

# **FIFTEEN QUESTIONS ABOUT SOCIALISM**

**By Daniel De Leon**



**Published by  
Socialist Labor Party of America  
[www.slp.org](http://www.slp.org)  
2005**

# FIFTEEN QUESTIONS

Asked by

**THE PROVIDENCE, R. I., "VISITOR"**

Representing the

**Roman Catholic Political Machine**

Answered by

**Daniel De Leon**

Representing the

**Socialist Labor Party**

---

PRICE TWENTY CENTS

---

Published by

**NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY**

45 Rose Street, New York

1914

# FIFTEEN QUESTIONS

Asked by  
**THE PROVIDENCE, R. I., "VISITOR"**  
Representing the  
**Roman Catholic Political Machine**

Answered by  
**Daniel De Leon**  
Representing the  
**Socialist Labor Party**

---

**FIRST EDITION**

---

Published by  
**NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY**  
45 Rose Street, New York

1914

## P R E F A C E

---

The fifteen questions in this pamphlet were propounded by the Providence, R. I., "Visitor," an Ultramontane, hence, political Roman Catholic weekly publication, in its issue of September 12, 1913, and were headed with this recommendation:—

"The next time you hear a Socialist soap-box orator you might interest him in the following list of questions. Clip these questions and carry them with you."

The Daily People, seeing that the "Visitor" voiced the political and economic creed of Ultramontaniam, while it itself expressed the political and economic creed of Socialism, and, holding furthermore, that, judging by the signs of the times, the economic and political forces of Capitalism in the land would gather to a head under the political and economic banner of Ultramontaniam, while the economic and political forces of Labor would be marshalled under the political and economic banner of Socialism for a final struggle between Capitalism and Socialism, immediately took up the "Visitor's" questions and answered them editorially, promising to invite the "Visitor" to reciprocate by answering a set of fifteen questions propounded to it. The questions answered by the Daily People are here presented in more available and lasting form.

**NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,  
SOCIALIST LABOR PARTY.**

New York, N. Y., 1914.

# CONTENTS

---

|  | PAGE |
|--|------|
| Preface .....  | 5    |
| Question   |      |
| I. How Determine Worker's Income?.....                               | 9    |
| II. Same Incomes for All?.....                                       | 13   |
| III. Won't Superior Ability Suffer?.....                             | 14   |
| IV. Will Not Some Get Less than Full<br>Product? .....               | 22   |
| V. Who Will Support "Non - Productive<br>Hordes"? .....              | 28   |
| VI. How Tell "True" Value of Worker's Toil?                          | 36   |
| VII. What of Professor's Pay and Brakeman's                          | 42   |
| VIII. Will Not Socialism Require More<br>Workers? .....              | 52   |
| IX. Will Not Cost of Production Increase<br>with Reduced Hours?..... | 58   |
| X. Will Not More Government Officials Be<br>Needed? .....            | 64   |
| XI. Can Enough Be Produced with Fewer<br>Hours? .....                | 75   |
| XII. Will Socialists Confiscate Capital?.....                        | 84   |
| XIII. How Reward the Inventor?.....                                  | 100  |
| XIV. Will the Industrious Divide with the<br>Lazy? .....             | 108  |
| XV. What Will Be Done with the Farm<br>Lands? .....                  | 117  |

# FIFTEEN QUESTIONS

---

## QUESTION NO. I.

**“How will the Co-operative Commonwealth determine the income of each worker?”**

**ANSWER:—**

In order that the answer to the question be understood, two things must first be grasped, and kept in mind.

One is the factor which determines the worker's income today; and that involves the worker's status under Capitalism.

The other thing is the worker's changed status in the Co-operative Commonwealth; from which status flows the factor which will then determine the worker's income.

How is the worker's income determined today, under Capitalism?

The income of the worker is his wages.

That which determines the wages of the worker today is the supply and demand for Labor in the Labor market.

If the supply is relatively large, the price of labor-power, that is, wages, which means income, will be relatively low. If the demand is relatively large, then the income, that is, wages, will rise.

As the Law of Gravitation may be, and is, perturbed

by a number of perturbing causes, so with the Law of Wages:—combinations of workers, on the one hand, may counteract an excessive supply of Labor in the Labor market, and keep wages up; on the other hand, capitalist outrages, such as shanghaiing, not to mention innumerable others, may counteract a small supply of Labor in the Labor market, and keep wages down. In the long run the perturbing causes cease to be perceptible factors, and the Law of Supply and Demand re-asserts itself.

It follows that, under Capitalism, the status of the worker is not that of a human. His income being his price, and his price being controlled by the identical law that controls the prices of all other articles of merchandise, under Capitalism the worker is a chattel. In so far as he is a "worker" he is no better than cattle on the hoof—all affectation to the contrary notwithstanding.

What, on the contrary, is the worker's status in the Co-operative Commonwealth?

"Co-operative Commonwealth" is a technical term; it is another name for the Socialist or Industrial Republic. He who says "Co-operative Commonwealth" means, must mean, a social system that its advocates maintain flows from a previous, the present, the Capitalist regimen; a social system that its advocates maintain is made compulsory upon society by the impossible conditions which the Capitalist regimen brings to a head; finally, a social system which its advocates maintain that, seeing it is at once the offspring of Capitalism and the redress of Capitalist ills, saves and partakes of the gifts that Capitalism has contributed to the race's progress, and lops off the ills with which Capitalism itself cancels its

own gifts. The issue of wages, or the worker's income, throws up one of the leading ills of Capitalism.

The Co-operative Commonwealth revolutionizes the status of the worker. From being the merchandise he now is, he is transformed into a human. The transformation is effected by his pulling himself out and away from the stalls in the market where today he stands beside cattle, bales of hay and crates of crockery, and taking his place as a citizen in full enjoyment of the highest civic status of the race.

The means for the transformation is the collective ownership of all the necessaries for production, and their operation for use, instead of their private ownership by the Capitalist, and their operation for sale and profits.

The worker's collective ownership of that which, being stripped of under Capitalism, turns him into a wage-slave and chattel, determines his new status. The revolutionized status, in turn, determines his income.

Whereas, under Capitalism, the very question whether the worker shall at all have an income depends upon the judgment, the will or the whim of the Capitalist, whether the wheels of production shall move, or shall lie idle,—in the Co-operative Commonwealth, where the worker himself owns the necessaries for production, no such precariousness of income can hang over his head.

Whereas, under Capitalism, a stoppage of production comes about when the capitalist fears that continued production may congest the market, thereby forcing profits down, and never comes about because there is no need of his useful articles,—in the Co-operative Commonwealth, use and not sale and profits being the sole



purpose of production, no such stoppage of production, hence, of income, is conceivable.

Whereas, under Capitalism, improved methods of production have an eye solely to an increase of profits, and therefore are equivalent to throwing workers out of work,—in the Co-operative Commonwealth, use and not sale and profits, popular wellbeing and not individual richness, being the sole object in view, improved methods of production, instead of throwing workers out of work, will throw out hours of work, and keep steady, if they do not increase, the flow of income.

Consequently, and finally—

The Co-operative Commonwealth will not determine, the Co-operative Commonwealth will leave it to each worker himself to determine his income; and that income will total up to his share in the product of the collective labor of the Commonwealth, to the extent of his own efforts, multiplied with the free natural opportunities and with the social facilities (machinery, methods, etc.) that the genius of society may make possible.

In other words—differently from the state of things under Capitalism, where the worker's fate is at the mercy of the capitalist—in the Co-operative Commonwealth the worker will himself determine, will himself be the architect of his fate,

## QUESTION NO. II.

“Will each worker, skilled or unskilled, receive the same income?”

ANSWER:—

The answer to this was virtually given in the preceding question.

Answering the preceding question—How will the Co-operative Commonwealth determine the income of each worker?—it was established that the income of each worker would be determined by himself, inasmuch as his income would “total up to his share in the product of the collective labor of the Commonwealth, TO THE EXTENT OF HIS OWN EFFORTS,” etc.

It follows that, so far as “income” is concerned, that will depend, not upon the category of the worker, or work done,—whether “skilled” or “unskilled”—but upon the rate of effort that the worker will have contributed towards the totality of the collective work done.

The income of the skilled worker, who loiters, will be less than the income of his unskilled fellow-worker who bestirs himself.

### QUESTION NO. III.

**"If all receive the same rate of compensation, will not such a system forever rob the superior workers of a part of their superior ability?"**

ANSWER:—

The question is grammatically defective. Surely the questioner can not mean that there can be a system of compensation that could rob a superior worker "of a part of his superior ability." Not unless a worker suffers physical injury could his ability be impaired; "robbed" it could not be. A worker may be robbed of the whole fruit of his ability, yet his ability will remain intact. What the questioner means is "a part of the fruit of his superior ability." The question would then read:

**"If all receive the same rate of compensation, will not such a system forever rob the superior worker of a part of the fruit of his superior ability?"**

The grammatical defect being eliminated, the question will next have to be cleansed of an ethical defect. It is un-ethical to assume an important fact, without specifically asserting its correctness, and then to proceed as if the alleged fact were an established one. Such a method amounts to the surreptitious injection of premises. The method is a favorite one with the Jesuit and Ultramontane Fathers Escobar and Hurtado. Ethics condemns the method; science will none of it.

The premises which the question assumes as granted is that in the Co-operative Commonwealth all workers

receive the same rate of compensation. The assumption is not weakened by being put conditionally. It amounts to the surreptitious injection of premises for which there is no warrant.

Cleansed of this ethical defect, and its grammatical error expunged, the question should be divided in two, and read:

“Are the rates of compensation in the Co-operative Commonwealth to be different for different workers, say, for workers of superior ability and of inferior ability? If the rates of compensation are to be different, what will determine them?”

“If all receive the same rate of compensation, will not such a system forever rob the superior workers of a part of the fruit of their superior ability?”

Seeing that the Co-operative Commonwealth is not a mechanical contrivance, contrived to accomplish a certain result, but is an evolutionary social growth, the conditions, at any rate the rough outlines of conditions, in the Co-operative Commonwealth flow from sociologic and economic facts. These facts being ascertained and grasped, the conditions follow.

The sociologic and economic facts that bear upon the question whether the rates of compensation in the Co-operative Commonwealth will be different for workers of superior and inferior ability, and, if so, what will determine them, are these:

1st economic and sociologic fact.—Useful work falls under two categories.

Useful work is either directly or indirectly productive of material objects, conducive to physical wellbeing.

—For instance:—

The men at the bench, who turn out the several parts that finally combine in a shoe, are directly productive.

The men engaged in the clerical work, requisite for the operation of a boot and shoe plant, are indirectly productive.

The two sets—"manual" work, so-called, and "clerical" work, so-called,—combine in producing a material object, necessary for physical wellbeing.

The second category under which useful work falls is that of work that is productive, neither directly nor indirectly, of material objects, but is conducive to mental or moral expansion.

—For instance:—

The heart, which, pregnant with celestial fire, gives birth to a poem that thrills the mind with lofty emotion; the hand that to ecstasy wakes the living lyre; the scientist, whose combined imagination and trained powers discover a secret of Nature;—the work of these and all such workers, tho' it produce no material object, is conducive to mental and moral elevation.

2nd economic and sociologic fact.—Tho' "man doth not live by bread only," neither can he live without "bread." Inestimable tho' the useful work be that is neither directly nor indirectly productive of material objects, the usefulness of such work is conditioned upon material existence. "A living dog is better than a dead lion," sayeth The Preacher.

3rd economic and sociologic fact.—As with the individual, so with society. Material existence, hence, material conditions, is the foundation of all else. Hence,

society concerns itself, first of all, with useful work that either directly or indirectly ministers to physical well-being. That is the starting point for all else as ultimate results.

4th economic and sociologic fact.—Useful work that is productive of material objects consumes unequal amounts of tissue in a given time. The amount of tissue thus consumed by the worker in useful production determines the rate of his toil, and that rate determines the rate of his contribution to the social store.

5th economic and sociologic fact.—As set forth in the answer to Question No. I., under the present, or capitalist regimen, in which the necessaries for production are held privately, and are operated for the sake of sale and profit, the worker's "income"—which means his total earnings—is determined by the merchandise Law of Supply and Demand. Seeing that improved machinery and methods tend to throw labor out of work, they tend to raise the supply of labor, and thereby to lower the price of labor-power—which is the worker's rate of compensation. Thus the factor, which determines the rate of the worker's toil, has, under the capitalist regimen, no regard for the factor which determines the rate of the same worker's contribution to the social store.

It follows from the synthesis of these sociologic and economic facts:—

1st. That in the Co-operative Commonwealth, where the necessaries for production are collective property, operated for use, the worker's rate of compensation will not be the same, but will depend upon that which determines the individual worker's rate of contribution to the

social store, to wit, the amount or rate of tissue that he expends in a given time.

2nd. That the method to ascertain the individual worker's rate of tissue expended in production must be substantially that which fatedly works human degradation under the capitalist regimen, but under the Socialist regimen must, as inevitably, have a contrary effect.

A simple illustration will make the point clear.

Say conductors and motormen are wanted on a new traction line. Say that there are 200 cars to be equipped. There will be wanted an equal number of each—200 motormen and 200 conductors.

What is the practical working of the economic and sociologic facts under the capitalist regimen? The large supply of undifferentiated labor will cause an excess of applicants for both jobs, with the consequence that the price of the applicants' labor-power will be depressed. Another effect will be that, in the very nature of things, many more will apply for the function of conductor than for that of motorman, with the further consequence that the price of the conductors' labor-power will suffer an even severer depression. Craft Unionism, "labor laws" requiring a certain length of residence from applicants, together with other such makeshifts and patchwork, may temporarily counteract these effects; they can neither permanently check them, nor yet prevent their aggravation.

Starting, on the contrary, under the regimen of the Co-operative Commonwealth, the same economic and sociologic laws work differently. Given the instance of 200 conductors and 200 motormen being needed, the

supply of conductors, which will be indicated by the number of applicants for conductors' function, and the supply of motormen, which will be indicated by the number of applicants for motormen's function, will be an exact index of the amount of tissue expended in each function. Temperamental and other exceptional causes being left aside, it will be found that the preference will be generally given by the applicants to the pleasanter, or easier, function, that is, to the function that consumes less tissue. Say that, in the instance under consideration, 400 workers apply for the function of conductor, while only 50 apply for the function of motorman, it would follow that 1 hour of a motorman's function consumes as much tissue as do 8 hours of a conductor's. The rate of tissue consumption being the index of the contribution to the social store, and the rate of contribution to the social store being the index for the rate of compensation, the motorman's 1 hour would receive a compensation equal to the conductor's 8 hours. The huge advantage of leisure that the motorman's function would thus be found to enjoy, and the conductor's function to be deprived of, would have the effect of counterbalancing the discrepancy in the consumption of tissue. A deflection of applicants from the conductors' to the motormen's function would set in. The effect of this effect would be the equilibration of the relative hours of the two. The action and re-action upon one another of these effects and counter-effects will ultimately and unerringly adjust the number of hours of the motorman's function which, all told, would be equivalent to the number of hours of the conductor's function. If, say, in the final adjustment



2 hours of the motorman's function are equal to 4 of the conductor's, then the voucher for labor performed,—that is, for contribution made to the social store,—paid out to the motorman for 2 hours' work will enable him to draw from the social store as much wealth as the voucher paid out to the conductor for 4 hours' work; and the voucher paid out to either will enable them to draw from the social store as much of the wealth produced by the other workers as they, motormen and conductors, respectively, contributed to the same store.

It will escape none but those whose powers of perception are clouded by bourgeois class interests; or by habits of thought; or by some other hindrance to rectitude of reasoning;—it will escape none other than the process for determining the worker's rate of compensation in the Co-operative Commonwealth follows, as has been indicated, the identical lines that are followed under Capitalism, to wit, the line of supply and demand, with, however, the difference that, whereas under Capitalism the process works evil, hence, injustice to the worker, under Socialism the process works good, hence, justice,—a justice that the abundance of wealth for all, producible today, underscores the injustice that obtains under Capitalism.

This latter and further feature of the subject, though entitled to incidental mention at this place, belongs for fuller consideration under Question No. XI.

It having been shown that the rate of compensation in the Co-operative Commonwealth will not be the same for all workers, and the method for determining the rate of compensation that the workers are entitled to in their

several functions having been set forth, the last portion of the question under consideration—whether, if all receive the same rate of compensation, the superior worker would not be robbed of a part of the fruit of his superior ability—has nothing left to be answered,—except in so far as the fact is undeniable that hardly any two workers, in the identical function, work with equal efficiency, a fact the consideration of which belongs in the answer to the next question.

#### QUESTION NO. IV.

**“And will not this conflict with the oft-repeated assertion of Socialists that the workers will receive the full product of their toil?”**

ANSWER:—

It is evident that this question is grounded upon the assumption that the answer to the question immediately preceding would be that in the Co-operative Commonwealth the “rate of compensation” was to be the same in all occupations. Seeing the answer was “otherwise and to the contrary” the present question would seem to have been disposed of.

In a way, it is so; not so in another.

This question, as well as the preceding ones, and several of the rest, betrays much looseness of thought, with consequent looseness of expression. It is evident the questioner jumbles together “occupational” work and “individual” work. We shall not take advantage of his confusion of thought. Having in the previous answer considered the “rate of compensation” by occupation, we shall now consider the “rate of compensation” by the individual worker.

The texture of the question justifies the belief that in the questioner’s mind there floats, undefined, the impression that individuals do not all produce the same amount of wealth, hence, that, either the individual can not possibly receive the “full product of his toil,” in case all are remunerated alike; or the “oft-repeated assertion

of Socialists that the workers will receive the full product of their toil" is hollow.

The "nut" that the question presents is no "nut" at all. In so far as it be a "nut," the nut has been amply cracked by economic science.

Grappling with the "nut" Marx says:

"In every industry, each individual worker, be he Peter or Paul, differs from the average worker. These individual differences, 'errors' as they are called in mathematics, compensate one another, and vanish whenever a certain minimum of workmen are employed together."

As an evidence that this view is neither new, nor revolutionary, but was a matter of common observation and experience, Marx quotes the thorough-paced bourgeois philosopher Edmund Burke, who records his observation and experience in the following express and expressive terms:

"Unquestionably, there is a good deal of difference between the value of one man's labor and that of another from strength, dexterity and honest application. But I am quite sure, from my best observations, that any given five men will, in their total, afford a proportion of labor equal to any other five within the periods of life which I have stated; that is, among such five men there will be one possessing all the qualifications of a good workman, one bad, and the other three middling, and approximating to the first and the last. So that in so small a platoon as that of even five, you will find the full complement of all that five men can earn."

In other words, even when those working together

are as few as five, all individual differences in the quantity of the wealth produced by each vanishes, and consequently, any given five workingmen, working together, "will," to quote Marx again, "in the same time do as much work as any other five."

The "nut" is involved in the subject known to political economy as "Co-operation."

Co-operation, or collective labor, brings out and establishes a political-economic fact from which flow two principles—one of sociology, the other of logic—both of which bear directly upon the question in hand.

The political-economic fact brought out and established by Co-operation is that the joint product of cooperating workers is larger than the sum of the products of the same workers, if they worked separately, individually, isolatedly. For instance: If five men worked isolatedly at the same industry, and the sum, or, in the language of Burke, the total, of their product amounted to \$5 worth, then, if the five workingmen co-operated, or worked collectively, their joint product would total up to \$8. The co-operative labor of these five would have yielded an excess of \$3, over and above what the total of their individual, or isolated, labor would have amounted to.

The point is luminously expressed by Marx:

"Just as the offensive power of a squadron of cavalry, or the defensive power of a regiment of infantry is essentially different from the sum of the offensive and defensive powers of the individual cavalry or infantry soldiers taken separately, so the sum total of the mechanical forces exerted by isolated workmen differs from the

social force that is developed when many hands take part simultaneously in one and the same undivided operation, such as raising a heavy weight, turning a winch, or removing an obstacle. In such cases the effect of the combined labor could either not be produced at all by isolated individual labor, or it could only be produced at a great expenditure of time, or on a very dwarfed scale." And Marx ties up the several threads of the economic fact which he recites with the observation that "not only have we here an increase in the productive power of the individual, by means of co-operation, but the creation of a new power, namely, the collective power of masses."

The principle of sociology that flows from this political-economic fact transpires in the answer to the question that the political-economic fact raises:

"Which one of the co-operators is entitled to the increased produce? If all, each according to the volume of his particular product, how shall the apportionment be made?"

Capitalism answers: "None of the co-operators is entitled to the increased produce; it belongs to the Capitalist Class";—and Capitalism makes good the answer by virtue of its placing the necessaries of production in the private hands of the Capitalist Class.

Socialism answers: "Seeing that the increased produce was and could be brought forth by none of the co-operators alone—whether the best, the worst, or the middling; seeing that the increased produce is the yield of a 'social force' that is latent in co-operative, or collective, labor;—seeing all that, the increased produce

belongs to all the co-operators, to none but them, to all share and share alike."

The principle of logic, which flows from the political-economic fact which Co-operation establishes, is one that may lightly be confounded with Equity. Drawing, however, sharp the line between Equity and Logic, and leaving the equity aspect of the principle for when we come to the fifteen questions with which we propose to reciprocate the "Visitor,"—logic, as demonstrated by John Stuart Mill, establishes that, if 50 needs 2 with which to be multiplied in order to produce 100, the 2—however much smaller than the 50—is as essential to the final and desired result as the 50—however much the 50 may be larger than the 2. Seeing that the co-operation of all the workers, whatever the differences among them may be, is requisite to obtain the final and desired volume of product, logic concludes that all the co-operators are at a par, and logic demands that they share alike in the fruit of their joint toil.

The thought that underlies the question in hand, to wit, the unquestionable fact of there being considerable difference in the work of different individuals, is a thought that concerns social conditions which exist no longer. Society no longer is grounded upon individual labor. Society is now grounded upon collective, or co-operative work. Indeed, the conflict that today convulses society is born of the contradiction that exists between collective, that is, the present system of production, and the private ownership of the means of production, that is, the old tenure of property.

To indicate injustice or contradiction in the remuner-

ative methods that the Co-operative Commonwealth proclaims marks him who makes the indication guilty of suggesting what is false, and also of ignorance, or, if not ignorance, of a disposition to trifle:—

—He is guilty of suggesting what is false in that false is the silent implication that Capitalism conscientiously ascertains, and scrupulously apportions their shares to the co-operators. Not only does the Capitalist Class appropriate to itself, normally, the surplus wealth that the individual worker yields over and above the value of his individual labor-power, the Capitalist Class also bags the whole of the increased produce which flows from the collective work of the workers.

—He is also guilty of blameworthy ignorance in that he knows not that society has left behind it the stage of individual, and has entered and rests today upon the stage of collective labor.

—Finally, if not ignorant, then he is guilty of presuming to trifle with so weighty a subject as the Social Question, in that he ponders about trifles of the nature of what is called “errors” in mathematics.

“The oft-repeated assertion of Socialists that the workers will receive the full product of their toil” is in conflict with no principle of science; nor is the Socialist at fisticuffs with himself.



## QUESTION NO. V.

**"If each worker should receive the full product of his toil who will support the vast horde of non-productive workers?"**

**ANSWER:—**

The word "horde" evokes before our mind a thing of evil. Our sense of the term is borne out by the only passage from literature that the Standard Dictionary cites in illustration of the word—the passage from Everett—"The magnificent temples of Egypt were demolished in the sixth century before our Saviour by the hordes which Cambyses had collected from the steppes of Central Asia." Accordingly, the word "horde," especially preceded by the word "vast," is a repetition of the offense committed in Question No. III.—the offense of the surreptitious injecting of premises. The premise, surreptitiously injected in this question, is that in the Co-operative Commonwealth there will be a "vast horde" of non-productive workers. Again, as happened with Question No. III., the assumption in this instance of an unwarranted premise compels the division of the question into its component parts, so that it will read:

**"Will not there be a vast horde of non-productive workers in the Co-operative Commonwealth?"**

**"If there will be such, who will support that vast horde, if each worker should receive the full product of his toil?"**

Before tackling the two propositions, a definition of terms becomes imperative.

What is "productive," and what "non-productive," and what "unproductive" work?

Upon this subject there is a vast amount of confusion of thought. It will be necessary to dispel two manifestations of the confusion.

Take the following chain of closely connected links of work:—

The work of the miner, who mines the coal;

The work of the carter, who carts the coal from the mouth of the mine to the station;

The work of the railroaders, who convey the coal to the centers of population;

The work of the servant, who carries the coal from the cellar to its last destination where it is finally consumed.

There are many other links of work necessary for the continuity of the chain, some subsidiary, others leading. The few that are mentioned will suffice to illustrate the point.

Of course, the work of the miner will be readily and unanimously accepted as "productive." Not so with the work at the other links.

Discriminate analysis, however, establishes that, appearances notwithstanding, every single link of the chain belongs in the category of "productive" work.

The coal is of no use at the mouth of the mine. Its use-value comes into play only on the spot of consumption—the furnace, the cooking, or the heating stove. Seeing that only then is the coal useful, every link of work, necessary for the realization of the coal's use-value, is "productive" work.

This economic fact being established, the numerous other links of work, without the performance of which the use-value of the coal could not conduce to physical wellbeing, will readily occur to the mind, without need of their enumeration. The work done at each of these links—whether it be “manual” or “clerical,” directly or indirectly productive,—is “productive” work.

But these are not yet facts enough from which to deduct the definition of “productive,” and less so of “non-productive” and of “unproductive” work. In order to marshal these further facts, the second manifestation of the confusion of thought regarding “productive,” “non-productive” and “unproductive” work must also be dispelled.

The impression is quite common that “productive” work is any work that brings into existence a material object which did not exist before. In common parlance the impression may pass. In social science it may not.

The work that brings into existence, for instance, a Yale lock to block burglars, or a blackjack for the footpad’s use, or flaming advertising placards, or a Krupp cannon,—all these species of work are, in a sense, “productive”; and he, whose mind has been sufficiently clarified to realize that all the several links of work needed for the fruition of the coal’s use-value also come under the category of “productive” work, might by parity of reasoning conclude that all the several links of work, needed for the realization of the use-value of the Yale lock, the blackjack, the flaming advertising placards, and the Krupp cannon, are likewise “productive.” This is an error in social science.

The consideration of Yale locks, blackjacks, flaming advertising placards, Krupp's cannon, and of all other products of kindred nature, together with the several links of work that are necessary for the realization of their use-values, belong for treatment under Question No. XI. Suffice it here to distinguish that no such work can be dignified with the appellation of productive, because all such work is either harmful to society, or is rendered needful by harmful social conditions, which, once removed, would render the product superfluous, and relegate it to museums, alongside of the thumb-screw and the rack of still darker ages. Such work is "unproductive."

We now have the requisite facts from which to deduce the definition of "productive" and of "unproductive" work.

"Productive" work is that effort of the human brain and brawn from which, directly or indirectly, flow material objects that are conducive to physical wellbeing, and the welfare of society.

"Unproductive" work is the exact opposite—the material objects that it directly or indirectly brings into existence are a waste, and wasteful of human energy.

Finally, there is "non-productive" work to describe and define.

A few simple illustrations will serve.

The school teacher works; so does the detective; so does the clergyman; so does the soldier; so does the lighthouse keeper; so does the lawyer;—and so on through a long list.

While all of these personages work, the work that

they perform has only one feature in common, to wit, their work is productive of no material object, good, bad, or indifferent. Beyond that common point, the different kinds of work that these personages perform differ widely.

They differ, first, in that they partake of the qualities that distinguish "productive" from "unproductive" that is, useful from harmful work:—the teacher and the clergyman and the lighthouse keeper perform work that is useful; on the contrary, the detective, the soldier and the lawyer perform work that is harmful, or that harmful social conditions render necessary.

The work of these personages differs, secondly, in that the work of those who perform useful work differentiates between work that is social and work that is not:—the teacher and the lighthouse keeper perform work that is social, the test whereof is that, however remotely, they do co-operate in the collective work of society: services that, by being specialized, enable the directly and the indirectly "productive" workers to bestow their undivided time upon their work; on the contrary, the clergyman performs work that is non-social, the test of which is that it in no wise co-operates in the collective work of society: such services minister to exclusive needs. in the instance of the clergyman's work, the person who temperamentally is incapable of grasping the philosophy of Matthew VI. 6.—"But thou when thou prayest, enter into thy closet and when thou hast shut thy door, pray to thy Father which is in secret; and thy Father which is in secret, shall reward thee openly"—that person will need an intermediary between

himself and his Creator; others, and that the majority of the population of this country, do not.

Accordingly, work, that is neither directly nor indirectly productive of material objects, yet is useful, is "non-productive." Non-productive work that is not useful falls, broadly, under the category of "unproductive" work.

Thus work is either "productive," or it is "non-productive," or it is "unproductive," the workers in the last of which category are the equivalent of the French "useless mouths"—mouths that must be fed without their returning any service.

Whether the term "non-productive" workers, as used in the present question, actually means what the term stands for; or whether it is used in a special and undefined sense, as might seem from the context of Question X., in which the terms recurs; or whether it is used in the sense of "indirectly productive workers"; or whether it stands for "unproductive workers"; we are unable to determine. The general looseness of the "Visitor's" terminology justifies the belief that the "Visitor" does not itself know.

However that may be, the expression "hordes of non-productive workers" in connection with the Co-operative Commonwealth is a contradiction in terms.

The opportunity for work, together with the certainty of the worker's enjoying the full fruit of his toil, that the Co-operative Commonwealth guarantees to all; man's physical need of exercise, together with the fact that, in point of hours and of conditions of work, work will cease to be a curse and become pleasurable exercise;

the further fact that production—once emancipated from the trammels of being conducted for sale, and having become for use,—will yield an abundance for all, as will appear in the course of the answers to subsequent questions;—these are circumstances and economic facts that inevitably will swell the ranks of the “productive” workers; reduce to a minimum the ranks of the exclusively “non-productive” workers; knock the bottom from under the ranks of the “unproductive” workers; and empty the “reserve army of the unemployed,” workers who are ready, but are not allowed the opportunity to work, that cruelest of the essential conditions for the capitalist regimen.

Accordingly, and now turning directly to the question under consideration:—

As to whether there will be a vast horde of non-productive workers in the Co-operative Commonwealth?—if by “non-productive workers” is mistakenly meant “indirectly productive” workers: Yes, the number will be vast; if by the term is meant what the term actually means: No, the number will be reduced; if by the term is mistakenly meant “unproductive” workers: No, the number will vanish like disease from a healed body.

As to who will support that vast horde?—if the “vast horde” is supposed to consist of “unproductive” workers, there will be none such to support; if the “vast horde” is supposed to consist of “non-productive” or of “indirectly productive” workers, they will support themselves, as they do now, with the difference that, whereas now they support themselves with a pittance of the fruit of their work, the bulk of the fruit of their work being

now plundered from them by the Capitalist Class under the title of "profits," in the Co-operative Commonwealth they will support themselves with the full product of their toil.



## QUESTION NO. VI.

**“As the capabilities of the workers will differ under Socialism, just as they now differ in our Socialistic public school system, how and what way will it be possible to determine the true value of each worker’s toil?”**

**ANSWER:—**

With the exception of one sentence, this question is essentially a repetition of the five previous ones.

The sentence that marks the exception is: “Just as they [the capabilities of the workers] now differ in our Socialistic public school system.”

The sentence, really, is foreign to the subject. It is a digression, intended for a tangle-foot.

Leaving the side-swipe, implied in the digression, for when we shall come to the questions with which we propose to reciprocate, be it here observed in passing that the difference in capabilities, observed “in our Socialistic public school system,” is a disadvantage, or an advantage, whatever you may please to call it, that the Ultramontane parochial school system likewise suffers from, or is blest with, according as you may prefer. The difference in capabilities among pupils is a fact, the recognition of which constitutes the single admirable feature of the pedagogic system of the Jesuit Order. Recognizing the fact of the difference in capabilities, the pedagogic system of the Jesuit Order seeks, at least in theory, to promote the powers that are latent in the different capabilities.

Does the digressive sentence about "our Socialistic public school system" mean to imply that the difference in capabilities, observed in our public school system, is due to our public school system being Socialistic?—If so, then, the sentence is just so much nonsense.

Or does the digressive sentence mean to indicate that our public school system, although Socialistic, hence a sample of what Socialism can do for the human race, reveals the human race's uneradicable feature of consisting of units of different capabilities?—If so, then the sentence is supremely infelicitous, coming from the quarter that it does. It draws attention to the sociologic fact that the capitalist regimen safeguards not even the one good feature of the pedagogic system of the Jesuit Order, but, on the contrary, rides rough-shod over the same. Capitalist Society rolls the steam-roller of the Capitalist Class ruthlessly over the Classes below, crushing them into one amorphous pulp, and annihilating the differences of individuality that flow from different capabilities.

The tangle-foot of "our Socialistic public school system" being laid aside, we may return, un-tangle-footed, to the question proper.

As already stated, what is left of the question is the substance of those that preceded it; hence, is a repetition of erroneous economic and sociologic views, already disposed of, but now dished up in a new sauce—the sauce of "value," the "true value of each worker's toil."

Let us submit the new sauce to the alembic of politico-economic science.

What can be the meaning of "the value of each worker's toil"?

The phrase is vaporous. Condensed, the vapor yields the substantive question, What is the true value of the product of each worker's toil?

The question raises the political-economic question of "value."

Wealth consists of useful products.

Useful products are the fruit of labor.

The value of a useful product of labor is twofold—it either is that quality of the product which indicates the particular human want which it satisfies; or it is that quality which indicates the quantity of other useful products which it is exchangeable with. The former quality determines the product's "use-value"; the latter quality determines the product's "exchange value."

Right here we may allow to evaporate from the alembic the "use-value" quality of the worker's product. Obviously, the question can have no reference to that "value" of the product of the worker's toil. The "true use-value of the product of each worker's toil" obviously is as different as the products themselves. The question can refer only to the "exchange-value" of the product.

Seeing that the exchange-value quality of the product is that quality which indicates the quantity of other useful products which the product is exchangeable with, it is a conclusion of logic that the exchange-value of a product must depend upon something that the product has in common with all others, and the quantity of

which something determines the proportion of the exchange.

The only thing that all products, whatever their use-value may be, have in common is human labor—the labor-power that was expended in their production, that is crystallized or embodied in them, and that they are the depositaries of.

But labor is a social magnitude. It always was since organized society. It becomes more markedly so in the measure of social progress. The mere fact of a given product's embodying a quantity of labor-power equal to that embodied in another product does not establish the equilibrium in their exchangeability. The yard of cloth, produced today with the spindle and loom of three generations ago, embodies an amount of labor-power that is enormously larger than that embodied in a yard of the same cloth turned out by a modern loom, the Northrop loom, for instance. The amount of labor-power embodied in the former yard of cloth may be equal to the amount of labor-power embodied in all the 5,000 yards turned out by the Northrop loom. Will, therefore, the yard of cloth that was turned out by the old-style loom be exchangeable for the 5,000 yards of the Northrop loom? "Far otherwise, and to the contrary." That yard of cloth is worth, is exchangeable with, no more than any one of the 5,000 yards of cloth from the Northrop loom. The excess of labor-power, expended upon the yard of cloth turned out by the old appliances, is labor-power wasted. It is labor-power wasted because it was socially unnecessary. It was socially unnecessary because society had evolved the superior appliances and

methods, whereby 5,000 yards of cloth could be turned out with the same expenditure of labor-power that three generations ago it took to turn out 1 yard.

Accordingly, the value (exchange-value) of a useful product is that quality of the product which is determined by the amount of labor-power socially necessary for its production.

Now, then, How and what way will it be possible to determine the true value of each worker's toil?

N. B. No. 1—"True value," means value in exchange; value, for short. If that which is called "value" is not "true," then it is not "value" at all. "True value" is a tautology.

N. B. No. 2—"The value of each worker's toil," or of "the product of each worker's toil," is a term inapplicable to modern methods of production. The term is a surreptitious injection of the premise that old methods of individual production still obtain. As elaborated in the answer to Question No. IV., the wealth of modern society is produced by co-operative labor. In co-operative labor no product, and no part of any product, is any longer traceable to the individual worker. In co-operative labor the product is the fruit of joint efforts in which inequalities vanish.

Now, again, How and what way will it be possible to determine the value of each worker's toil?

The value of each worker's toil will be determined by the value of the product that flows from the workers' co-operative toil;

The value of the product of the workers' co-operative

toil will depend upon the amount of labor-power socially necessary for the production of the product.

The amount of labor-power socially necessary for the production of the product of the workers' co-operative toil will depend—as elaborated in the answer to Question No. III.—upon the amount of tissue-consumption that the production of the product may demand.

The amount of tissue-consumption that the production of a product demands from the toiler will be determined—as also elaborated in the answer to Question No. III.—by supply and demand.

Whereas, under Capitalism, contrary to the implication that the posture of the "Visitor's" questions falsely suggests, there is, as indicated in the course of previous answers, no conscientious attempt to ascertain, and no scrupulous effort to allot to each worker the share of the product that belongs to him, in the Co-operative Commonwealth, on the contrary, the laws of scientific political economy—operating untrammelled by private interests and the system of production for sale—guide the workers themselves to determine "the value of their toil" to society.

## QUESTION NO. VII.

**“How much more should a college professor receive than a railway brakeman?”**

ANSWER:—

This question is admirable. It is admirable in that it presents an excellent illustration of the degree to which habits of thought can interfere with the understanding of the law, or principle, which lies at the root of even the habit of thought itself. The question is, inferentially, also an illustration of the sorrowful capers that he cuts who denies the materialist conception of history, that is, the material foundation and shaper of principles, or ideals.

Of course, the “Visitor” is of the opinion that “high remuneration for college professors and low remuneration for railway brakemen” is itself a principle, a law of nature. But what the “Visitor” believes does not alter facts.

He who would form an estimate of the bourgeois, from the iniquities and injustices that obtain under Capitalism, would put the bourgeois down as a fiend from Hell. Indeed, such is the Anarchist conception. Violently tho’ our modern bourgeois would bristle at the charge of their conception of Right and Wrong being closely akin to, and differing from, the Anarchist only as the obverse and reverse of the same medal differ, the charge is sound. The Anarchist starts with a principle, or ideal, and seeks its realization without re-

gard to the material facts which determine the possibility of the ideal or principle. The modern bourgeois starts with the habit of a certain standard; forgets, if he ever knew, the material facts which raised the standard; and ends by believing that the standard itself is a principle, or ideal, instead of its being, what it is in fact, a practice fashioned upon and by the anvil and the hammer of material necessity. The Anarch would, for instance, start with the principle that the remuneration of the college professor and the railway brakeman should be the same, without stopping to consider whether the material social conditions will allow the realization of the principle, or ideal; the bourgeois, as we notice, starts with the idea that the present crass difference between the remuneration of college professors and railway brakemen is a fundamental principle, or standard, without any inkling of the material facts that pounded the practice into the existing standard.

Drawing from the psychologic facts thrown up by history a conclusion exactly the opposite from that drawn by those who impute constitutional, God-ordained, depravity to man, the Socialist concludes with the Confucian sage that "as water naturally will run down, but can be forced to flow up by artificial means, man naturally aspires upward and nobly, but can be forced by artificial means downward and ignobly." The bourgeois is no exception, much tho' the imputing to him of the virtue may surprise him.

It is ignoble to remunerate a human being, whose work is necessary to society, whose necessary work, moreover, is perilous, less bountifully than another



human being, whose work, however useful to society, is beset with no danger to life or limb. How, then, comes it that the reverse of the noble principle obtains in bourgeois society? Inquiry into the material foundation of practice, and the shaper of principle, or ideal, into practice, answers the question; and the issue being grounded upon, hearkens back to, a vital page in Social Science.

That page will be found condensed in the following passages from our address on "Woman Suffrage," delivered at Cooper Union on May 8, 1909, under the auspices of the Socialist Women of Greater New York:

"Given a society of, say, one hundred persons, in which, work as they may, all they can produce is one dollar's worth apiece, while five dollars' worth of wealth is the minimum each would require for comfort—given such a society, then its people are upon a level with brute creation; compelled to devote their whole existence to the supplying of their animal needs; ever on the brink of want; hence, dogged by the worst, the most demoralizing of all specters—the specter of want; and, of course, deprived of leisure—that boon without which no room is left for mental and spiritual expansion. In such a society there would be equality, but the equality would be that of pauperism, with all the ills that that implies. This is no imaginary picture. It was the actual condition of our savage ancestors—it is the condition that the ripening of society into classes, with the consequence of the Class Struggle, had the instinctive purpose to pull us out of.

"Of course, there was no 'town meeting' called to

consider the subject as a special order of business; there was no motion made, seconded, debated, and carried. The race marches obedient to certain laws; the more backward it is the less of a hand does itself take in the application of these laws. Early man marched unconsciously in unconscious obedience to the laws that underlie his progress, much as a river flows to its destiny. Only when far advanced, with a fund of past experience that gives him prescience, does man take evolution by the hand, so to speak, and perform an active part in the process.

“Early society, accordingly, faced unconsciously the alternative—

“either, equality—and then remain rooted in brutish and brutifying poverty;

“or, pull out of the rut—at the price of equality.

“Unconsciously, instinctively, society took the latter alternative, instinctively, unconsciously, striking the route of the valley of the Class Struggle.

“It is a plain arithmetical proposition that, given a social stage where the one hundred persons composing it, work as they may, can produce only one dollar's worth of wealth on an average, five dollars' worth being the minimum for comfort—it is a plain arithmetical proposition that under such material conditions, if only as few as five members of the community secure to themselves the amount of wealth necessary for freedom from toil, with the resultant freedom from want and the fear of want, and the leisure required for mental and spiritual expansion—it is a plain arithmetical proposition that the consequence must be intensified evil con-

ditions for the large majority. The Ninety-five will then have to feed the Five. Each of the Ninety-five being unable under the then conditions to produce more than one dollar's worth of wealth, it follows that out of the ninety-five dollars' worth producible by them will have to come the twenty-five needed by the Five. Thenceforth the Ninety-five can not even enjoy the pittance of their own individual one dollar's worth of the fruit of their toil. Thenceforth their share would be seventy dollars' worth of wealth—less than their product. In short, slavery arises."

No more than slavery—whether in the form of "chattel-slavery," or in the form of "wage-slavery"—is a device of hell-hounds, is the hell-houndish present difference in the economic treatment bestowed upon college professors and the economic treatment inflicted upon railway brakemen a device of Satan. Society's economic, material necessity dictated originally the latter as it dictated the former. Material possibilities rendered impossible material wellbeing for all, and curbed the lofty sense of justice.

The bourgeois mental poise, which transpires from the sneer that peeps through a question that counterpoises the college professor with the railway brakeman, is a close kin with the Communist-Anarch's mental poise of ethereal justice, which transpires from the Communist-Anarch's motto: "To each according to his needs."

To the Communist-Anarch the Socialist answers:

"Your ideal is lofty. It is lofty to desire to help the less fortunate. That is not open to dispute. But lofti-

ness of ideal is not, socially, the determining factor in its favor. The determining factor is the material possibility to reach the ideal. The father who has four children, three strong and robust, one not so, would be only too anxious to bestow upon his less favored offspring the additional support that its greater needs call for. And he will do so—provided he is materially able to. If, however, he has not enough even for the minimum support of his stronger children, it will be physically impossible for him to deal with his weaker child 'according to its needs.' The father may stretch a point, or ten points, but reach the requisite, hence, desired point he cannot. Not unless the father has enough wherewith to attend to the minimum required by his stronger children, and has enough left to see to his weaker child, will the latter be provided 'according to its needs.' It is the father's material possibility that constitutes the determining factor. Consequently, the course to pursue is not to set up a standard of loftiness as goal. That standard will rise of itself. It will rise, as daylight bursts forth with the rising sun, from material conditions favoring it. The course to pursue is to grasp the economic development of society. Can the economic development of society produce a sufficiency of wealth to meet the needs of the less favored without crippling all others, and thereby cripple social progress itself? If the economic development of society is such that it cannot—then the motto: 'To each according to his needs' is idle. It is impossible of execution: those who utter the motto are crying in the wilderness. If, however, the economic development of society is such

that it can—then the course to pursue is to buckle down to action, and re-organize society in such manner as to bring its organization abreast of the lofty standard which its own material possibilities themselves raise. The moment, however, this course is pursued in our generation, that moment the Communist-Anarch's standard justly and inevitably droops as obsolete. The moment the economic development of society is grasped, the face of the problem suffers material change. It is no longer the case of a father with four children of unequal strength, and materially unable to meet even the minimum requirements of the robusiter children; it is not even the case of a father with material ability to meet the minimum requirements of his stronger children, and enough left to satisfy the greater needs of the less favored; it is found to be the case of a father holding in his hands the possibility to bestow abundance upon all. What need, then, of the Communist-Anarch's motto: 'To each according to his needs'? The problem regarding the less favored is eliminated. Co-operation upon the gigantic scale, now possible, finds a place for the 'less favored,' as the weak of sight, or otherwise unfit for military duty in the field, find a place in other branches of the German army. The actual cripples, where cripples there be, present no social problem. Then up rises the Socialist motto: 'To each according to his needs.'"

And, turning to the bourgeois who sneeringly contrasts the railway brakeman with the college professor, the Socialist makes answer:

"You slander the humanity within you. But you

know not what you do. You are the victim of your class habits of thought, strengthened by the ignorance that your class interests breed. What you hold to be just, so just that you indulge in sneers, is not just at all. It is an evil consequent upon the race's early economic weakness, which then rendered the injustice imperative. The laborer is worthy of his hire. He who co-operates towards ultimate results is essential to the result. As such he is entitled to an equal share in the result, even leaving out of consideration the peril that attaches to his function in the co-operative chain. The economic impotence of the race in its infancy, coupled with the sociologic law that drove the race to aim at economic potency, obscured the principle of justice. But we live at a stage when the race's one-time economic impotence has grown to giant potency; the sociologic law that served as scaffolding to reach the present stage is sociologically out of date. The justification, or even the extenuation, of social injustice lies behind us. The material possibilities of today plant the railway brakeman a peer of the college professor in the co-operative work of society. Man, turn to history. Read it with discretion and discrimination. It bristles with evidence of the compelling force of material necessity. In the thirty-third edition of his work, 'Woman Under Socialism,' August Bebel sketches the devastated condition of Germany after the religious war of Thirty Years—whole territories and provinces lying waste; hundreds of cities, thousands of villages partially, or wholly, burnt down; the population sunk to a third, a fourth, a fifth, even to an eighth and tenth part; the men carried

off, and of women there being an excess;—whereupon the physical necessity arising of providing the depopulated cities and villages as quickly as possible with an increased number of people, the drastic measure was resorted to of returning to polygamy. In proof of which statement Bebel cites the resolution—adopted only two years after the close of the war, on February 14, 1650, by the Congress of Franconia, convened at Nuremberg, in the Catholic Kingdom of Bavaria,—providing that ‘every male shall be allowed to marry two wives,’ and even ordering that ‘priests and curates, if not ordained, and the canons of religious establishments, shall marry.’ Soon as, or in the measure that, the material necessity ceased, the polygamous laws were suspended, and the Church’s relaxed political-disciplinary institution of celibacy regained its pristine rigidity. Inversely, no longer compelled by economic stress to trample upon his fellow co-operator, his economic needs being easily, comfortably, healthily and abundantly suppliable, the college professor in the Co-operative Commonwealth will spurn as idiotic—the unjust craving could then be attributable only to mental weakness—would spurn as idiotic the base thought of wanting his deserts ‘weighed,’ let alone demanding a larger share of the jointly produced hoard than the already bountiful one which will be his, along with his fellow co-operators’ in all other social functions. With pity for your bourgeois mental and moral deformity, the Socialist organizes your victims, and endeavors to redeem your fellows, to the end of reorganizing society abreast of its material possibilities.”

Now, then, how much more should the college professor receive than a railway brakeman?

Grounded upon the material possibilities of modern society, together with the principles elaborated in the answers to Questions No. I., II., III., IV., and V., the income of a college professor in the Co-operative Commonwealth will normally be no more and no less than that of a railway brakeman. If any difference there should be, the difference will arise from the socially personal misconduct of either,



## QUESTION NO. VIII.

"If we are to reduce the working time to four hours per day under Socialism, as Socialists assert, will it not require the services of two million more railway workers to perform the same service that the 1,500,000 railwaymen now perform? And will not this cost the nation over \$1,000,000 annually more than the present cost for our transportation?"

ANSWER:—

The next question—Question No. IX.—is so much of a piece with this one, being, in fact, but the extension to all other industries of the misconceptions with regard to the relation between hours of work and number of employes, and of the confusion of thought with regard to the cost of production, both of which underlie this question, that we shall omit from this answer, reserving for the next, the consideration of the confusion of thought regarding cost of production, and shall omit from the next, and consider in this answer, the misconceptions regarding the relation between hours of work and number of employes.

In pursuing this consideration we shall not allow ourselves to be drawn aside by matter of such secondary importance as the exact number of hours which Socialists are alleged to assert that the working time will be reduced to; or the actual present figures of the employes engaged in the railway, or any other industry; nor yet, when we come to the matter of cost of pro-

duction, any precise attempted estimate of what the cost will amount to.

The gist of the question is this:

Socialists maintain that the existing hours of work are inhuman, and unnecessarily long; hence, the Socialist program must contemplate a greatly reduced working time. Will not a greatly reduced working time entail a proportional increase in the number of workers, and also a proportional increase in the cost of production?

In the first place, the belief, that decreased hours must necessarily be followed by an increased number of employes, proceeds from the tacitly accepted premise that the full number of present employes is needed for conducting the industries. The premise is false.

—Not in the railway or transportation industry only, in all other well developed industries there is a considerable number of employes, whose status is that of “unproductive” workers, or “useless mouths,” as defined in the answer to Question V. The “spotters,” who are permanently employed along the lines, the “watchers,” who are perpetually kept in the offices or on the floors, to keep alive, if necessary, to throw “the fear of the Lord” into the hearts of employes and of customers, are a type of this order of “workers,” or employes;—and their number is not “a few.”

—Furthermore, even in industries such as the transportation industry, that have attained a high grade of centralization and even trustification, much more so with industries that have not yet reached such a stage, competition is still alive. It is languid and sporadic among

the more concentrated ones; it is brisker in those that are less concentrated; and it is intense in those industries, the nature of which is less aidful to the concentrating process. Competition there still is in all. The consequence is a veritable horde, a vast horde of employes, who, tho' "indirectly productive," as the term is technically defined also in the answer to Question No. V., fill a status that is hard to distinguish from that of the "unproductive" workers. Tho' not engaged in occupations that are actually harmful, their activities are due to harmful social conditions. To this category of workers belong, for instance, the clerks, bookkeepers, cashiers, accountants, salesmen and saleswomen, floor-walkers, "pages," liveried and unliveried, inspectors, superintendents, along with their numerous assistants in competing stores, factories and mills, on railroad, telephone and telegraph lines. To this category of workers belong also the drivers, together with their long train of human appendages, of competing deliveries who cross one another in and from all directions. Bone of the bone and flesh of the flesh of this category of workers are the swarms of drummers, traveling agents and canvassers for rival concerns. Etc.; etc.; etc.; etc.

The output of wealth that engages the energies of the above-described two categories of workers—the downright "unproductive" and the semi-"unproductive," in so far as the number of these is necessarily greatly in excess of the number that concentrated production would require,—needs not for its production the myriad human energies that its production now consumes. Concentration and properly organized industry could,

even under the capitalist regimen, and **without the reduction of the hours of work**, yield as much without the employment of the present swarm of, "useless mouths." Consequently, the hours of work, needed for the present output, could be greatly reduced without the reduction compelling the employment of more workers than the total now employed under Capitalism. The at present "useless mouths" could be absorbed by the reduced hours. The fact of a vast horde of employes whose "work" could be well missed, but whom still unripe Capitalism needs temporarily, is an effective denial of the supposedly logical conclusion that decreased hours must necessarily be followed by an increased number of employes.

In the second place, the belief, that decreased hours must necessarily be followed by an increased number of employes, proceeds from a disregard of the ample teachings of experience as to what improved mechanical appliances and methods can do with regard to the number of employes previously needed.

—The history of the Eight-Hour Movement in this country illumines the subject with respect to improved mechanical appliances.

Two were the arguments which the Movement advanced in its behalf.

The first argument was that a reduction of hours would be beneficent to the workers. It would afford them greater leisure to recuperate, and for mental expansion. This argument, although the reality made serious breaches into it,—the "International Typographical Journal," for instance, stated that the mor-

tality in its trade had increased appallingly coincident with the intensified labor demanded by the type-setting machine, despite the 8-hour day,—does not directly concern the subject in hand, and may be passed.

The second argument was that reduced hours would absorb the unemployed. The argument was presented in mathematical form, this wise:

If an employer employs 1,000 men at 10 hours a day, it means that he needs 10,000 hours of work. If, then, he can work his men only 8 hours, he could get only 8,000 hours out of them, that is, 2,000 hours less than he needs. Seeing he needs 10,000 hours, he will have to employ 250 more men; and thus the evil of out-of-work is relieved.

The practical result was not merely a severe breach into the argument: it smashed the argument to pieces. The smashing was done by improved mechanical appliances and improved methods.

To present the result also in mathematical form, improved mechanical appliances enabled the employer of 1,000 men, at 10 hours a day, to get out of them, under the 8-hour day, the equivalent of, not 10,000 hours, but of 15,000. The consequence was that, instead of needing more men to make up for the deficiency that supposedly was to arise, the employer could actually discharge 333 of his men and yet turn out as much product as before; or, if willing to turn out the equivalent of 15,000 hours, the improved mechanical appliances enabled him to do so with the same 1,000 of before, at 8 hours a day. In the latter event the army of the unemployed was relieved by not one man; in the former, the

army of the unemployed was increased by 333 fresh recruits. The total number of employes has increased since the 8-hour day, but not through it. It increased through the expansion of the country.

—With regard to improved methods of production, these repeated and aggravated the result brought about by improved mechanical appliances. Keenly cutting into profits through its wastefulness, the competitive warfare between capitalists is rendered still more disastrous through the 8-hour day. The consequence is an acceleration of the tendency of combination, with the further consequence of "economies." One of these "economies" consists in a reduced pay-roll, not through lower wages, but through fewer employes: the clerical force of one office can run the business of two, often without any, generally with very little increase in the former personnel, while the "dismantled" plants, as the expressive term runs, loudly tell of directly productive workers set afloat—all of these incidents being incident to the reduction of hours.

Accordingly, reduced hours of work is not synonymous with an increased number of employes. While decreased hours may require an increase of workers, the reverse is as likely a phenomenon.

The facts herein exposed have direct bearing upon "cost" in the Co-operative Commonwealth—the subject that will be considered under the next question.

## QUESTION NO. IX.

“And if we reduce the working time in all other industries to a four-hour basis will it not cost twice as much to produce everything?”

ANSWER:—

It is psychologically impossible for the bourgeois to think of “increased cost” without a shiver. The term covers him with goose flesh. The reason therefor will transpire from a simple example.

Take manufacturer John Jones, for instance, who employs the 1,000 men in the illustration given in the answer to the preceding question, works them 10 hours a day, pays them an annual wage of \$400 apiece, and himself pockets \$400,000 profits. Assuming the hours of work to be reduced to 8, and leaving out of consideration, for the present, the capacity of improved machinery to counteract the reduction of hours, as explained in the previous answer, John Jones will then have to employ 250 more men; his pay-roll will rise by \$100,000; and his profits will sink to \$300,000. The lower the hours are reduced, all the higher will his pay-roll rise, and all the lower will his profits sink. If the hours are reduced to 5, other things remaining unchanged, the pay-roll will absorb all the profits, and our Mr. Jones would be put out of business. Taking, now, into consideration the capabilities of improved machinery, and assuming that the same will enable the identical 1,000 men to produce in an 8-hour day the equivalent of

15,000 hours with inferior mechanical appliances, the manufacturer's condition would have been improved. With a pay-roll no higher than before, his profits will have risen 50 per cent. They will be \$600,000. But the capacity of improved machinery to make up and more for displaced hours has its limits. If hours are further reduced from 8 to 4, other things remaining equal, the manufacturer will have to employ twice as many men, 2,000; his pay-roll would be raised to \$800,000; and his profits reduced to one-third, from \$600,000 to \$200,000.

Nor yet is this all.

Our manufacturer John Jones does not thrive merely from the existence of the proletariat whom he regularly exploits, and with whom the necessity to live is the guarantee of his reign. The prosperity of his reign hinges upon the existence of an even more wretched layer of the proletariat. The figures presented by the "Visitor," and showing that the vacancies created by reduced hours would be filled by additional workers, implies the existence of a proletariat sufficient in numbers and ready to fill the vacancies. The implication is true; and the truth thereof is a crack inadvertently dealt by the "Visitor" itself over the head of the saintly capitalist regimen. The truthful implication is the substantiation of one of the worst counts in the Socialist indictment against Capitalism. That count is what Socialism designates as the "Reserve Army of the Unemployed." As Marx put it—Capitalism cannot start without there is a mass of humanity unable to live without it sells itself into wage-slavery; and it can not expand without there is a superabundance of these, a



superabundance large enough to keep wages down, and large enough, besides and above all, to keep on hand a reserve army of potential exploités upon whom to draw whenever a favorable fluctuation of trade demands an increased output. In other words, Capitalism is cornerstoned upon continuous starvation wages for its continuous exploités, and periodically actual starvation for its periodical exploités, when not needed. Accordingly, the systematic lowering of hours would furthermore tend to reduce and eventually wipe out the Reserve Army of the Unemployed, and thereby to deprive Master John Jones of both the lever whereby to keep wages down, and the ready-at-hand human material upon which to draw periodically at periodically recurring seasons of industrial briskness.

Such stands the case under Capitalism. Reduced hours spell, in the end, heavily reduced profits, if not bankruptcy.

Why?

Because the profits of the employer represent the surplus wealth produced by the employes; in other words, profits represent the amount of wealth that the employes yield over and above their wages; in still other words, profits are plunder, with the workers as the plundered.

Of course, Capitalism denies the economic estimate. In order to substantiate the denial, Capitalism has invented a variety of theories—the theory of profits being “wages of abstinence,” despite the glaring fact that “abstinence” is the virtue most conspicuous by its absence in the Capitalist Class; the theory of profits being

"wages of superintendence," despite the fact that from top to bottom production is in the hands of, and is carried on by the Working Class; the theory of profits being "remuneration for risk," despite the deserved ridicule that Ruskin heaped upon the theory, and the tragic fact that the risk of false imprisonment, of limb, of life, even of wages themselves, is the "portion of Labor"; the theory of profits being "wages of management," despite the fact, abundantly uncovered by Congressional and other investigations, that all that the members of the Capitalist Class "manage" is conspiracies how to over-reach one another, and how to circumvent and cheat the law.\* But the denial of the facts concerning profits, and the fables invented to give a color to the denial, affect the truth, and the Socialist Movement planted upon the truth, no more than the sacerdotal denials, along with the myths in support of the denials, of Columbus's astronomic and geographic principles, succeeded in preventing Columbus's triumph.

---

\*In the course of an address, delivered by R. W. Babson, the noted statistician, to the members of the Efficiency Society in conference at the Biltmore Hotel, New York, on January 26, 1914, the speaker said:

"Efficiency experts should devote more time to developing the efficiency of the heads of great corporations, and let the employes rest once in a while.

"If an efficiency engineer is honest, he will recommend in most cases the firing of the president, the employment of a new treasurer, and the choosing of a new board of directors.

"I believe that the greatest inefficiency is in the boards of directors of our various corporations. Most of these men, are indifferent and attend meetings only for their fees, if they attend at all. Moreover, many of them hold their positions simply because of inherited property and are utterly unfitted for their work."

Just because of the economic facts, which cause the "cost" involved in reduced hours under Capitalism to spell reduced profits and even bankruptcy, in the Co-operative Commonwealth, on the contrary, the argument of "cost" is downright idiotic—as idiotic as the complaint of the murderer in the story that if the rope which was tightening around his neck tightened much more it would choke him to death.

The estimate of John Stuart Mill, with the Marxian amendment, is to the effect that it is doubtful whether improved mechanical appliances had reduced the hours of work of a single workingman. Work has remained intense; the benefit of mechanical improvements has accrued to the Capitalist Class in the shape of ever huger profits—how huge, the frequent "melons" that corporation directorates cut for stockholders serve to give an inkling of. The plea against reduced hours, upon the strength of "cost," is a plea for the capitalist only. A systematic reduction of hours, in even step and measure with improved machinery and methods, would cost the capitalist his profits, under whatever name he makes them, whether under the name of rent, or under the name of interest, or under the name of dividends, or what not. Hence the plea is one that presupposes capitalist conditions. Where no capitalists are, neither can there be any "costs" incurred by shorter hours.

Finally, and now taking both the preceding, Question No. VIII., and the present, Question No. IX., by the throat—the only reduction of hours that will be "costly" to the Nation would be a reduction in excess of what improved and improving machinery and meth-

ods would warrant. Only that reduction would, or could, be "costly," because it would lower the store of wealth. The reductions made in even measure with improved mechanical appliances and methods would transfer the "melons," now cut for capitalists, to those who produced them, the usefully engaged population of the land,—and a 4-hour day, as will appear more in detail when Question No. XI. will be considered, will furnish a veritable garden of "melons."

## QUESTION NO. X.

"Then how about the non-productive workers—i. e., the strictly government officials? Will it not require the service of a million boards of arbitration and two or three million bookkeepers to keep track of the hours, income, skill, etc., etc., of each worker in order to determine whether the Socialist nation is robbing somebody or paying too much to somebody? And who but the workers, the real producers, will pay all these bills?"

ANSWER:—

This question is a "bull." Not that the previous ones, or the ones to follow, are free of "bull" earmarks. This one, however, is pronouncedly so. It is all "bull."

Passing by the recurrence of the misuse of the term "non-productive workers," a term that was defined and rectified in the answer to Question No. V.; passing by the suggestion regarding the "two or three million bookkeepers," etc., a suggestion that has been parried and met in the answers to Questions VIII. and IX.; furthermore, passing by the suspicion regarding "the Socialist nation robbing somebody," a suspicion that the answers to most of the previous questions have disposed of by anticipation; finally, passing by the affectation of zeal to protect the workers from paying swollen bills, an affectation from under which the answers to several of the questions preceding this one knocked the bottom;—passing by, for the present all these side issues, already considered in some way or other, what there is

left of this Question No. X., is the concept, silently asserted, and taken for granted, that the Socialist government is bourgeois government run by Socialists. The concept transpires from the sentence "the strictly government officials." The concept is radically wrong. It brings up the question of the "Political State" and the "Industrial Republic," or of political and industrial government.

Whether Government be protectionist or free trade, absolute or constitutionally monarchic, theocratic and feudally oligarchic or bourgeois republican,—however marked the differences may be in the governmental principles of these various regimens, all have one characteristic in common: while they are all based upon some method of production, **production is independent of them.** That fact marks them all members of the same governmental family, the Political State,—a governmental system that is no part of, takes no hand in, and has other functions than the functions of production.

To the bourgeois, his professors, his politicians, his press and his pulpiteers, the governmental system of the Political State always was. The notion is one of the many that bourgeois and Anarchists share in common, proceed from as a premise, and bank upon as a foundation, the bourgeois, however, arriving at the conclusion that such governmental system is ideally good and for all time, the Anarchist that it, hence, all government, is wrong, bad, and utterly rejectable. Fact is, the governmental system of the Political State—political government, for short,—is of comparatively recent date in the annals of the human race.

What the "State," or the "Political State," is and what the development of "Government" has been, constitute a broad subject in social science. The subject is essential to the appreciation of the "bull" which the question under consideration perpetrates, hence, also to the grasping of the answer. We shall give the gist of the subject by quoting a passage from our address, "Reform or Revolution," delivered under the auspices of the People's Union, at Well's Memorial Hall, Boston, Mass., January 26, 1896:

"How many of you have not seen upon the shelves of our libraries books that treat upon the 'History of the State'; upon the 'Limitations of the State'; upon 'What the State Should Do and What It Should Not Do'; upon 'Legitimate Functions of the State,' and so on into infinity? Nevertheless, there is not one among all of these, the products, as they all are, of the vulgar and superficial character of capitalist thought, that fathoms the question, or actually defines the 'State.' Not until we reach the great works of the American Morgan, of Marx and Engels, and of other Socialist philosophers, is the matter handled with that scientific lucidity that proceeds from the facts, leads to sound conclusions, and breaks the way to practical work. Not until you know and understand the history of the 'State' and of 'Government' will you understand one of the cardinal principles upon which Socialist organization rests, and will you be in a condition to organize successfully.

"We are told that 'Government' has always been as it is to-day, and always will be. This is the first funda-

mental error of what Karl Marx justly calls capitalistic vulgarity of thought.

“When man started on his career, after having got beyond the state of the savage, he realized that co-operation was a necessity to him. He understood that together with others he could face his enemies in a better way than alone; he could hunt, fish, fight more successfully. Following the instructions of the great writer Morgan—the only great and original American writer upon this question—we look to the Indian communities, the Indian settlements, as a type of the social system that our ancestors, all of them, without exception, went through at some time.

“The Indian lived in the community condition. The Indian lived under a system of common property. As Franklin described it in a sketch of the history and alleged sacredness of private property, there was no such thing as private property among the Indians. They co-operated, worked together, and they had a Central Directing Authority among them. In the Indian communities we find that Central Directing Authority consisting of the ‘Sachems.’ It makes no difference how that Central Directing Authority was elected: there it was. But note this: its function was to direct the co-operative or collective efforts of the communities, and, in so doing, it shared actively in the productive work of the communities. Without its work, the work of the communities would not have been done.

“When, in the further development of society, the tools of production grew and developed—grew and developed beyond the point reached by the Indian;



when the art of smelting iron ore was discovered; when thereby that leading social cataclysm, wrapped in the mists of ages, yet discernible, took place that rent former communal society in twain seemingly along the line of sex, the males being able, the females unable, to wield the tool of production—then society was cast into a new mold; the former community, with its democratic equality of rights and duties, vanishes, and a new social system turns up, divided into two sections, the one able, the other unable, to work at production. The line that separated these two sections, being seemingly at first the line of sex, could, in the very nature of things, not yet be sharp or deep. Yet, notwithstanding, in the very shaping of these two sections—one able, the other unable, to feed itself—we have the first premonition of the classes, of class distinctions, of the division of society into the **independent** and the **dependent**, into **master** and **slaves**, **ruler** and **ruled**.

“Simultaneously, with this revolution, we find the first changes in the nature of the Central Directing Authority, of that body whose original function was to share in, by directing, production. Just so soon as economic equality is destroyed, and the economic classes crop up in society, the functions of the Central Directing Authority gradually begin to change, until finally, when, after a long range of years, moving slowly at first, and then with the present hurricane velocity under capitalism proper, the tool has developed further, and further, and still further, and has reached its present fabulous perfection and magnitude; when, through its private ownership the tool has wrought a revolution

within a revolution by dividing society, no longer seemingly along the line of sex, but strictly along the line of ownership or non-ownership of the land on and the tool with which to work; when the privately owned, mammoth tool of today has reduced more than fifty-two per cent. of our population to the state of being utterly unable to feed without first selling themselves into wage slavery, while it, at the same time, saps the ground from under about thirty-nine per cent. of our people, the middle class, whose puny tools, small capital, render them certain victims of competition with the large capitalists, and makes them desperate; when the economic law that asserts itself under the system of private ownership of the tool has concentrated these private owners into about eight per cent. of the nation's inhabitants, has thereby enabled this small capitalist class to live without toil, and to compel the majority, the class of the proletariat, to toil without living; when, finally, it has come to the pass in which our country now finds itself, that, as was stated in Congress, ninety-four per cent. of the taxes are spent in "protecting property"—the property of the trivially small capitalist class—and not in protecting life; when, in short, the privately owned tool has wrought this work, and the classes—the idle rich and the working poor—are in full bloom—then the Central Directing Authority of old stands transformed; its pristine functions of aiding in, by directing, production have been supplanted by the functions of holding down the dependent, the slave, the ruled, i. e., the working class. Then, and not before, lo, the State, the modern State, the capitalist State! Then, lo, the

Government, the modern Government, the capitalist Government—equipped mainly, if not solely, with the means of suppression, of oppression, of tyranny!

“In sight of these manifestations of the modern State, the Anarchist—the rose-water and the dirty-water variety alike—shouts: ‘Away with all central directing authority; see what it does; it can only do mischief; it always did mischief!’ But Socialism is not Anarchy. Socialism does not, like the chicken in the fable, just out of the shell, start with the knowledge of that day. Socialism rejects the premises and the conclusions of Anarchy upon the State and upon Government. What Socialism says is: ‘Away with the economic system that alters the beneficent functions of the Central Directing Authority from an aid of production into a means of oppression.’ And it proceeds to show that, when the instruments of production shall be owned, no longer by the minority, but shall be restored to the Commonwealth; that when, as a result of this, no longer the majority or any portion of the people shall be in poverty, and classes, class distinctions and class rule shall, as they necessarily must, have vanished, that then the Central Directing Authority will lose all its repressive functions, and is bound to reassume the functions it had in the old communities of our ancestors, become again a necessary aid, and assist in production.

“The Socialist, in the brilliant simile of Karl Marx, sees that a lone fiddler in his room needs no director; he can rap himself to order, with his fiddle to his shoulder, and start his dancing tune, and stop whenever he likes. But just as soon as you have an orchestra, you

must also have an orchestra director—a central directing authority. If you don't you may have a Salvation Army pow-wow, you may have a Louisiana negro breakdown; you may have an orthodox Jewish synagogue, where every man sings in whatever key he likes, but you won't have harmony—impossible.

“It needs this central directing authority of the orchestra master to rap all the players to order at a given moment; to point out when they shall begin; when to have these play louder, when to have those play softer; when to put in this instrument, when to silence that; to regulate the time of all and preserve the accord. The orchestra director is not an oppressor, nor is his baton an insignia of tyranny; he is not there to bully anybody; he is as necessary or important as any or all of the members of the orchestra.

“Our system of production is in the nature of an orchestra. No one man, no one town, no one State, can be said any longer to be independent of the other; the whole people of the United States, every individual therein, is dependent and interdependent upon all the others. The nature of the machinery of production; the subdivision of labor, which aids co-operation, and which co-operation fosters, and which is necessary to the plentifulness of production that civilization requires, compel a harmonious working together of all departments of labor, and thence compel the establishment of a Central Directing Authority, of an Orchestral Director, so to speak, of the orchestra of the Co-operative Commonwealth.

“Such is the State or Government that the Socialist revolution carries in its womb.”

Accordingly, to speak of “strictly government officials,” in connection with the Co-operative Commonwealth, is to perpetrate a robustious “bull” sociologic:—there will be none such in the bourgeois, or modern sense of “government.” With the downfall of the Political State, or of “political government,” the personnel of the same vanishes, leaving not a rack behind.

Again, the broad hint at, and even assertion of, a largely increased number of administrative public officials in the Co-operative Commonwealth is an equally robustious “bull,” but a “bull” of a different breed, a “bull” arithmetic:—it must take an exceptionally dull bourgeois to fail to realize, or an exceptionally insolent “barker” for the bourgeois regimen to realize and yet deny the fact that the administrative officials whom the Capitalist Class employs in the running of the industries are virtually public officials, seeing that industry has become a public function; it takes an additionally dull bourgeois to fail to realize, or an additionally insolent “barker” for the bourgeois regimen, to realize and yet deny that, as indicated in the answer to Question No. VIII., vast hordes of these virtually public officials are “useless mouths” whom the competitive warfare of Capitalism breeds; it will take a still duller bourgeois to fail to realize, or a still more insolent “barker” for the bourgeois regimen to realize and yet deny that the circumstance of these larger masses of public officials not being technically public officers only adds to the evil the brand of “taxation without representation”—

their wages, or salaries, are in the nature of a tax levied upon the wealth produced by the Working Class, and yet the Working Class is without representation in the sanctums where the tax is ordered. Leaving aside this last and aggravating feature of the situation, it would finally, take a sublimely dull bourgeois to fail to realize, or a sublimely insolent "barker" for the bourgeois regimen to realize and yet pretend that the number of these virtually public officials—excessive under competitive Capitalism, and reduced under Capitalism only in the measure that it clears the field of competition—would be multiplied in the Co-operative Commonwealth, where the occasion for such wastefulness of forces can not be.

So far from the Co-operative Commonwealth multiplying and needing a large number of public officials, the exact opposite is inevitable. On the one hand, the complete wiping out of the Political State with its "political government" leaves no place for the mass of public employes whom "political government" requires, and of whom, alone, even exclusive of its most typical branches, the Army and Navy, it is estimated that the proportion was 1 to every 1,300 of the population in 1816, and has since risen so gigantically as now to be 1 to every 242 of the population; on the other hand the elimination of the competitive warfare necessarily eliminates a vast number of the virtually public officials that are actually "useless mouths."

In his epoch-marking work, "Looking Backward," Edward Bellamy summed up the situation under Capitalism with the terse sentence: "We go to war as an

organized body, and we go to work like a mob." The summary at once portrays the situation in the Co-operative Commonwealth. If war be necessary, due to an aggression from without, similar to that of the combined Crowns of continental Europe against the rising French Republic and which Carlyle characterized as the combination of Cimerian Darkness, the war methods of the Co-operative Commonwealth will not put its productive methods to shame. The Co-operative Commonwealth will not go to work as a mob. Every member thereof of "military age," in the only way that civilized conditions will know, the War against Want, will be directly or indirectly productive. As to who will pay the workers, we need but repeat the closing words of the answer to Question No. IV.:

"They will support [pay] themselves, as they do now; with the difference that, whereas now they support themselves with a pittance of the fruit of their work, the bulk of the fruit of their work being now plundered from them by the Capitalist Class under the title of 'profits,' in the Co-operative Commonwealth they will support [pay] themselves with the full product of their toil."

## QUESTION NO. XI.

“If we are able to produce less than \$700 net wealth per worker per year, as the last census shows, and with the best machinery and the best organization to aid us, with an eight hour work day; how are we to produce two or three thousand dollars per year per worker, as the Socialists assert, with a four-hour work day and a great increase in non-productive labor which Socialism will impose?”

ANSWER:—

The feature of this question is a large number of assertions of things that are not so.

It is not so that “we are able to produce less than \$700 net wealth per worker per year.”

It is not so that “the last Census shows” anything of the kind.

It is not so that we are aided by “the best machinery.”

It is not so that we are aided with the “best organization.”

It is not so that Socialists assert that we shall produce “two or three thousand dollars per year per worker.”

It is not so that “Socialism will impose” a “great increase in non-productive labor.”

The key-stone in this arch of Not-Soness is the third assertion, to the effect that we are aided with the best



machinery and organization. We shall first knock out that.

The empire city of the land offers a spectacle that is itself a treatise. New Yorkers, upon whom the sight dawned gradually, are not generally startled; visitors from younger and smaller centers of population are. It is the sight of the street cars run by horses, notwithstanding the tracks are crossed, re-crossed and criss-crossed by numerous electric underground trolleys, and that overhead rumble the electric-motored elevated trains. How comes it that, in these days of electricity in transportation, the old horse-power still prevails on some lines, and in the leading city of the land, at that?

Capitalist production is production for sale; that is, production, not for use, but for profit—profit, of course, for the capitalist. This is the starting fact of Capitalism, and the fact sways and controls every thought, and move, and fibre of the capitalist.

Profits are that amount of wealth that the capitalist's plant, labor included, yields over and above what, in slovenly parlance, is called his "cost of production," or what, in technical language, is termed the value of the material that is consumed in the product, the labor-power included.

An item in the "cost of production" is the wear and tear of the plant in which the capitalist made his investment. If the capitalist discards an older plant and invests in a better before the first investment has been exhausted, then he is the loser to the extent of the difference between the value of the wear and tear that already has gone into his output, and the value of the

wear and tear that yet remains latent in his investment. Obviously, it is a matter of keen interest with the capitalist to extract the last penny's worth possible from his first investment.

The mental process has a number of serious consequences, most of which have none, or only indirect bearing upon the matter in hand—as, for instance, the capitalist's nerve-racking hurry to get as much wear and tear as possible out of his plant before improved machinery, invested in by his competitors, compel him to drop his plant before he has drawn out all that he invested in it, or be smoked out of the competitive field into bankruptcy. A direct bearing upon the subject in hand is the consequence of the capitalist's "hanging on" to his plant so long as possible, whenever he at all can do so. The longer he does, before the plant is exhausted, all the more completely is he re-imbursed for his investment. This economic-psychologic process is glaringly illustrated by the still surviving horse-cars—rickety concerns that should have been dumped upon the junk heap long ago, and antique nags, whose march to Fresh Pond, L. I., there to be converted into "guaranteed Bologna sausage," is being postponed.

These horse-cars give a "tip" of what is happening in other quarters of production.

Notwithstanding the nigh to phenomenal newest machinery that is in operation in many industries, the inferior machinery which they have displaced has not been cast away. Sold cheaply, such inferior appliances are still in operation, and yield a profit—at the cost of

the increased output that up-to-date machinery could turn out.

Furthermore, valuable inventions are locked up in the safes of our financiers. These inventions are dreaded. They are dreaded for two reasons.

One reason has already been indicated. If put into practice now, the invention would render older machinery obsolete, and this, being displaced, much of the original investment would remain unrecovered. The huge value of, and still higher prices fetched by modern machinery, together with the equipment that this demands, renders displacement a matter of serious consideration to the profits-greedy, hence, loss-dreading capitalist. Though inferior to what could be had, if the invention were put into operation, the inferior machinery is preserved—again at the cost of the larger output that could otherwise be had.

The second reason why these inventions are dreaded is that they would increase the output to the extent of lowering the price, and thereby “smashing” profits.

The facts are exactly the opposite of those alleged in the question. Neither is the best possible machinery now employed, nor is the best available machinery in operation to the extent that it should be. The speech delivered by the Secretary of Commerce, William Cox Redfield, before the National Association of Employing Lithographers, in session at Washington, D. C., on May 14, 1913, and commented upon in *The Daily People* in an article entitled “Surely No Trust-Buster,” recognized and condemned the fact of inferior machinery being greatly in use. He recognized and condemned the fact

so bluntly that Washington despatches reported the Secretary's audience to have been "flabbergasted."

The key-stone of the arch of Not-Soness being down, down are, along with it, the other stones of the arch. We can now inspect the debris collectively and separately.

Whether the net wealth be \$700, or \$500, or \$1,000 is immaterial. True it is that the wealth actually produced to-day falls short of the amount required to afford comfort, let alone abundance to all the workers of the land. That is the fact of importance; and the truth thereof is even more signal if the water, that capitalist chicanery causes the capitalist to inflate his wealth with, is wrung out of the Census figures. But that is one thing, and a very different thing it is to say that the pittance per worker, actually produced today, is all that is at all producible, and that the Census proves the allegation. Quite "otherwise and to the contrary" as Artemus Ward would say.

Production being carried on for profit, "prices" is the first consideration with Capitalism. Now, then, prices depend upon supply and demand. A large supply, a supply in excess of the demand—or, rather, in excess of the money capacity of the masses to demand,—spells lower prices, with the sequel of decreased profits. In order to prevent the to capitalists "dire calamity," coffee in tens of thousands of bags is ordered burnt in Brazil by the coffee syndicate seated in London; peaches are periodically dumped into the Raritan; shiploads of bananas are thrown overboard in New York harbor; and so on. Even wheat has been similarly treated. It was

this spectacle, observed by him in the harbor of Marseilles, that first aroused the indignation of Fourier against the existing social system, and first turned his thoughts to Communism, as Socialism was then called.\*

Nor is this all. The wealth thus destroyed, although it certainly does not figure in the net wealth of the Census, was wealth produced. Its destruction partakes of the criminality of infanticide. Vastly larger, immeasurably larger, is the volume of wealth that is strangled off before birth. How vast the amount of wealth that, though possible of birth to bless man, yet remains unborn in this country alone, was inadvertently admitted in a recent document of first rank. The Republican platform of 1908, written in a moment of unguarded exuberance by the then President, issued from the White House, and accepted by the Republican national convention at Chicago, truthfully declared:

"We have a vast domain of 3,000,000 square miles, literally bursting with latent treasure, still waiting the magic of capital and industry to be converted to the practical uses of mankind."

The mechanical appliances are there and more are ready to be fashioned; yet much of them remains idle, and the additional appliances, ready to be fashioned, remain unfashioned for fear of "a market."

---

\*The January 20, 1914, Bulletin, issued by the Office of Information, U. S. Dep't of Agriculture, contains this passage:

"No other civilized country wastes foodstuffs as we waste them. If all the crops that the farmers raise were utilized; all the meat animals that are killed eaten; all the fish that come into the nets marketed, hundreds of thousands who are now hungry would be well fed," etc., etc.

Nor yet is this all. Even the small \$700 net wealth per worker is, in reality, smaller than the figures would indicate. Even after the water, with which the capitalist inflates his wealth, is wrung out, a still closer inspection of what remains reveals the fact that much of that wealth does not really belong under the category of "wealth," being harmful. The Yale locks and similar cunning devices; the burglar-proof safes, burglar alarms and the like; the implements of war; the adulterants; the trashy mass of advertising that draws upon and debauches art;—these are but a few samples of a kind of "wealth," the mass of which is gigantic, and as harmful as it is gigantic. The story is told of a Connecticut Yankee, who, having come at home to the end of his tether in the wooden nutmeg industry, went out West and put up his shingle as a physician. That same night he was aroused out of bed by violent raps at the door. It was a distracted father who called him in for a sick child. "What ails him?" asked the self-approved Aesculapius. "He has the small pox." "I know nothing about small pox," replied the medical fraud, pressing a vial into the father's hand; "you give the little cuss this; that will throw him into fits; then call me; I have graduated on fits." A large percentage—to state an estimate would sound incredible—of the raw material that could be turned to useful purposes, of the human labor that could be put to better use, is expended by Capitalism in curing society of the "fits" that Capitalism itself throws society into. Waste breeds waste. The amount of labor wasted in wasteful, because harmful, products, could, if usefully employed, be productive of larger

stores of wealth than the stores of harmful so-called wealth that it turns out.

And still this is not all. Though the idle Capitalist Class is relatively small, absolutely it is no inconsiderable number; add to this number the vast number of "non-productive" workers, indicated in the answers to Questions Nos. V. and VIII., a veritable horde, whose "non-productiveness" verges on "un-productiveness"; add, finally to that sum the further mass of Labor whom the exigencies of Capitalism require to be kept in periodical idleness as indicated in the answer to Question No. X.; do that, and a conception may be formed of the huge body of human labor-power that is suffered to go to waste under Capitalism, and that Capitalism deliberately wastes.

With Nature teeming, and ready to be tapped, yet "still waiting the magic of capital and industry to be converted to the practical uses of mankind"; with magnificent machinery available, yet curbed in its productivity; with still more magnificent machinery invented, yet the invention kept frozen lifeless; with vast human forces turned into "unproductive" channels, and still vaster human forces available, yet left, or condemned to idleness; with, in short, production manacled and trussed; and, with, to crown it all, competition squandering the nation's productive potentialities, and all due to the exigencies of capitalism;—with such chaotic conditions, to speak of "the best organization to aid us" betrays either fathomless Ignorance or sublime Effrontery. The estimate of Bellamy is correct—capitalist society goes to work like a mob.

Socialists might, like all previous carriers of Progress at critical epochs in the forward march of mankind, at times yield to visions that are unwarranted. The dawn always inspires. It even intoxicates. But the Socialist carries the corrective with him. He is the first, in the line of progressive revolutionary descent, to do so. Leaving on one side the "philosophy" of the Anarchist, and on the other side the "philosophy" of the Anarch's cousin, the Bourgeois, the Socialist ever endeavors to sober up his Ideal by adjusting it to the material possibilities. These he ascertains first. While all the facts requirable for an exact estimate are not accessible, nevertheless, sufficient facts are, from which to induce and deduce the conclusion that—with our population properly organized; with all the machinery that is available, or that can be rendered available, in operation; and with a social system under which production is conducted for use and not for sale and profits;—then, only four hours a day, male adult work, that is, no more exertion than the healthy physical exercise that the body requires, and only for the period of 21 years, will yield to each an annual social share equal to what today it would require \$10,000 to purchase, and enable the workers to be mustered out at the age of 42, veterans in the War against Want, deserving of the rest and the further expansion that the dignity of a useful life and advancing years entitle them to.



## QUESTION NO. XII.

"How are you Socialists going to get possession of all the land, railroads, manufacturing plants, business blocks, banks, church and school property, machinery, etc.? Will you Socialists confiscate or purchase all capital now used in production and exchange?"

ANSWER:—

Had the question simply asked, How are you Socialists going to get possession? we could have proceeded with the answer without further ado. The question is, however, loaded with a number of kinks. These will first have to be straightened out.

The first kink is imbedded in the word "confiscate." A definition of the word in its historic and juridic sense becomes a necessary preliminary.

What is "confiscation"?

We shall answer the question with two passages from Socialist Labor Party literature—one furnishing a sidelight into the concept of "confiscation," the other directly defining it—and then clinching the point with illustrations fresh from the history of our own days.

The first passage is taken from "The Warning of the Gracchi" in our address, "Two Pages from Roman History," delivered in New York City under the auspices of Section New York, S. L. P., at the Manhattan Lyceum, April, 1902:

"When, at the critical stage of the revolution he was active in, Tiberius Gracchus took a 'short cut across

lots,' and removed, regardless of 'legality,' the colleague who blocked his way, consciously or unconsciously he acted obedient to that canon of the Proletarian Revolution that it must march by its own light, look to itself alone; and that, whatever act it contemplates, it judges by the Code of Law, that, although as yet unformulated into statute, it is carrying in its own womb. When, afterwards, Tiberius looked for justification to the laws of the very class that he was arrayed against, he slid off the revolutionary plane, and dragged his revolution down, along with himself. The revolutionist who seeks the cloak of 'legality' is a revolutionist spent. He is a boy playing at soldier.

"It was at the Denver convention of the American Federation of Labor, in 1894, that a scene took place which throws much light on the bearing of this particular point in the Movement of our own days. The A. F. of L. at a previous convention had ordered a general vote upon a certain 'declaration of principles.' Among these principles there was one, the tenth, which a certain class of people, who called themselves Socialists, were chuckling over with naive delight. They claimed it was 'socialistic.' One of their number had bravely smuggled it into the said 'declarations.' They were by that manoeuvre to capture the old style Trades Unions, and thereby 'tie the hands of the Labor Leaders.' For a whole year these revolutionists had been chuckling gaily and more loudly. The unions actually polled a majority for all the 'principles,' the celebrated 'Plank 10' included. At the Denver convention the vote was to be canvassed; but the Labor Leaders in control

threw out the vote on the, to them, good and sufficient reason that 'the rank and file did not know what they had been voting for.' That is not yet the point; that is only the background for the point I am coming to. But before coming to that let me here state that the rank and file meekly submitted to such treatment. The point lies in a droll scene that took place during the debate to throw out the vote. The scene was this:

"The revolutionist who had surreptitiously introduced 'Plank 10' in the 'declaration of principles,' and thereby schemed to capture the Unions by ambush, a gentleman of English Social Democratic antecedents, one Thomas J. Morgan, now of Chicago, was storming in that Denver convention against the Labor Leaders' design to throw out his 'Plank 10,' and incidentally, as he expressed it himself, was 'putting in fine licks for Socialism.' Suddenly his flow of oratory was checked. A notorious Labor Leader, to whom the cigar manufacturers of America owe no slight debt of gratitude, Mr. Adolf Strasser of the International Cigar Makers' Union, had risen across the convention hall and put in:

"'Will the gentleman allow me a question?'"

"'Certainly.'"

"'Do you favor CONFISCATION?'"

"The answer is still due. Mr. Morgan collapsed like a punctured toy balloon.

"The scene should have been engraved to preserve for all time pictorially the emasculating effect of ignorance of this canon of the Proletarian Revolution upon that venturesome man who presumes to tread, especially as a leader, the path of Social Revolution, notwithstand-

ing he lacks the mental and physical fiber to absorb in his system the canon here under consideration.

"As I said, the Proletarian Revolution marches by its own light; its acts are to be judged by the Code of Legality that itself carries in its fold, not by the standard of the existing Law, which is but the reflex of existing Usurpation. Indeed, in that respect, the Proletarian Revolution shares a feature of all previous revolutions, the Capitalist Revolution included. A new Social System brings along a new Code of Morals. The morality of the Code that the Proletarian Revolution is impregnated with reads like a geometric demonstration. Labor alone produces all wealth, Idleness can produce maggots only; the wealth of the land is in the hands of Idleness, the hands of Labor are empty; such hard conditions are due to the private ownership by the Idle or Capitalist Class of the land of the tools with which to work; work has become collective; the things needed to work with must, therefore, also become collective property; get from under whosoever stands in the way of the inevitable deduction, by what name soever he may please to call it! Accordingly, no militant in the modern Proletarian Revolution can be knocked all of a heap by the howl of 'Confiscation.'"

The second passage is taken from our debate, "Individualism vs. Socialism," held under the auspices of the Troy, N. Y., People's Forum, April 14, 1912, with the nominally Democratic, but actually of Ultramontane political persuasion, Attorney-General of the State of New York, Thomas F. Carmody:

"I am asked: 'How are you going to cure the situa-

tion?' 'What are you going to do?' 'Are you going to confiscate?'

"I want my distinguished adversary to refresh his mind upon the juridic meaning of the word 'confiscation.' Confiscation means the appropriation of property contrary to the laws of an existing social system. Revolutions, however, bring their own laws with them. Consequently, under the laws of a Social Revolution, that may be done legitimately, without the brand of 'confiscation' which, under the laws of the social system that the Revolution has supplanted, would be called confiscation. We have a striking illustration of this fact in the language of one of the early leaders of our country, one whom, I hope, Mr. Carmody will not repudiate. When our Revolutionary Fathers were asked: 'Are you going to confiscate these colonies' it was no less a man than Jefferson who answered the 'confiscatory' charge: Whenever in the history of a people conditions have become such that they have to be changed, changed they shall be. 'Confiscation,' from the British viewpoint was at the root of this Republic. Like all Revolutionary Governments, the Government of the United States was born in revolution. It did not 'confiscate' under the laws of its own existence, whatever the name given to the act by the social system and government which it overthrew. The question is, Do the requirements of the working class demand a different state of society? If the answer is, Yes, then that appropriation is not confiscation at all. I hope my distinguished adversary heard and will remember my answer. The breath that denounces us as 'confiscators' curiously enough brands

Thomas Jefferson, on this platform, by a Democrat, a 'confiscator.'"

Finally, as clinchers of the principle, the following illustrations will be found exceptionally to the point, besides cogent as demonstrations:

In the city of Scranton, Pa., are two congregations of Roman Catholic religious persuasion. The property—real and movable and worth considerable—was purchased with contributions made by the parishioners, or pew-holders. The Bishop, a gentleman of Roman Catholic political, or Ultramontane persuasion, took possession of the property, and assumed the functions of owner in the name of the church. The congregations brought an action at law against the Bishop. After an expensive and long litigation, the congregations won out. The highest court decided that the title to the property of each congregation vested in whomever the majority of the contributing members ("pew-holders") should choose. Upon the congregations choosing themselves as owners, they were promptly excommunicated.

Somebody attempted confiscation. Who?

It all turns upon what the social principle is upon which the nation rests, hence upon the constitution and laws that are in force.

If the laws of the land should be found to be such as obtained during the Middle Ages, when Ultramontanism was the organic principle of society; when the local civil magistracies were but the constabulary of a temporal Papacy; when by law, implied and expressed, all church property, wherever situated, was vested in the temporal Vatican via its Bishops and other subordinates;

—if such should be found to be the law of the land, then the theory that parishioners have proprietary rights in the property that their funds brought together, or have any function other than to contribute funds and obey their Bishop, is an utterly revolutionary theory. It would be a revolutionary theory because it would be a theory that flew in the face of the established social theory of Ultramontanism. If, therefore, Ultramontanism should be found to be the law of the land, then the Scranton congregations attempted to enforce a code of social principles at war with the social principles in force; then they attempted to enforce a revolutionary principle before their own anti-Ultramontane Revolution had triumphed and overthrown Ultramontanism; then their conduct was Anarchic; then were they guilty of the social misconduct named “confiscation.”

If, contrariwise, it should be found that the laws of the land bear the distinct mark of anti-Ultramontanism, and are planted upon a social principle that denies and repudiates the social principle of Ultramontanism;—if such should be found to be the laws of the land, then the theory that parishioners have no proprietary rights in the property that their own contributions brought together, and have no function other than to pay and obey their Bishop, that theory would, in turn, be the revolutionary theory. It would be revolutionary because it would be a theory that flew in the face of the land's established social theory of anti-Ultramontanism. If, therefore, anti-Ultramontanism should be found to be the law of the land, then it would be the Bishop who attempted to enforce a code of social principle at war

with social principles that are in force; then it would be the Bishop who attempted to enforce a revolutionary principle before his own Ultramontane Revolution had triumphed in the land, and overthrown anti-Ultramontanism; then it was the Bishop's conduct that was Anarchic; then it would be the Bishop who was guilty of the social misconduct named "confiscation."

There can be no doubt upon what the determining facts are. The migrations that founded this country, including that which flowed into Maryland, with possible exceptions that are negligible, left behind them the Ultramontane social polity. They had cast it off even in their respective mother countries. The social polity that they set up was the exact opposite of the Ultramontane. Whereas, the social polity of Ultramontanism is pivoted upon the theory that "power comes from above"—another way of saying that "the will of God is conveyed to the ruled through the rulers," the polity that the founders of this country set up was that "power comes from below"—another way of saying that "the or "Vox populi, vox Dei." When the country shaped itself into an independent Nation the theory, latent theretofore, became vocal in the Declaration of Independence—"Governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." The theory may be right, the theory may be wrong—wrong or right, it became, was and is to-day a "Law of the Land." There may be those who at any time hold a "Law of the Land" to be wrong. It is their privilege so to hold. It also is their privilege to endeavor "to



alter or to abolish it, and to institute a new Government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness"—the field of speech, press and the ballot being left free. Until so altered or abolished, and substituted with a different "Law of the Land," to practice that different "Law of the Land" is to slide into Anarchy.

The Bishop was well within his rights when he excommunicated the two congregations for insubordination. The right of the individual to secede—a right conquered by civilization—is balanced by the reciprocal right of the organization to expel. When, however, obedient to a social polity that is at war with the existing social polity, or "Law of the Land," the Bishop took and sought to hold the property of the pew-holders, the Bishop was guilty of the Anarchic misconduct named confiscation—a misconduct that the brilliant American satirist Artemus Ward summed up pictorially with the pictorially new-coined word "confistigation."

Will the Socialists confiscate?

Socialism is not Anarchy. The Socialist will not confistigate.

The second kink is imbedded in the stringing together of "land, railroads, manufacturing plants, school property, machinery, etc.," as the things that Socialism is to take possession of.

The sentence presents a sort of mental hash, that can only proceed from hashy information and thought.

As to "machinery," that is included in "manufactur-

ing plants." The word is surplusage. A manufacturing plant without machinery belongs to the realm of myths, disemboweled spooks, and other nightmares. The fate—good, bad or indifferent, "Godly" or "un-Godly,"—that strikes the "manufacturing plant" strikes the "machinery"; it strikes it "simultaneously and at once"; and cannot choose but strike it in the same manner—on the same principle that when Elijah ascended to heaven in his fiery chariot, his kidneys had a ride along with him; or when Lucifer fell headlong into hell, his liver and other intestines went down in even swiftness.

As to "railroads" and "manufacturing plants," while they do not stand to each in the relation of "machinery" and "manufacturing plants"; while, therefore, the coupling of either with the other is not surplusage, the mentioning of both is redundant. They are categories of identical economic nature. The atmosphere that would suffocate men, will suffocate women, lawyers, seamstresses, bachelors, widows, carpenters, and parsons as well. No need of specifying each. That which affects life, affects it whatever its envelope may be. "Railroads" and "manufacturing plants" being capital when they are privately owned and used for profit and exploitation, the decree which smites the "capital" feature of any necessary of production smites the "capital" feature of all, without the need of specifying each.

As to "school property," the term is loosely used. Much school property is now the property of the Nation, hence, need not be gotten possession of. But there is considerable "school property" in the country that is privately owned, and used for profit and exploitation.

As Marx has it—whether a capitalist invest in a sausage factory and employ sausage-makers, or he invest in a school and employ teachers, the economic process is the same, to wit, exploitation. The asking of questions regarding such school property is as redundant as the question that specifies railroads and manufacturing plants when the issue is what's to be done with "capital."

As to "church property," to the extent that the same is actually devoted to the uses that its name indicates, that is, to the extent that it is CHURCH property, property devoted to religious edification,—to that extent the property falls, as a matter of course, within the category of property devoted to private consumption, like clothes, shoes, hats, etc., with all the consequences of such, as indicated in the answer to Question No. III.

But a considerable amount of property that would pass as "church property" is not such at all.

For instance:—

Within the last year, a plot of ground in Newark, N. J., was attempted to be kept from taxation. The reason given was that the plot had been consecrated to divine service. The fact being established that the alleged consecration was purely formal, and no church had been raised or attempted to be raised upon the plot, the tax was ordered paid. That "church property" was a real estate speculation, masked with the word "church."

In August of the year 1913, special Master in Chancery, appointed by the Federal District Court at New Orleans, in the suit brought by the Societe Anonyme de la Distillerie de la Liquere Benedictine de l'Abbaye de Fe-

camp against Yochim Brothers of New Orleans, reported to the court a recommendation that a perpetual injunction issue restraining the defendant from using on the labels the name of "Compound Liquer Benedictus" and "Compound Liquer Superieure Benedictus," or any imitation of the trade mark or label of the complainants. The facts in the case brought out the fact that the Benedictine monks at the Abbey of Fecamp were in business. That "church property" is in the nature of a distillery with the mask of "church."

Of such nature the instances are innumerable. Property, said to be religious and church property, in Barcelona, Spain, has been shown to be sweatshops; similarly in Portugal, hence, the overthrow of Ultramontanism in the land amid the execrations of the working class, and the establishment of the Portuguese Republic; similarly in Mexico, where property, labeled "church," constitutes vast agricultural slave pens upon which the peons are exploited. That considerable property, similarly labeled and similarly used, is to be found in this country, the evidences of are numerous.

All such property falls under designation of "capital." Its specification is redundant.

Likewise as to "business blocks" and "banks."

Finally, as to "land," the kink regarding huge chunks of it is straightened out along with the kinks of "railroads," "manufacturing plants," "school and church property," etc. Moreover, seeing that the last, Question No. XV, is wholly devoted to "land," the straightening out of the kink on the subject shall be left for when we come to that question.

The third and last kink is imbedded in the suggestion of the "purchase" of capital.

What would be the effect of purchasing capital?

The purchasing idea, advanced in some quarters by the Socialist, proceeds from the notion that capitalism could be reconciled to its own downfall, and that, unless it is reconciled, it would give insuperable trouble. The idea is self-contradictory. If Capitalism could be reconciled, it will not allow itself to be reconciled. The downfall of Capitalism means the enthronement of the Co-operative Commonwealth, that is, the Industrial Republic. The enthronement of the Co-operative Commonwealth is tantamount to the wiping out of the function of metallic money, that is, Money: exchange will no longer need a medium of exchange that is itself the depository of intrinsic value. The wiping out of the function of metallic money wipes out the standard of the value of money. The wiping out of the standard of the value of money renders coin, or its token, worthless.

The bourgeois may not know much; his instinct helps him out. That instinct tells him that the purchase money which he would receive will be a snare and a delusion; indeed, a mockery. If it be in the power of the capitalist "to make trouble," he will exercise the trouble-making power anyhow, to its extreme limit, well aware that it is with him "to be, or not to be."

Socialism does not propose to "purchase all capital," or any part thereof. Socialism proposes nothing of the sort, for four good and sufficient reasons, amply promulgated by its philosophy and literature:

1st. To buy the capitalist off with money, or its

token, would be to cheat him, as above indicated. Socialism is no dealer in green-goods.

2nd. To "pay" the capitalist by pensioning him out of the National Store would be to bond the Nation, and bond it indefinitely. Socialism is here to free, not to bond the workers.

3rd. No Social Revolution ever bought off the tyrant class against whom it rose. It never did, not out of revengefulness, but in unconscious obedience to the principle that "property" is not merely "wealth"; that property is "wealth held under a certain tenure of ownership"; thence, that, as Franklin summed up the case, "property is the creature of society and society is entitled to the last farthing thereof whenever society needs it." The principle is recognized even in bourgeois jurisprudence, our highest courts having recognized in taxation the power to "destroy property," and in society the unlimited right to tax. That society has reached the stage of development in which it needs the wealth which itself produced, but which, under the capitalist tenure of ownership, is held by the Capitalist Class, is evident. That wealth being needed by society, society is entitled to, and will take it.

4th. Socialism being the highest expression of morality and justice, the taking of the capital, and thereby the emancipating of property from the shackles of private ownership, can be accomplished without inflicting upon the present ruling class the social penalty that all previous class revolutions have inflicted upon the class that they overthrew. With all previous class revolutions, though the oppressed freed themselves, they

did not establish freedom. The conquering class, in turn, became an oppressor, the previous oppressor being placed under the yoke. The Socialist Revolution will be, must be free of the stain. The law of its being leaves it no other choice. Seeing that Socialism abolishes, not simply the class rule of the present ruling class, but class rule itself, the conquered capitalist will not be yoked; he will be raised, along with the rest of the population to peership with all others in a Commonwealth where his existence will be safeguarded, the same as the existence of all others, under the only condition that he sponge not, but do his share in the co-operative work. The "right to vote" in the Co-operative Commonwealth is accompanied with the supplementary right to live a civilized life, that is, a life of economic freedom.

The kinks that loaded the question under consideration being straightened out, the question now stands out in its purity: "How are you Socialists going to get possession of the capital now used in production and exchange?"

With all his iniquities, the bourgeois is entitled to the merciful treatment that the pending Social Revolution has in store for him. He is entitled to it because it is he who cleared the way for the redemptory revolution of Socialism. He cleared the way by casting the mold into which the Co-operative Commonwealth is to be organized. Despite the substantially mob appearance and disorganized state of the capitalist productive regimen, it is under the lash of Capitalism that the outlines are drawn of the industrial organization of the people, and the skeleton centers around which the subdivisions

are to be ranked. It matters not that the bourgeois has done this work unconsciously, even unwillingly, and often seeks to undo it. The law of his own existence compels him to persevere. WITHOUT this work on the part of the bourgeois, all Socialist efforts would be vain. WITH this work on the part of the bourgeois, Socialist political activity supplements the labors of the bourgeois, supplements them with the economic agitation that renders the workers conscious militants, consciously filling the ranks of the industrial organization of the land.

From top to bottom production is today conducted by the Working Class. As a consequence, all the capital, that is, all the plants "used in production and exchange," are actually in the hand, actually in the possession of the Working Class. Ownership, however, lingers with the bourgeois by reason of the continued imperfection of the industrial organization. So long as the incongruity between ownership and possession lasts, the Political State and its political government will prevail. The day the industrial organization shall have reached the minimum of perfection needed, that day the scales will tip; ownership will be coupled with the existing fact of possession, and the Co-operative Commonwealth will be master.

That is the "how."



### QUESTION NO. XIII.

“Will the man who invents a machine worth millions to society be paid a life income (a new form of royalty), or how will he be rewarded?”

ANSWER:—

We do not know. What is more, we do not care. The Socialist, being no dreamer and no idler, finds better use for his time than to indulge in inconsequential speculations. It is—in the matter of inventors and the treatment of the same—enough for the Socialist to know that the principle-shaping material conditions in the Co-operative Commonwealth, being fundamentally different from the principle-shaping material conditions in Capitalist Society, will safeguard the inventor, instead of, as happens today, expose him to a life of mental torture, through apprehensions that generally come true.

Few, if any, are the inventions that can be turned to financial profit with little capital. Generally, the capital needed is large. Very often it is gigantic. The inventor, who owns the requisite capital to experiment, perfect, and, finally, turn out the product of his genius, does not exist, at least not “to any alarming extent,”—and thereby hangs one of the most distressful pages of capitalist history, full as that history is of distressful pages.

The pace of the fate of the inventor of machines “worth millions to society” was set, in this country, from an early day of its history by the fate imposed upon Eli

Whitney. So valuable to the then Southern society, the then dominant portion of the country, was the cotton gin which he invented that it was immediately prized at its true value,—and as promptly seized and appropriated by the dominant class without any returns. The thorny path of legal procedure that Whitney was forced to enter upon only added to his trials. He himself tells of an instance when the whir of his machine, in full operation only a block away, could be heard distinctly in the very court-house where he was endeavoring to assert his rights, and where defendants, judge, and jury, striking the ostrich posture, affected total ignorance of the “alleged infringement.” Whitney died disappointed, broken-hearted, in poverty, while his invention, true to the “millions it was worth to society,” made his despoilers affluent.

It is a part of the history of inventions which “are worth millions to society” that the most valuable agricultural inventions accredited to McCormick were not at all his. The fabulous wealth that the appropriation of the fruit of another’s genius channeled into his coffers enabled McCormick to silence and elbow the inventor out of court, into impotent poverty and obscurity, while he himself rose to richness and prominence. His brazen effort to induce his effigy to appear on the Federal currency issued under McKinley revived the memories of the despoiler’s high-handed antecedents. Although human conscience asserted itself sufficiently to thwart the vainglorious attempt at immortality through the Nation’s currency, the despoiler’s wealth, seconded by the laws of capitalist society, enabled him

to retain possession of the invention which he had misappropriated.

The more recent Dempsey case is of kindred nature. The employe of a dyeing firm in Pennsylvania, Dempsey, who was a chemical genius, had made valuable discoveries which he applied to dyeing, and the formulas of which he preserved in his note-book. The firm desired to obtain possession of the note-book. To this end it summarily dismissed Dempsey, entered his room, took the notes—and kept them. Dempsey's legal efforts to recover the fruit of his genius failed. The court plump and plain pronounced "intolerable" the conditions that would arise were an employer to be "kept under dependence" to his employe by reason of the latter's discovery.

The Bonsack case was another in point. It is summarized in this passage from our address, "What Means This Strike?" delivered in New Bedford on February 11, 1898, to the weavers then on strike:

"The Bonsack Machine Company discovered that its employes made numerous inventions, and it decided to appropriate them wholesale. To this end it locked out its men, and then demanded of all applicants for work that they sign a contract whereby, in 'consideration of employment,' they assign to the Company all their rights in whatever invention they may make during the term of their employment. One of the employes, who had signed such a contract, informed the Company one day that he thought he could invent a machine by which cigarettes could be held closed by crimping at the ends, instead of pasting. This was a valuable idea; and he was told to go ahead. For six months he worked at

this invention, and perfected it; and, having during all that time received not a cent in wages or otherwise from the Company, he patented his invention himself. The Company immediately brought suit against him in the Federal Courts, claiming that the invention was its property; and—the Federal Court decided in favor of the Company, thus robbing the inventor of his time, his money, the fruit of his genius, and his unquestionable rights!”

Substantially the same was the experience of Mergenthaler, the talented and persevering inventor of the linotype type-setting machine. That dark and fresh history has been very fully written. The upshot was that, while the great Mergenthaler was left to linger and die in want, a set of millionaires became multimillionaires through his invention, and one of these, White-law Reid, the son-in-law of Darius Q. Mills of Coeur d'Alene mining iniquities celebrity, could afford to “keep up the standing” of a United States Ambassador at the court of St. James's, and even impart to the standing a chrysanthemum gardens glamour of Asiatic splendor that was the delight of Queen Victoria, a frequent visitor at the gardens.

Long, tedious by repetition, distressful and often heart-rending is the history of the “men who invented a machine worth millions to society.” One more instance—the tragic fate and death, in 1913 in Paris, of Charles Tellier—brings up-to-date the internationality of the inventor's fate under Capitalism.

Released, penniless, from a debtor's prison—whither the appropriation by capitalists of his successful inven-

tion of a boat in which ammonia was used as motive power had caused him to be thrust—Tellier, undiscouraged, turned again to inventing. His second effort matured in 1869 in a contrivance of untold benefit to the human race. The invention consisted in a system of freezing food by compression. The new machine was able to preserve, not only meat, but all kinds of vegetables and fruit. Tellier's invention may be considered the rounding up of that great ethnic invention that pushed the human race upward from the upper status of Savagery to the next higher, or lower status of Barbarism—the invention of the art of pottery, whereby man turned down the leaf of that part of his history when he lived from hand to mouth, thenceforth able to lay up a store for "the next day." Eggs from Australia, peaches from the Cape of Good Hope, strawberries from California, salmon from Alaska, meat from Argentina and New Zealand could be enjoyed in Paris just as fresh as when they left their distant home countries. It was an invention that helped to deal a deathblow to famine by enabling the transportation of food in good condition to and from regions however distant. The Cold Storage Associations of capitalists arose, appropriated Tellier's invention to themselves, and, while the invention poured millions and billions into their coffers, Charles Tellier languished. Occasionally a bone was thrown at him, and the genius and human benefactor died in the summer of 1913 literally of starvation at the age of 86.

And naturally so. For the same reason that the proletarian is under the necessity to sell himself in wage slavery, that is, to sign a social contract whereby, in consideration of a chance to earn his own living, he sur-

renders to the capitalist the lion's share of his product, for the identical reason, the overwhelming majority of inventors face the "Hobson's choice" of either selling their invention to the capitalist for a song, or to be kept in constant apprehension of their invention's being stolen—an apprehension but too often verified.

For the exact opposite of the reason that such is bound to be the treatment that Capitalism has for the general run of inventors, a treatment exactly the opposite is bound to prevail in the Co-operative Commonwealth. The point need but to be indicated. Man, being emancipated from want and the fear of want, the goad to man's iniquity to man is blunted, or broken. On the one hand, the overpowering motive for wronging the inventor, together with the institutions to match, cease to be; on the other hand, the inventor himself, no longer in danger of being "done" by others, can no longer feel, and succumb to, the demoralizing pressure to exploit his invention for personal profit. It is in keeping with the known qualities of man, under favorable conditions, to find his actual reward in the bestowing of benefaction upon his kind. In the language of the great and good, the scientific and practical Benjamin Franklin, "as we enjoy great advantages from the inventions of others, we should be glad of an opportunity to serve others by any invention of ours; and this we should do freely and generously."

Will the inventor be rewarded with the intrinsically worthless oaken-crown that the economically independent patriciate of Rome rewarded its members with, and

that these economically independent members gloried in receiving?

Will he be rewarded with mural tablets, or statues?

Will the superfluity of a "life income," or a "new form of royalty" be the style?

The Socialist knows not—and cares less.

In our debate, "Individualism vs. Socialism"—quoted in the answer to Question No. XII.—our distinguished opponent having asked a number of specific questions concerning the Co-operative Commonwealth, the answer was:

"We are asked for a complete list of items of the Socialist Republic. The same demand has been made before upon great men upon great occasions—and with as little sense.

"When Columbus proposed to start on his trip to discover the eastern shores of Asia, there were people of my distinguished opponent's bent of mind who asked him where the mountains, and the mouths of rivers, and the harbors would lie. His answer was: 'I do not know, and I do not care. What I do know is that the world being round, if I travel westward I must strike land.'

"If Columbus is too ancient in history, take Washington. When he was fighting the battles of independence there were Tory pamphleteers who pestered him and the other Revolutionary Fathers with questions upon the kind of government they contemplated—was it to be a Venetian Doge affair, a Dutch Republic of High Mightinesses, or what? Washington's answer was. 'First lick the British.'

“Impossible for the capitalist system with its political state to continue. The Goddess of Liberty cannot sit upon bayonets. With a logic similar to that of Columbus’s answer, the Socialist says that the Co-operative Commonwealth, or the Industrial Government, is next in the order of social systems. No more than Washington can we give details in advance, and, like Washington, we say: **First lick the British of today.**”

And so we say now to whomsoever is preoccupied, or affects to be preoccupied, with curiosity regarding how will the man, “who invents a machine worth millions to society, be paid,”—**first lick our Britishers of today, the Capitalist Class.**



## QUESTION NO. XIV.

“Is it not true that of the 1,500,000,000 people on earth no two are alike? One man is a success, the other is a failure; one industrious, the other a spendthrift. Will the industrious, sober and thrifty man be willing to divide and help support the lazy man, the drunkard and the spendthrift?”

ANSWER:—

It is true that of the people of the earth, whatever the number of the earth's population may be, no two are alike.

It is also true, too true, that one man is a success, the other a failure; one industrious, the other a spendthrift.

Will the industrious, sober and thrifty man be willing to divide with and help support the lazy man, the drunkard and the spendthrift?

The subject opens two angles of view from which to consider it.

Taking up the subject from one angle of view, we find that, whether the industrious, the sober and the thrifty are willing or not, they do today “help support the lazy man, the drunkard and the spendthrift”:

It, surely, is not by the lazy man, the drunkard, or the spendthrift that, for instance, Harry Kendal Thaw is being supported. The wealth that supports that homicidal paranoiac spendthrift is wealth produced by the industrious, the sober and the thrifty. It is, accordingly,

the sober, the industrious and the thrifty who today support that worthy . If they did not, the earth would long, long ago have been relieved of the worthy's presence.

It, surely, is not from the lazy man, the drunkard, or the spendthrift that the funds flow to the support of the inebriates inside of our asylums, or those who wander at large. The wealth that supports the habitual splicers of the main-stay is wealth produced by the sober, the industrious and the thrifty. It is, accordingly, the sober, the industrious and the thrifty who today support these moral, physical and mental cripples. If they did not, then, neither the inmates of our inebriate asylums, nor the many more who belong there, could be alive today.

Sloth, sayeth the adage, is the beginning of all crime. It surely is not through the lazy man, the drunkard, or the spendthrift that the moneys are raised which go to the support of the humanity that graduate from the University of Sloth into the penitentiaries of the land. The money that goes to the support of these social waifs represents, and is exchanged for, wealth produced by the industrious, the sober and the thrifty. It is, accordingly, the thrifty, the sober and the industrious who today support the convict. If they refused, what would become of the criminals?

Summing up the subject, as it presents itself from this first angle of view, even if lazy people, drunkards and spendthrifts should be found in the Co-operative Commonwealth, and even if the Co-operative Commonwealth were to compel the industrious, sober and thrifty to support such social refuse, it is not for a

supporter of Capitalism to throw the first stone. The house he lives in is too much of a glass house for him to start the stone-throwing process.

Taking up the subject from the other angle of view which it presents, the telescope of political-economic science, turned upon the capitalist regimen, reveals the sociologic fact that the capitalist regimen does not give the industrious, the sober and the thrifty the option whether they will divide with the lazy man, the drunkard and the spendthrift. The capitalist regimen is so constructed that it compels the industrious, thrifty and sober to divide. Indeed, it compels them with such a compelling power that the division leaves them but a beggarly pittance, while the lion's share goes to the lazy, the drunkard and the spendthrift.

Paul Lafargue condensed the process of "division" under the capitalist regimen in the terse motto: "Wealth is the product of Labor, and the reward of Idleness."

Surely, idleness can produce nothing. The obvious principle notwithstanding, the bulk of the enormous wealth of the land is found in the possession, not of the workers, but of the idlers. To what an extent this is true has lately been uncovered by the statistics which the idle, finding it impossible to keep the lid tight upon, have endeavored, as a last resort, to use as a warning against the enactment of the income tax. The statistics indicate that even after lowering the limit of untaxable incomes to \$3,000, barely 500,000 people will "bear the burden." Allotting four dependents to each of these, only two millions of our more than ninety million population will be affected.

This indicates the existence of a "division" with "a vengeance," and "with a vengeance" to have the industrious, sober and thrifty support the lazy man and the spendthrift.

The fact that the wealth produced under the capitalist regimen is found divided into two disproportionate shares, the overwhelmingly bigger share being in the possession of the idle, the idle have long sought to justify with a number of more or less ingenious, more or less clumsy fictions:

They have given their share the name of "wages of abstinence"—despite the striking, often shocking exhibition of the fact that abstinence is with them a non-existent virtue, the excesses of most of them being replaced, with others, by the extreme, opposite, corrosive miserliness.

They have given to their share the name of "wages of superintendence"—despite the notorious fact that, from top to bottom, the industries are run by the wage-earners.

They have given to their share the name of "remuneration for risk"—despite the experience, painfully made by the wage-earners, and brilliantly elaborated by Ruskin, that theirs is the risk, the whole risk, the risk of a living, the risk of limb, the risk even of life.

They have given to their share the name of "wages of management"—despite the fact that, so far as production is concerned, they manage next to nothing, their managerial activity consisting mainly in managing political and economic conspiracies against, in order to overreach one another.

It is the industrious, sober and thrifty Working Class that produces the wealth of the land. Under the capitalist regimen the Working Class is forced to divide with the Capitalist Class, a class the idleness of whose members in production is illustrated every time one of them is gathered unto the bosom of Abraham, and not a single wheel of production ever stopping to turn. An idle class is a lazy class, with the spendthrift and the drunkard as no infrequent specimens.

But Socialism would not be the redemptory Movement that it is if, every time a charge is made, or insinuated, against it, all that the Socialist could do were to play the schoolboy act of "You're another." When the Socialist stops, in this instance, for instance, to show that that which is insinuated against Socialism is actually a feature of Capitalism, the Socialist legitimately places his finger upon a state of things that is inevitable from capitalist, and, therefore, impossible from Socialist premises. The very social structure of Capitalism, the social structure pivoted upon the private ownership of the means of production, renders natural the existence of an idle and of an industrious class, with the former dividing the wealth produced by the latter in such a manner that, while wealth remains the product of labor, it becomes the reward of idleness.

Nor is this all.

It cannot be denied, indeed, the psychologic fact should be emphasized that, apart from the lazy men, the drunkards and the spendthrifts, whom, due to the possession of excessive wealth, Capitalism breeds within the Capitalist Class itself, laziness and drunkenness

crop up among the proletariat also, and crop up to a vast extent. The consideration of the subject in hand from the first view-point which it presented showed that, under the present regimen, these unfortunates are supported by the industrious, the sober and the thrifty, to the extent that they are at all supported. Is inherent depravity the cause of laziness and drunkenness among the masses? The convenient theory, that inherent depravity is the cause, is the theory set up by the Capitalist Class, together with its press, its politicians, its professors and its pulpiteers. Sociology rejects the theory.

There where, however excessive the toil and abundant its product, the toiler's income is trifling and insufficient even to restore the tissue that is expended,—there incentive is nipped in the bud, hopelessness and helplessness follow, and drunkenness, laziness, and a long train of similar and even worse habits and vices fatedly crop up. As fatedly as these evils flow from capitalist conditions is the inevitableness of their eradication in the Co-operative Commonwealth, where, abundance being possible for all, and the full product of his toil being inured to each, incentive is inevitably spurred, and hopelessness and helplessness as inevitably take wing, to make room for the exact opposites.

Before closing this answer, this is the place to lock a certain switch.

Will not the Co-operative Commonwealth build streets and highways, and keep them up? Will not the Co-operative Commonwealth lay out parks, establish libraries and other public buildings? Moreover, apart from the wealth required for these and similar items,

must not the Co-operative Commonwealth land in bankruptcy, unless it providently make provision to restore the wear and tear of its plants? If it make such provision, must not the provision come from the wealth produced by the workers? Does it not, therefore, follow that the promise of "the full return of their toil" is hollow?

The promise is not hollow, it is solid.

In the days of Marx and Engels, when the Socialist Movement was still entangled with "Communism," hence, with "Communist Anarchy," and, as a further consequence, was in the toils of Bakouninism,—in those days an extreme precision of language on this subject seemed imperative.

Socialism implies co-operation upon a large scale, the only scale on which wealth is producible with the abundance that renders involuntary poverty unnecessary. Co-operation on a large scale implies organization to match; and such organization implies a central directing authority. Communist-Anarchy, on the contrary, with its small, "directly governed," "autonomous" communities is a denial of Collectivism, or Socialism. It is an aspiration without economic foundation—hence, a freak aspiration. As such, Communist-Anarchy lightly fell into extravaganzas of economic and sociologic demands. These were harmful to intelligent and effective organization. As such, Marx leading, the statement that the worker should receive the full returns of his toil was pointed out as defective. The function of the central directing authority—an authority rejected by Anarchy—to reserve from the collective product the

portions requisite for public institutions, and also for the replacement of the wear and tear of the existing plants of production, was pointed out.

The policy of such precise expression, wise at that time, has now become unnecessary, and, if now insisted upon, would, in turn, be misleading. Now that Socialist Science has spread in all directions, and Anarchy in all its freak manifestations is no longer a danger, however frequent its flarings up,—now the statement that the worker will receive the full product of his toil can lead to no quagmire. The mission, functions and duties of the central directing authority in the Co-operative Commonwealth once grasped, no thinking man will deny that the product of the worker which is appropriated for public institutions, for the restoration of his own plants of production, and so forth, is a product the fruition of which falls to the workers themselves. Under the capitalist regimen the portions of the workers' product, appropriated for such uses, accrue only in a trifling degree to the benefit of the workers; in the Co-operative Commonwealth those portions accrue wholly to the benefit of the workers. Tho' the route by which these portions of the workers' product reach the workers be different—one route directly to the individual, to be disposed of as he wills, the other indirectly, to be profited by collectively,—in the Co-operative Commonwealth the worker receives the full product of his toil.

The problem of the lazy man, the drunkard and the spendthrift, and, we may add, of criminals, generally, will be a non-existent one in the Co-operative Commonwealth. In the Co-operative Commonwealth—where



production will be abundant for all and each will be insured the full product of his toil—the problem will be known only from the history of the nightmare that Capitalism in its maturity was to man. As well ask how to prevent drowning, where no water is to be drowned in.

## QUESTION NO. XV.

“What will you Socialists do with the farming lands, and with the five million owners of these lands? Will you divide the tract into five, ten, or fifty-acre tracts and parcel it out to each farmer and will each farmer be compelled to account to the State for what he raises? Will the intelligent farmer receive the same income as the ignorant farmer? Will an account be kept of what each farmer produces and the quality? If so, will it not require an army of experts and bookkeepers to see that each farmer receives the full reward of his toil? Or will you Socialists farm the lands in large tracts with Socialist farm bosses and Socialist farm hands? And which will you be, a farm boss or a farm hand?”

ANSWER:—

If the framer of this question had read Prof. Ely's book on the “Weaknesses of Socialism” the fact would have manifested itself in some degree of system in the objections to Socialism therein implied. As it is, the implied objections, or the numerous sub-questions that constitute the question itself, bump against one another in such a disordered manner that the suspicion is justified the “Visitor” is in the mental state of the bewildered, thick-skulled peasants in the German story who “heard the bell ring, but knew not where it hung.”

That bell is the extensive European Socialist literature on the Agrarian or Land Question.

The Agrarian or Land Question raises no economic or even sociologic principle different from the economic or sociologic principle raised by urban industry. Not a

line and not a word is found in all the mass of Socialist literature to indicate that, so far as economics or sociology is concerned, the Socialist faces on the farm a problem different from that which he faces in manufacturing towns. The difference in the problem goes, not to the root of the economic problem: it affects only the top-most branches. It is a difference that dictates tactics, a difference due to the historic antecedents of the peasant, a class that does not exist and never existed in this country, due to the circumstance of the country's never having passed through a really feudal period, except, perhaps, in spots.

The string of incoherent questions, strung up under this XVth question, affects economics. Even in Europe—where there is a peasantry whom social evolution has to hurl into the cities before Capitalism can grip them, hence, before they can be rendered accessible to Socialist propaganda—these objection-questions to Socialism are shots with blank cartridges. In this country—where there is no peasantry, where capitalism itself stalks forth and reaches out into the fields, and renders the farm the rural aspect of the factory, and the factory the city aspect of the farm—in this country the string of questions under XVth Question is as downright a bit of idiotic pertness as if a school boy, who was told that the camel was an animal used in order to cross sandy deserts, were to interject: "But, Teacher, how could the camel swim across the oceans in the desert?"

What will the Socialists do with the farming lands?—Just what they will do with the urban plants of production.

What will the Socialists do with the five million owners of farming land?—Just what they will do with whatever the number may be who own the urban plants of production.

Will the Socialists divide the tract into five, ten, or fifty acre tracts and parcel it out to each farmer?—They will do that no more than they will divide the plants of production into five, ten, or fifty inch plants, and parcel them out to each industrial worker.

Will each farmer be compelled to account to the State for what he raises?—No more than each industrial worker will be compelled to account to the State for what he turns out. Like the present plant-of-production owner, who, if he does not mean to go on a hunger strike, will have to take hold of the co-operative cable of production, the farmer will have to step into the Nation's co-operative army of production.

Will the intelligent farmer receive the same income as the ignorant farmer?—Yes, or no, the same as the urban industrial worker, as fully set forth in the answers to Questions I. and II.

Will an account be kept of what each farmer produces and the quality?—No more than an account will, or could, be kept of what each individual urban worker turns out, for the reasons fully set forth in the answer to Question No. IV., which set forth the features of co-operative labor.

If an account will be kept of what each farmer produces and the quality, will it not require an army of experts and bookkeepers to see that each farmer receive the full reward of his toil?—Seeing that, no more than

an account will, or could, be kept of what each farmer produces than of what each industrial urban worker turns out, it will no more require an army of experts and bookkeepers to see that each farmer receives the full reward of his toil than it will require such an army of experts and bookkeepers to perform the same services for the industrial workers.

Will the Socialists farm the lands in large tracts?—Just as industrial production will be carried on upon a national scale, agricultural production will be conducted “on large tracts.”

Will Socialists farm the large tracts with Socialist farm bosses and Socialist farm hands?—Yes. Just the same as the Nation-wide industries, and for the same reason. There will be no anti-Socialist labor of whatever nature and category to be found in the Co-operative Commonwealth outside of asylums where merciful care will be taken of the mental cripples who may have been inherited from the capitalist regimen.

Finally, would we be a farm boss or a farm hand?—Either indifferently. As to which of the two, will depend upon the circumstances detailed in the answer to Question No. III.

Some capitalists run large urban industries, others run large agricultural concerns; some run small urban industries, others run small agricultural enterprises. The farmer, accordingly, is nothing but a differentiated capitalist. He is a capitalist in agriculture; the same as the manufacturer is a capitalist in industry, or the railroad magnate is a capitalist in transportation. To handle the agricultural capitalist upon a principle entirely different

from his industrial cousin is, in economics, as idiotic a proposition as, in anatomy, the proposition would be to handle city residents on the correct theory that their heart is the organ from which, and to which their blood pulsates; but to handle country residents on the theory that their heart is located in their big toe, and that its function is to keep the body from wobbling.

Socialism will affect the farmer (agricultural capitalist) exactly as it will affect the urban or industrial capitalist:—

The large agricultural capitalist will be dethroned by Socialism from the class throne that enables him to exploit the workers, the same as it will dethrone the urban capitalist, compelling the former, as it will the latter, to take hold of the co-operative cable of production and cease sponging—or starve.

The small agricultural capitalist will be freed by Socialism from the illusion of property that today is a millstone around his neck, the same as it will free the small urban capitalist of the identical illusion. To the one and the other, Socialism will be a redeemer—redeeming them from the peculiar material ills that are born of the optical delusion which causes both to fill the disgraceful social role of being duped by the upper capitalists, while themselves seeking to dupe the proletariat.

The "Visitor" heard the sonorous sound of the bell of tactics rung by European Socialist literature with regard to agriculturalists, but the "Visitor" knows not where that bell hangs, and it fancies the bell hangs under the dome of economics.