having military discipline for workers under Socialism than there is at the present, nor, indeed, half so much.

**Work and Pay Under Socialism.**

To-day, when our Post Office wants a number of letter carriers, it advertises the fact, and has no trouble in securing plenty of applicants even though the pay is ridiculously small. Under Socialism, it would pursue exactly the same course, namely, advertise that it needs men; but the pay would be so much larger and the hours so very much shorter, that there would be plenty of volunteers. The essential difference between work under Socialism and under the present system is that the Socialist state would demand less hours
and give more pay. If a man should choose to work ten hours instead of two hours a day, it would be necessary for him to work only one day in five, or he might work for a year continuously, and then be a man of leisure for four years. In other words, the pay for one year of ten hours a day would be sufficient to keep a man for five years.

To-day the great desire of the average man is merely to get employment; therefore, the tendency is for the Government to do what it can to provide this employment, whether by the non-use of machinery in the Government printing department, or by means of a protective tariff which, by setting labor to work at the point of least efficiency, to that extent diminishes production, and to that extent gives men employment.

For instance, we have a protective tariff against Cuban tobacco and sugar, so that these commodities are produced under disadvantageous circumstances, which means that more labor is required to produce an inferior article. It is vain for the free-traders to argue that we are thus wasting labor and diminishing our output, when the great demand of the laborer is to get a job rather than an increased product. Mr. Mallock tries to score a point against Socialism in reminding us that the Carthusian monks, the most ascetic of the monastic orders, take care to demand for each bottle of their celebrated liqueur the highest exchange value procurable. Evidently he is under the impression that this would not be allowed under Socialism, and that the monks would have to content themselves with less. This I fail to see. If people under the Socialist state wished to buy the Carthusian liqueur, and were willing to pay the price, what would prevent the monks receiving it? Would the monks not be in exactly the same position that they are today? The only difference that occurs to me is that they would be likely to get a still better price, inasmuch as the market would be more widely extended,
the more people could afford to pay for the liqueur. The Socialist recognizes clearly that any one who has a personal monopoly, whether it be a talent for painting a picture or directing a railroad, or for making a peculiar liqueur, will always be in a position to demand from the public a competitive price for the use of his talent. The only stipulation that Socialists make is that the price charged shall never be a mortgage upon the producers for all time.

No Change in "Human Nature" Needed.

Mr. Mallock further says that until human nature undergoes a radical change, men will not rush so eagerly to build a house while bricks are falling all about them like snowflakes, and killing every tenth man, as were the Japanese to risk death upon the field of battle. But let me point out that if he should investigate the record of accidents on the railroads of the United States, he would find that men do enter the industrial army with an even better chance of being killed than that of the Japanese soldier who stormed Port Arthur. And if men enter the service of the railroads to-day with such a certainty of death, and being, withal, so poorly paid, there will surely be no question but that under Socialism we shall find all the volunteers we want, since accidents will have been practically eliminated. For it is well known that the accidents on American railroads are due to a great extent to the greed of these very "men of ability," whom Mr. Mallock seems to think such a necessary factor in our industrial system. In short, it is found less expensive to work men long hours and pay damages for deaths and accidents, than to pay them just wages for normal hours.

If Mr. Mallock can show that the people, on the whole, are getting direct and tangible benefit by the
payment to Mr. Astor of a rent of twenty million dollars a year for land in New York City, and a like sum to Mr. Rockefeller for the privilege of using his oil refineries, then, no doubt, we should allow things to remain as they are. On the other hand, if Messrs. Astor and Rockefeller cannot show satisfactory returns to the public for the incomes they enjoy, it is but natural to suppose that sooner or later the public will demand a change.

**An Evolutionary Process.**

Finally, let me say that the Socialists do not desire to impose a new order of things upon society, as Mr. Mallock supposes, but simply declare that society is undergoing a process of evolution. To evolution was due the change from slavery to feudalism, and from feudalism to capitalism, and evolution will be likewise responsible for the coming change to Socialism. I may add that the particular reason that forced the change from feudalism to capitalism was the introduction of machinery, and that the use of this machinery, and the consequent enormously increased production, which cannot be consumed under our competitive system, is the cause which will finally force the change from the capitalist, or competitive, method of distribution to the co-operative method. We now have production under the co-operative plan, directed by capitalists; the next step will be distribution under the co-operative plan, directed by the workers,—or Socialism. But when I say directed by the workers, I must again remind Mr. Mallock that the Socialist includes the director of superior ability in the word worker, and is willing to pay him the price of his services.

The Socialist views the Trust with the greatest interest; to him it is a sign of the end of our com-
petitive system, the beginning of the breaking-up of capitalism. The Trust is a bulwark raised by the capitalist to prevent being submerged by the over-production of unnecessary machinery. It is, however, but a temporary bulwark: when the breakdown comes, no business, whether protected by a Trust or otherwise, will survive.

The coming collapse of capitalism will mean not only the bankruptcy of the capitalist because of his inability to make profits, but also the starvation of the workingman, because he will be unemployed. I therefore foresee a period in which the workingman will become a Socialist in order to save his life, and in which the capitalist will, at least, see the uselessness of continuing a system which no longer rewards the “men of ability.” It is not illogical, therefore, to assume that when this point is reached, the Socialist party will recruit itself equally from the capitalist class and from the workers.

War Keeps Our Industrial System Going.

The American Revolutionary War was fought that we might bring our political machine under the control of the whole people. The next revolutionary struggle in this country will be when the people decide that not only should the political machine be managed democratically, but the industrial machine as well.

Does Mr. Mallock think that democracy which did not pale before the frowns of Popes and Emperors, will surrender at the behest of a Rockefeller or a Morgan? The industrial system of to-day would have been in a state of shipwreck had it not been for three recent wars which have devastated the earth, namely, the Spanish-American war, the Boer-British war, and the Russo-Japanese war. These conflicts, by the destruction of an enormous amount of property, and by the
taking away of millions of men from the productive processes of industry, have created a demand which has stimulated industry throughout the world. The effect of these wars, however, is rapidly wearing off, and unless another intervenes, or more earthquakes occur to bring down our cities, requiring labor for the rebuilding, I can see no possibility of the world's avoiding a period of over-production, followed by a fall of prices so great as to render certain productive processes unprofitable. This, in turn, will lead to the shutting down of factories, and will give rise to an unemployed problem, which can only end in the voters demanding that we change the existing system—a system that threatens us with famine because we have the power to produce too much.

An Anatomical Illustration.

IV.

Doctors tell us that the human heart may be removed from the living body and kept alive artificially for a period of at least twenty-four hours. Let us suppose that a man were to go into a hospital where this experiment were being performed, and should be shown a heart still beating lying upon the dissecting table. If he knew nothing of the history of the case, he would naturally be astonished, and would wonder why nature had created such an object—a heart beating without a body to beat for. Indeed, if one could imagine the heart having a consciousness, one would naturally conclude that it found life under such circumstances very discouraging. Why should the heart care to live when it has no body to beat for? Might it not ask the same question that Mr. Mallock propounded some twenty years ago in the title of his novel, "Is Life Worth Living?"
The essential difference between Mr. Mallock’s view of the relation of the individual to society and that of the Socialist, is that the latter regards the individual as part of an organism, namely, human society. Mr. Mallock sees no such relationship: hence it is quite comprehensible that he should ask “is life worth living?” The Socialist looks upon the individual as definitely related to society, and as having as definite functions to perform for the preservation of that organism as has the heart for the preservation of the body.

It is just as important, furthermore, that the body nourish the heart properly while the latter performs its function, and it would be as great a mistake to over-nourish as to under-nourish that organ. For if the heart be nourished improperly, it beats irregularly, and the whole body suffers. No one would contend that the heart, because it is such an important member, should receive more nourishment than it needs merely because of its importance; much less that it should receive its nourishment, at the expense, say, of the liver or the lungs. Nor would anyone think of the body’s being so organized that if it produced more than enough for its necessary nourishment, the surplus should be turned over to certain important organs without reference to their necessity, but merely because they are in a position to demand it by reason of their superior digestive ability.

**Society an Organism.**

In the animal organism, injury to a part is injury to the whole. A pain in the finger is a pain to the body. The organism is just as much interested in relieving a pain in the finger as a pain in the head. There is no discrimination; all must work perfectly for the body to be well. The normal organism, in short, is a perfect democracy; and Socialists would have human
society organized into a similar ideal democracy. The man who cleans out a sewer is as important to society as the man who directs a railway. The leg, being the larger organ, needs more nourishment than the brain, though in order of importance, i.e., the capacity of directing, the brain certainly precedes the leg. But would Mr. Mallock say that, owing to this fact, the brain should receive more nourishment than the leg, whether it need it or not? The man who cleans out the sewer may need more food than the man who directs the railway: would society deny him because of his comparative unimportance? However, when one speaks of the material necessities of life as being the worker's reward for his contribution to production, one really talks in meaningless terms, because under the Socialist system production will be so great that the supply for each will be far greater than anyone could desire.

Anti-Trust Laws Futile.

Socialists quite agree with Mr. Mallock as to the absurdity of men's trying to make laws at variance with the natural law. There is no one readier than the Socialist, for instance, to say that an "anti-trust law" is an utter impossibility, inasmuch as the Trust is but a natural development of our present form of industry. At one time, no doubt, it was necessary to have private ownership of certain properties in order to insure their proper development. On the other hand, it is evident that the day has come when some forms of property should no longer be privately owned. For instance, it was not so many years ago that the Post Office was everywhere a private enterprise, whereas to-day every nation without exception recognizes the necessity of operating it under Government management. The same is true regarding education. At one time all schools were private; to-day there is
a strong tendency to make them public. Even our city fire departments were once private institutions; now they have universally come under public control. And it is the same with the railways, there being now a widespread movement to bring them under public ownership. In these changes from private to public ownership of various institutions, the true cause lies in the desire of society to obtain fuller control of its important functions.

The Trend Toward Concentration and Its Meaning.

The same tendency is also seen in the evolution of private business. Take the case of the Steel Trust, which owns railways, steamship lines, and ore-bearing lands. In the beginning of the steel industry, the capitalist owned merely the rolling-mill, but year by year he came to realize the importance of controlling outside functions necessary to the workings of his mill, and gradually extended his ownership until the Steel Trust to-day is a complete exemplification of the process in private industry which obtains in the national system, namely, the tendency of the superior organ to control all minor organs. The next step in the evolution of the steel industry will be a closer relation between the railways and the Steel Trust—that is, either the Steel Trust will own the railways, or vice versa—and the next and last step will be for the nation to own both.

In this natural development of industry, whether under private or public ownership, one notices the passing of the owners' control and the substitution of salaried officials in their stead. When Japan takes over its railways, the remuneration which the Government railway directors will receive will not be based upon the railways' earnings, but upon what efficient
men can be found to work for. In the United States, likewise, we do not pay our Post Office officials upon a basis of profits earned by that department; and if we did, there would not be any salaries at all, since the Post Office shows a deficiency. We pay them, in fact, a compensation necessary to secure men of the required ability.

**Steel Trust Refutes Mr. Mallock’s Argument.**

Similarly, when the Steel business underwent its evolution from a single rolling-mill to a complex organization comprising not only the mill, but the railways and steamship lines, the blast furnaces and the ore body, there was an elimination of separate owners, and an installation of a central management, which directed the various operations not on the basis of what the “traffic would bear,” but directly in the interests of the Steel Trust. Now the managers of the Steel Trust are eminently qualified to judge what is to their own best interests, and if they have decided that it is better to have a salaried employee in charge of their ore body and railway lines rather than an owner who can determine for himself how much he shall get by the simple process of charging all that the “traffic will bear,” then the Steel Trust is not managed according to the method that Mr. Mallock declares to be the best, and I would suggest that he call Mr. Corey’s attention to this mistake. The evolution of the capitalist system, in fact, is now eliminating the small owner in every line of business, or the very “men of ability” whom Mr. Mallock declares to be so essential to our system of production.

**Brains On the Market Also.**

Mr. Mallock, it seems, would have us believe that among those who get the great rewards for “directive
"ability" are the scientific men, such as the chemists in the steel industry, and that these are more highly paid than manual laborers. As a matter of fact, these brain workers are paid a competitive wage, which very often gives them much less than the manual laborers. It is not difficult to get a good chemist, a graduate of one of our first universities, at a salary of one hundred dollars a month; while many a manual laborer in the steel mill receives as high as two hundred dollars. But while these workers get their one hundred and two hundred dollars respectively, the stockholder, who may do nothing at all, is getting, perhaps, twenty thousand dollars a month.

The capitalist, being the recipient of the surplus product with no necessary effort on his part, very naturally turns a portion over to his wife, and she, in turn, as Mr. Mallock has noticed, spends it for feathers, furs, and diamonds, as among the easiest ways to get rid of it. That Mrs. Astor wears diamonds is no evidence whatever that Mr. Astor has given any special "directive ability" to the country in payment for those diamonds. It simply means that the public has no alternative but to pay Mr. Astor a large income for the use of his land, and that he, on his part, has nothing better to do with the money than to give it to his wife to spend for diamonds.

What Destroys the Family?

In regard to the destruction of family life, which Mr. Mallock alleges to be one of the objects of Socialism, I would point out that the greatest foe to the family is the system that so underpays the laborer that his wife and children are forced to work. What family life can there be if the mother and children must work in the factory? Take the case of an employee of our Subway in New York, with twelve hours of labor a
day, and less than one dollar and a half in wages. Imagine a man supporting a family upon such wages, and picture his family life? I reply to Mr. Mallock that it is the Socialist who is most urgent in demanding child labor legislation, and an eight-hour law to ameliorate such conditions. If we are to preserve the family life, it is necessary to create a condition which will allow the wife and children to remain at home. It is not the theories of Socialists which menace family life, but the hard facts of the competitive system.

In many instances, moreover, the laborer, whether intellectual or manual, receives a wage insufficient to keep his family, unless his wife and children work, for under the present system the whole of the surplus produced by labor falls automatically into the laps of those who own the machinery of production. Now as better machinery is introduced and the product increases, the income of the capitalist increases accordingly; but the workers get the same as before, merely their keep. The latter, in fact, are paid upon the same basis as mules are fed. Through the use of better machinery and more fertilizers, the product of the farm may be increased one hundred per cent, but the mules get the same quantity of oats as ever, merely enough to keep them, while the increase of the product goes to the man who owns the farm. We Americans under the present system are practically in the position of these mules. The product increases from year to year, but we don't get it. We hand it over to the capitalists who own America, and we do this because we can't help it. The capitalists, on the other hand, take it because they can't help it—there is no one else for it to go to.

**Take It Or Leave It.**

A singular fallacy that Mr. Mallock holds regarding the present system of production, is that the capitalist
is rewarded for his special ability because he supplies the public with a particular quality of goods. He is compared to the brewer who, by furnishing good beer to the public, prospers, at the expense of those who furnish bad beer. But the capitalists, as a class, do not receive their profits because of the superior quality of the commodities they furnish, but because the commodities furnished are necessities which the public must buy, be they good or bad. The Gas Company of New York is paid for its gas, whatever the quality may be, simply because there is no other company to buy from. We hang on the straps in our Subway not because we best enjoy that method of transportation, but because no other transportation is offered. We pay rent to Mr. Astor not that we like his particular house, but because there is none other to be had. In these, as in many other things, we have no option. We are in the hands of the Trust.

Wicked Laborer, Virtuous Capitalist.

It is interesting, not to say amusing, to notice the varied terminology which Mr. Mallock applies to the manual laborer and the capitalist. It is “free bargaining” between the public and the capitalist; but in the case of workingmen’s refusing to work for the price offered,—the strike—he calls it “harassing” the employer. I wonder why he never speaks of the capitalist’s “harassing” the public when he refuses to give them his wonderful directive ability until he gets his price?

The Cash Nexus.

While I quite agree with Mr. Mallock in the importance of a ship’s crew recognizing the necessity of protecting the captain’s life, I would point out, on the other hand, that there is no greater disgrace than for
a captain to leave a sinking vessel before the crew are safe. No matter what ability Captain McVey, of the ill-fated Larchmont, may possess, the very fact that his life was saved while so many were lost, will forever be a stain upon his reputation. The relation between the men directed and the man who directs is reciprocal, just as reciprocal, in fact, as the relation between the head and the body. The body must protect the head if it would live, and the head, for the same reason, must protect the body. Under our modern system the capitalist has no care for the laborers, and loses nothing if they die. The nexus joining the capitalist to the laborer is cash, but the Socialist is striving to establish a more human nexus between man and man, the sense of the oneness of humanity, of solidarity.

Summary and Conclusion.

To sum up briefly my reply to Mr. Mallock, I would say that I deny that the Socialists have in mind a future state in which the man of superior ability will not be at liberty effectively to demand a proportionate reward, although it is true we are very doubtful whether he will ever desire to make any such demand. Nevertheless, we acknowledge that the man of ability, having a monopoly of which he cannot be deprived, will always be in a position, whatever the form of society, to enforce his demand for higher pay, and the public is in no position effectively to resist that demand.

On the other hand, so far as the capitalist is concerned, we assert that he gets the larger share not because of his superior ability, but because he owns the machinery of production. Socialists declare that by nationalizing this machinery of production, the actual producers will come into possession of the income
which now goes to the capitalist. But we include in the term producers, the man of ability, the artist, and the hod-carrier. The Socialist says that the larger the product which may be distributed among the workers, the larger will be the reward of the man of superior ability. Therefore, I conclude, if it be so desirable, as Mr. Mallock asserts, that the man of superior ability be amply rewarded, there is but one consistent course for him to pursue: let him take his natural place in the ranks of the Socialists who demand that the non-producer shall no longer consume at the expense of the producer.
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The capitalist world has studiously endeavored to conceal the fact that the famous political economist became a Socialist in his latter days, and were largely successful for the reason that Mill's views on Socialism were contained almost altogether in posthumous papers. Mills naturally knew little of Socialism from the Marxian standpoint, but none the less his work will be found extremely interesting to modern students of the movement. Price $1.00 postpaid.
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Spencer has been generally regarded as one of the most powerful intellects that ever existed, and a perusal of this work will amply repay the effort expended. As is well known, Spencer regarded Socialism as the coming slavery—inevitable, but still slavery, and wrote a special essay on the subject which is still frequently quoted by opponents of Socialism. A considerable portion of this book is devoted to this famous essay, and Mr. Owen's comments on it will be found peculiarly instructive to all Socialists. Price $1.00 postpaid.
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By Karl Marx.


This well-known treatise on money is one of the most prominent of Marx's writings. It constitutes the basis upon which Marx first laid down his fundamental principles of political economy, and for this reason it is of great importance to the student.

The book has also a particular importance as the first real scientific work on economics that Marx wrote, containing in the preface the formulation of his philosophy known as the Materialistic Interpretation of History.

The appendix contains a General Review of Political Economy, abounding in brilliant and most suggestive ideas on the subject. This has just been made public among the posthumous papers of Marx, and is published in book form for the first time in any language.

THE SILVER CROSS;
Or, The Carpenter of Nazareth.

A translation from the French of Eugene Sue.


The plain but thrilling story told in a masterly manner by the great French author, gets hold of the reader as soon as he starts to read it. Stripped of the Church garb, Jesus appears before us the type of the earnest, honest, radical leader of the people, a figure which history has reproduced with slight variations in every crucial period in the progress of mankind, when the older order of things had reached its climax and was about to give way to the new.

As a picture of society and the social classes of that epoch with the class struggle raging within it, this story will throw a strong light on our conditions of to-day.
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The story of the revolt of the people of Paris against the surrender of the city by the Government of France to the German conquerors; of how the propertied classes by their withdrawal when the revolt became armed rebellion against the corrupt French state, placed it in the hands of the proletariat; and of its final form as an expression of the economic and political ideals of the wage workers, who were at all times its militant backbone—this is the greatest story of struggle, achievement and defeat in the history of labor.

The administration of the affairs of daily life—finance, police, justice, education, labor and exchange—and the maintenance of real liberty, this constitutes the success of the Commune.

The betrayals by false leaders, the sacrifice in the struggle, the final failure, and the governmental murder of thirty thousand men, women and children—this, in rough outline, is the end of the Commune,—the close of the reign of the workers in the city of Paris in the year 1871.

Lissagaray narrates this story in an impartial manner—"and if he has erred, it has been on the side of moderation, in his anxiety not to make a single statement that could not be corroborated by overwhelming proofs of its truth."

"The History of the Commune" opens with a prologue which gives the details of the campaign by which the Prussians obtained control of Paris. The first attacks of the coalition against Paris, the formation of the Central Committee, the proclamation of the Commune, the conspiracies against it, the massacres, the pitched battles—these and much more are told in forceful language by Lissagaray.

The time has come when all who would be considered intelligent and well informed, must know the story of the Commune. And every Socialist owes it to himself as well as to the cause to be informed, to know the reasons for the success and the failure of the Commune. There is no excuse for ignorance on this point, for Lissagaray's History is comprehensive, lucid and impartial.

Well printed and bound in substantial cloth, it is a book that tempts one to read and learn its lessons. We have a limited supply in stock of the famous edition, always sold heretofore at $3.00. Our special price, $1.50. Send your orders in early.
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ERNEST UNTERMANN,
Member of National Executive Committee Socialist Party and one of the foremost Socialist scholars in the world.

I heartily agree with every statement of principle which you make. There are some places where I might get up a discussion with you, but none of them concern the crux of your whole work, the Trust problem, they are side issues or minor points. Fundamentally we are agreed not only on matters of Socialist economics, but also on matters of wider Socialist philosophy. Your position on the Trust problem is in perfect agreement so far as the outcome is concerned, with Marxian economics, and even in the explanation of the causes of the accumulation of capital you are in accord with Marx, only that Marx goes more deeply into the mechanism of capitalist accumulation.

EUGENE V. DEBS.

My Dear Wilshire:—Let me thank you right heartily for the splendid volume of "Wilshire Editorials" which came in my absence, and which I shall read with interest and preserve with pleasure.

These are busy days, but I note that you are keeping well up in the procession. You are sending out a vast amount of good stuff, and I hope your rapid-firing machinery will increase in capacity and keep in good working order. I send love and greeting.
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