

WHAT
MAN
MIGHT
MAKE
OF
MAN

By

"The Crank"

WHAT MAN MIGHT
MAKE OF MAN

BY

“THE CRANK.”

LIVERPOOL:

E. BENINGTON & SON Ltd.,

35 SOUTH CASTLE STREET.

1930.

Preface.

This little book is not intended as a complete "A.A." route to Heaven ; but only as a suggestion that to go from St. Paul's to Charing Cross, it is not necessary to go by way of the Maze at Hampton Court.

Foreword.

From a chapter on "Crank's" in "Press, Platform and Parliament," by the late Spencer Leigh Hughes, M.P., by permission of Messrs. Nisbet & Co. Ltd.

"Let no one suppose that I pretend to have been always right in my forecasts, and that I have never described as impossibilities proposals or suggestions which have since been universally accepted not only as practical, but useful. I can well remember a visit I received from a gentleman years ago in a newspaper office, when he assured me that flying machines heavier than air, that would travel long distances, not only could, but very soon would be made. I listened to him politely, but I thought he was mad—indeed I felt certain he was, so that I was relieved when he went away without any display of

violence. As soon as he had gone I wrote an article which gave great satisfaction to myself on cranks in general and on flying machine cranks in particular. And what is more, I 'proved' that what the gentleman had predicted as being close at hand could never take place. There were some impressive passages about the immutability of the law of gravitation, and passing allusions to the same quality that used to distinguish the laws of the Medes and Persians. It was really a strong article, for I firmly believed what I wrote, and what is more, I am certain that nine-tenths of those who read it agreed with me at the time. But the 'crank' was right and I was wrong; moreover, if he thought I was a fool, as I certainly thought he was, again he was right and I was wrong. It may be that the same could be said of some cranks and some critics to-day."

Why not make more of Man ?

A million and a half unemployed !

A million and a half units of productive energy idle, worse than idle, rusting to uselessness.

A works employing 5,000 workers is a huge works ; and here are 300 times 5,000 workers idle ; and the country in need of wealth.

Had these million and a half, from infancy up, received the hygienic, educational, and technical training best suited to develop any latent ability that in them lay, together with a due sense of the duties and responsibilities of citizenship, and were now organized on the most scientific principles, and equipped with all the latest tools and machinery, what a volume of pro-

ductive power would now be at the command of the community, in place of the pitiful spectacles, all too familiar at our labour exchanges and in our slums and police courts.

Would it not have been worth while ?

Would it not be wise to avoid the repetition of this sad folly with our rising generation ?

And although not educated and trained as they might so advantageously have been, do not these million and a half unemployed still represent a vast volume of wealth-producing power. Their ability would not be of the first quality, but every one of them could do something towards the increase of wealth, and the employment of all could not fail to increase wealth : it could not be a loss to the community.

Will anyone be bold enough to suggest

that the country does not need wealth ?

Would it not be better and wiser to wipe out the national disgrace and shame of unemployment by adopting the manifest cure—employment. Not merely to reduce unemployment to normal (that pitiful confession of incompetence), but to set every one of them, the whole million and a half, to work according to their ability.

* * *

“ Oh, yes! but how are you going to find employment for them ?”

“ What can you give them to do ?”

“ Where is the money to come from ?”

“ We can't afford it !”

What is there for them to do ?

Is it not an overwhelming condemnation of our present day methods that such a question should be asked? Not only asked, but regarded by many as unanswerable.

And yet, are there not many children insufficiently clothed and fed ?

Are there not men and women similarly in need ?

Are not more and better houses needed ?

Are there no slums to be cleared ?

Could we not make use of more schools and again more schools, with better equipment and more teachers ?

Are our hospitals and medical services all that they might be ?

Might not our roads and railways be vastly improved ?

Is there not much waste land that might be reclaimed ; and of the land now under cultivation, how much is cultivated up to the highest standard of our scientific and practical knowledge ? Is one-tenth or even one-hundredth ?

Would it not be for the good of the community that these things should be done ?

Have we not in this country arrived at a stage of civilization and intellectual development when we might reasonably be expected to make common cause to utilize all our marvellous scientific and mechanical achievements, and our undoubted powers of organization, to solve the economic problem of life in a rational and humanitarian manner for the good of all and the credit and glory of the community.

What is this economic problem ?
Is it not to utilize our natural resources
and labour power in the most effectual
manner, and distribute the wealth
produced, to the best of our ability,
in the spirit of kindness, for the
promotion of happiness ?

Exception will be taken by many to
the term "happiness." Too vague !
You can't define happiness. But is it
not quite as easy to define as progress,
which we are always having dinned
into our ears ; and moreover is an
exact definition of much moment ?
Let each accept his own definition, no
matter how vague, for his own guidance
(remembering it is not just his own
happiness, but the happiness of the
greatest number that we seek) and it
will be found that we are all travelling,
for a very long way, on the same
road.

Why are these things not done ?

Is there any insurmountable difficulty in the way ?

Have we not at our command all the essentials for wealth production : Land, Capital, and Labour ?

The land of the world is ample for all the needs of man, labour we have here, standing idle, waiting for something to do, whilst ample capital is also at our command ; not money which is neither capital nor wealth, and of which more anon, but real capital, the actual things that we require to set the workers to work, tools and raw materials and food, clothing and shelter for the workers, all of them already produced in abundance or easily producible with very little delay, by labour.

Land and real capital existing in abundance, it stands to reason that our wealth-producing capacity is only limited by our labour power, and that only when the last member of the community is reasonably employed have we reached the full extent of our wealth-producing power.

Then why do our workers stand idle, whilst anxious to work, instead of doing the things we all wish to see done ?

Is it because we have allowed ourselves to regard as fundamental, unalterable, and almost divine laws, what are really only ill-conceived, man-made rules and customs ; and upon this unsound basis have endeavoured to build up and practice a complex, specious science of economics and finance, which we are constantly patching, shoring, and amending, as rifts and defects appear, in a vain

endeavour to make it serve our ends, and to bring it into conformity with the higher ethical standards that are steadily gaining ascendancy; ever disputing and quarrelling over the method of patching the superstructure, instead of rationally and scientifically examining and relaying the foundations, and building thereon a new edifice worthy of our civilization and our noblest aspirations and ideals ?

Plunder.

“The good old rule, the ancient plan,
That he shall take who has the power,
And he shall keep who can.”

Do we sufficiently realise that this “good old rule” is not merely the the obsolete creed of mediæval knights in armour, but still remains the unwholesome and disastrous basis of our economic and business system of to-day ?

The power and environment have changed in character. Instead of sword and spear and physical prowess, money and laws of property, and individual knowledge and cunning, give power in the battlefield of the market place, where the object of each is to secure the “plunder” of gain by the strategy of bargaining.

It is all done with outward seemliness; the battle is often tempered with kindness, but in principle is it not still "The good old rule," each according to the power at his command, and the weakness of his competitors, taking what he can of the wealth of the world, and holding the "plunder," if he can, to give him still greater power to plunder.

The individual going out into the world finds no duty placed upon him to perform any service for the community, but sees around him many desirable things, things of use, comfort or amusement, which he can take if he has the power within the limits of the law.

This power may be his by inheritance of land or money and he can help himself to the good things of this world, rendering no service of production, or otherwise, in return.

He merely lives by "plunder" under
"The good old rule."

Or being less fortunate, he goes into business. The business may or may not serve a purpose useful to the community. What recks it? The purpose of business is to take by means of bargaining more than is given; to make a profit; to buy, whether it be labour or commodities, in the cheapest, to sell in the dearest market.

Many well-intentioned persons contend, and like to think, that the purpose of business is service; the reward being incidental; but can such a contention be logically and honestly maintained. In judging a business, does not the making of a profit always transcend the service. Many miners' children are now in need of shoes and stockings, but there is no rush of business men to provide them: there is no profit to be made out of unemployed miners.

How often do we see in the report of a company meeting, the chairman dwelling upon the good service that the company is rendering to the community, as compared with references to the profit made, or to be made; what has been taken or is to be taken by the company's activities. To do otherwise is to pass into the realm of philanthropy and sentiment; and has it not been well said:—"Sentiment must not be allowed to interfere with business."

And even the individual worker, actually producing real wealth, primarily judges his success by the income he earns, not by any increase of the wealth of the community, although consciousness of such increase may be a source of satisfaction.

Look at it as you will "The good (?) old rule" still holds sway as the prime purpose of business.

“He shall take who has the power.”
But is it necessarily so ? Is it a funda-
mental or Divine law ? Is it wise that
it should be so ? Is there not a better
way ?

Money - Power.

Two very different uses of the term "money" are in common use.

When a man says he has "money" in his pocket he means currency, a very different use of the term from when he says he has "money" in the Bank, or in a Company or War Loan.

Currency, if of metal, is, of course, real wealth in a convenient and portable form, readily exchangeable for other forms of wealth; but if of paper it is palpably not real wealth beyond the value of the paper and printing, depending for its exchange value upon the guarantee of the state. The guarantee failing, this form of money immediately demonstrates its difference from real wealth by becoming

quite worthless, as so recently illustrated in Germany.

Money in bank or investment is still less real wealth, consisting as it does, of nothing but records that to such and such individuals appertains so much "money-power," so much power to take in conformity with recognized conditions, usages, and laws.

Currency confers "money-power" upon the holder, but money-power can exist quite apart from currency, although measured in terms of currency, for although a customer can use his recorded money-power to demand currency from his banker, the banker does not profess to hold currency ready to meet all the "money-power" recorded to the credit of his customers and if all the holders of recorded money-power should demand full payment in currency at one time there

would not be anything like enough currency to go round.

And when money is said to be needed to start a company or set the unemployed to work it is not currency that is wanted but "money-power," power to take from the holders the real wealth or capital, the stored up labour, needed for the undertaking.

The function of money is ever to take, not to produce, wealth. Only when wealth has been produced is "money-power" of any avail. If there is no real wealth to take it has no value. A bundle of bank notes will not help a man to produce wealth, but if he uses them to take a spade from the holder, he can set to work to produce wealth, and although individuals may become wealthy by the manipulation of money in more or less respectable ways, from high finance to betting, the wealth of the community cannot

be increased by money manipulation within the community.

But the facility with which money (either currency or "power") can be exchanged for any desired form of real wealth, has established a very general impression that money is the one and only form of wealth, and real wealth is only so much money in another form, so that the modern economic battle has developed almost entirely into a struggle for "money-power," the power to take under "The good old rule" and the battle is called "business," and the knights who wage it "business men," and a knight who wields his weapon of "money-power" solely for the taking of more "money-power" and again more "money-power," and can direct others how to do the same, is known as a "financier," to distinguish him from other business men who incidentally engage in some activity of more or less service to the

community in the course of their takings.

And what is the outcome of all this complex system of business and finance?—a very distorted view of life by the vast majority; to the actual cost of all the commodities and services we need, a considerable addition to satisfy the plunderers; a million and a half of our workers unemployed; and poverty and misery throughout the land.

Although, under present conditions, quite legitimate, is this use of “money-power” as a plundering weapon, and all this struggling for its possession, desirable or wise from the community point of view. Beyond removing obstacles of its own creating, does the amassing of “money-power” serve any purpose which could not be more rationally and more efficiently achieved in some other way.

Ruling out purposes of business as only having the object of taking more money, what are the ultimate purposes for which the individual wants money.

As you sit in your home, reader, think out quietly and honestly what are the things you need and to secure which you wish for money—food, clothing, a house, furniture, public services, i.e., water, lighting, roads, railways and other means of transport : then books to read, education for your children ; golf, theatre, wireless and other forms of sport and recreation, and so on : but everything you put down on your list you will find to be either material wealth produced by labour or personal service rendered by labour.

As we all have these needs of wealth and service, and as the satisfaction of them, as amply as possible, is the whole economic problem, would it not be more rational and more in accord

with the wonderful advances we have made in all the knowledge and arts of civilization, for us all to band ourselves together, in mutual helpfulness instead of antagonism, to carry out the work that really needs doing, and provide the things we want, at actual cost, without any reservation for plunder ; and restrict money to the currency necessary for convenience in distribution, making it only obtainable in return for, and proportionately to, recognized service to the community.

It might, it would, cost us our millionaires ; but as with our millionaires would pass away poverty and unemployment with all their attendant evils, might not our children and our children's children rise up and call us blessed.

Service.

What is service to the Community ?

Any action that adds to the sum of happiness throughout the community by increasing wealth, wisdom, knowledge, convenience or comfort is a service to the community.

It is, however, very important not to confuse actions bringing happiness only to a few at the expense of others, with actions that add to the sum throughout the community.

The husbandman who tills the soil and produces corn, the miller who mills it, the baker who bakes it, and he who carries it from one to the other, and finally to the consumer, are clearly performing service to the community ; but the landlord, who, under

our antiquated laws of property, owns the land, and merely permits the use of it in return for rent, as clearly, performs no service whatever. Rent is "plunder" pure and simple, under "The good old rule," for if the landlord is blotted out and no one takes his place, the land remains precisely the same, but if the husbandman, the miller and the baker pass away, the community is the poorer by what they would have produced.

The artist who paints a great picture, performs a valuable service, but he who buys it, and sells it at an enhanced price, and all the long succession of buyers and sellers, until it is sold for hundreds of times the original price, are only plunderers, using their power of possession to plunder the community, for the picture is still precisely the same picture and its real value the same. And so it is with all who merely buy and sell. Wealth cannot be in-

created by mere buying and selling ; and is all the modern development of salesmanship and advertising, anything but a vastly wasteful elaboration of plunder, although its association with distribution, which is real service, gives it a very misleading appearance of service.

We don't find any pushing salesmanship or flaring advertisements of postage stamps, but we know where to get them when we want them, and the supply is always equal to the demand, and there are neither inflated prices from scarcity, nor spring sales and bargain counters to relieve a glutted market ; for this is a service for service sake.

Making all due allowance for unavoidable complexities, could not something of this rational organization be applied with advantage to all commodities by substituting the

motive of service for the motive of plunder.

If a very bad patch in a good motor road were constantly causing accidents to motors and motorists, an engineer and a doctor on the spot might be performing very good service in mending the injured ; but the service would be a very unnecessary and wasteful one, for it would be more rational and better in every way to mend the road and avoid the accidents.

So it is with many seemingly useful services, which are only necessary because of the defects in our present irrational economic system.

An outstanding example is Insurance, which although of great service to individuals, is of no direct service whatever to the community as a whole. If a house is destroyed by fire, it is a dead loss of wealth to the community, which will have to be replaced by labour

of the community. Insurance in no way replaces that loss, but only distributes it, more or less widely, over the community instead of allowing it to fall on the individual owner; an operation which would automatically result from community ownership of all houses.

Equally useless to the community is life-insurance, which is merely a method of accumulating money-power to enable the insured, when his active power of taking declines or ceases, still to take a share of the wealth of the community; another wasteful elaboration of the game of "plunder," which would be quite unnecessary in a rationally organized community where the well-being of every individual from birth to death was the concern and responsibility of all.

In the same category, seemingly useful, but when rationally judged from

the community point of view, wastefully unnecessary, are in a greater or less degree, banking, stockbroking, company promoting and other forms of financial manipulation, salesmanship, advertising, law, charity, tax-collecting, and many other of our present-day activities and pseudo-services.

In a somewhat different category of mixed blessings comes the leader of industry who personally organizes some great productive work. He undoubtedly performs a real service to the community, and is entitled to a just remuneration for that service; but that remuneration not being fixed by any rule of value or proportion, but only by what the individual has the power to take from the community, the spirit of service is very quickly swamped by the spirit of "plunder." Then others, seeing the opportunity the undertaking offers of securing

“plunder,” bring in their money-power, that they may increase and share in its power to plunder, generally quite regardless of any service to the community, which, if it does incidentally result from the exertion of their money-power, could be quite as effectually attained without their intervention.

And consequently how very frequently the really capable practical men in industry, the men who are really producing wealth, are entirely subservient to these financial interests, whose aims of “plunder” they have to serve ; frequently to the very decided disadvantage of the community, who would be much better served by the practical men if directly employed, as is so incontrovertibly demonstrated by the success of municipal and national undertakings ; all common talk and loose statements to the contrary notwithstanding. If any

one doubts this, let him read "Practical Socialism," by Christopher Addison, Minister of Munitions, during the war, and learn what were the actual results of State intervention in that service.

If all these needless activities were, by better organization of our powers, eliminated and the released power, much of it of high quality, applied to purposes of real usefulness to the community, what an immense increase of wealth we should enjoy.

Would it not be worth while to exert our reasoning power upon these matters, instead of calmly accepting what is, because it has been.

Cease Borrowing.

A party of children scramble for sweets. When the scramble is over, the hostess finds that her own boy, being stronger and rougher than his guests, has secured by far the largest share of sweets, and asks him to give her ten of them to give to small boys who have secured none.

“Yes! if you will give me fifteen to-morrow.”

He is a financier, he takes advantage of his mother's dilemma to drive a good bargain for himself. Is he to be admired? Should his mother encourage the spirit of “plunder,” which in after life may lead to fortune, by agreeing to his terms, or would she more wisely reply, “No! You have taken more than your share; I

am sorry to disappoint you, but you must give them up."

Is not the lending of money by individuals to the community very similar to the boy's lending to his mother? Is it necessary? Is it wise?

It has so long been the practice for the individual embarking upon some enterprise, for which he has insufficient capital or "money-power," to borrow "money-power" from others who have accumulated it; that when the community or any section of the community, has decided upon some undertaking of public utility, requiring capital, the same practice has been adopted without any question as to its wisdom.

With the object of lightening our present burden by the rather mean expedient of throwing part of it on to our children, the repayment is extended over a long term of years; but it has,

eventually, to be paid and the longer the term, the greater the amount that has to be paid in interest.

One such borrowing might be excusable, but when a continuous succession of borrowings is indulged in, the seeming gain very rapidly disappears and is succeeded by the almost grotesque result shown in the following table, in which, for the purpose of illustration, it is assumed that the community borrows £2,000 each year, and, each year, repays 5% of the principal, together with interest on the balance outstanding at the rate of 5%.

Irregularity in the amount of annual borrowings and variations in the term for repayment and rate of interest, whilst altering the incidence, will not alter the character of the result.

Each year the community, with the borrowed money-power, will be able to take £2,000 worth of value. For the

TABLE illustrating the effect of repeated borrowings repayable in 20 years with 5% interest.

Loan No	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	Annual Totals.	Balances owing.	Annual saving.	Annual loss.
1 st Year	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	200	1900	1800	
2 nd "	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	395	3700	1605	
3 rd "	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	585	5400	1415	
4 th "	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	770	7000	1230	
5 th "	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	950	8500	1050	
6 th "	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1125	9900	875	
7 th "	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1295	11200	705	
8 th "	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1460	12400	540	
9 th "	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1620	13500	380	
10 th "	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1775	14500	225	
11 th "	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	1925	15400	75	Total in 9 years £5250.
12 th "	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2070	16200		70
13 th "	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2110	16900		210
14 th "	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2345	17500	9900	345
15 th "	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	-	2475	18000		475
16 th "	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	-	2600	18400		600
17 th "	120	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	-	2720	18700		720
18 th "	115	120	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	-	2835	18900		835
19 th "	110	115	120	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	-	2945	19000		945
20 th "	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	-	3050	19000		1050
21 st "	-	105	110	115	120	125	130	135	140	145	150	155	160	165	170	175	180	185	190	195	200	3050	19000		1050

Annual value received £2000.

first eleven years it will escape full payment for that value, by an annually decreasing amount, but to a total sum of £9,000 in the eleven years, but from that time forward, the annual payment will be greater than the value received by an annually increasing amount, reaching a total of £5,250 in the next nine years, and from the twentieth year the community will annually pay £3,050 for £2,000 worth of value and a balance of £19,000 will still be owing as long as the process goes on.

If it goes on for a further twenty years and then the balance is paid off, exactly £80,000 will have been paid in the twenty years for £40,000 worth of value received.

The whole transaction, being merely manipulation of money-power within the community, does not of course, directly decrease or increase the total wealth of the community, but enabling

the few to plunder the many, under "The good old rule," and exaggerating the inequalities of distribution, it tends to check production and increase poverty and unemployment.

Is this wisdom? Would it not be wiser, better in every way for ourselves, and more honest and generous to our children, to pay for each £2,000 worth each year.

It may quite correctly be contended that most of the undertakings for which money is usually borrowed are of a local character and undertaken by Local Authorities, who have not the powers of taking, and the control of money-power possessed by the community as a whole.

But in these days of rapid travel and complex inter-relationship and inter-dependence, is it not a source of satisfaction to all good citizens to see the towns and cities of our country,

whether our home town or not, improved in appearance and convenience, and the beauty spots preserved ; and is not a slum, wherever existent, a national disgrace.

Would it, then, be too severe a call upon our patriotism for the whole of us, as a community, to undertake and finance all improvements, in whatever part of the country the need arose, with or without special contribution from the particular locality.

Such community action would not only overcome the financial difficulties by calling into operation the special powers of the community, but would render much more feasible, improvements, often much needed, in the less populous and less affluent districts, such as, for instance, combatting coast erosion ; for although to-day it may only be John Jones who is suffering loss by his land melting into

the sea, to-morrow there will be less land for the community to live on.

Although there would eventually be a great reduction of taxation by adopting direct payment in place of borrowings, the change over from the old policy to the new would involve a temporary increase of taxation, for the payments on old borrowings would continue, although annually decreasing, and we should not reap the specious advantage incidental to the first few years of new borrowings.

This of course, would call forth protests and complainings from the tax-payers, with forebodings of crippled industry and lack of capital for new enterprises and the employment of the unemployed ; but to these the answer must be, as the wise mother's to her son who has secured too many sweets, "You have taken more than your share, we are sorry to

disappoint you, but the necessary quota must be surrendered." Moreover, as the equivalent of the money-power taken in taxation would, under the old practice, have been sunk in useless loans, to the plundering of the community, and not applied to industry and new enterprises, these latter could not suffer to any serious extent by the taking.

If it should be contended that we could not afford immediate payment, but must borrow to gain the advantage of postponed payments until we have been able to reap some of the benefits of the improvements, the contention cannot stand, for our ability to afford is evidenced by such works being actually carried out without any approach to the exhaustion of our labour reserves (see "What can we afford," on the next page).

Moreover, the money being actually

raised, on loan, from surplus incomes,
it stands to reason that it could be
raised by taxation.

Honestly analysed, does not this
borrowing resolve itself into a rather
mean and silly device for making our
children pay ?

What can we afford ?

This query immediately suggests a problem in finance.

But if we are rationally to decide what the community can afford, it may be confidently contended that it is not safe to look at the question from a financial point of view.

The function of money-power being solely to take, it can only affect the distribution and ownership of wealth already produced, and although, in practice, money-power is the controlling factor in what the individual can afford ; for the community, with its inherent power to create money-power by the issue of currency, or to take existing money-power by taxation, or to commandeer real wealth, some

different gauge wherewith to measure capacity to afford, must be sought and will be found in its capacity to produce real wealth in goods and services. The measure of that capacity being labour power, it follows that we can afford anything for which the necessary labour can be spared from more important service, and, therefore, if we have labour standing idle we can afford to do something more than we are doing, to wit, anything of which that labour power is capable, any seeming obstacles of finance notwithstanding.

But there being a definite limit to our labour power, it behoves us carefully to inquire :—

“ How can we use our labour power to the greatest advantage ? ”

“ Which services are of the greater, which of the less importance ? ”

“ What is it wise for us to afford ? ”

“ What ought we to afford ? ”

When we seriously attempt to answer these questions, we are brought with appalling abruptness face to face with our shameful neglect of those things to which every noble and lofty motive of humanity points as indisputably first and foremost amongst what we can and ought to afford.

For the man who will deliberately leave his children without sufficient food and clothing, that he may, himself, wear a gold ring, words will scarcely express our horror and contempt, and our penal code brands him as a criminal ; and yet, here in the midst of the greatest accumulation of wealth the world has ever known, and with unused power at hand enormously to increase it, we, the men and women of England, condemn little children to live, ill-clothed and ill-fed, in the squalor and filth of slums.

Will our better humanity permit us

to accept the short-sighted, unworthy, almost cowardly, but sadly too frequently accepted, plea of parental responsibility. Shall we attempt to excuse ourselves for setting a child on the road to Hell by the fatuous, if not sinister, suggestion of his possibly recalling a father who is already half-way there, or shall we starve the child because we are too stupid or too selfish to let his father work.

Can there be any possible excuse ?

Breathes there the man or woman in this land of ours, with humanity so warped and shrunken, as to contend that under any possible circumstances it is right and proper to cripple, body and soul, a little child ?

From the economic point of view there can, surely, be no greater folly ; for the children of to-day are the citizens of to-morrow, and if we have any proper pride in our country, any

real patriotism, it should, surely, prompt us to train up a race of happy, healthy and cultured citizens imbued with the noblest ideals and loftiest aspirations that it is within our power to instil.

Not each parent endeavouring to endow his own particular child with the power and ability to plunder his fellow citizens under "The good old rule," but a loyal and earnest endeavour to make the very best we can of every child born to the community.

The full and ample care of all the children is then the first thing for which the necessary labour should be reserved.

We have the power ; nothing is wiser, nothing is of greater importance.

And yet, many children are neglected.

Why ?

Is it to continue ?

Ye women of England, the answer is with you. You have the vote.

Much has, of late, been said of labour being the first charge on industry. If then, commonsense dictates the employment of everyone capable of working, justice dictates a decent standard of comfort for every one who works ; and humanity extends the claim to all the aged and infirm. To which end our reserves of labour power must be called upon to provide food, clothing, houses, furnishings, water, light, transport and many other commodities and services, and all the works and machinery incidental to their production.

Then education, from nursery school to university and technical training, hospitals and medical service with scientific and industrial research, will demand their quota of labour power, together with books for instruction and pleasure, theatres, playing fields and

other provision for rational recreation of mind and body. And ever as we consider what we can and ought to afford, our intelligence, our honour, our patriotism, our conscience and our religion will, surely, all point, more and more, to our satisfying this need of a decent standard of life for every citizen, and provision being made for the intellectual, industrial and cultural advancement of the community, before employing any of our labour power in providing special luxuries for favoured individuals ; and all our reserves of labour power will, most assuredly, be exhausted before we arrive at anything approaching the extravagant luxuries and costly follies of the privileged few to-day.

One thing is very certain, we cannot afford millionaires.

* * *

“ Cannot afford millionaires ? ”

“How absurd, for they are here ;
what we want is more of them.”

But can any patriot, not a mere flag-waver but a truly patriotic and thoughtful citizen, with the well-being and credit of his country really at heart, look without shame upon a small girl in ragged stockings and soleless shoes, looking into a shop window filled with gorgeous and costly apparel.

That is the cost of millionaires. We pay the price, as does the criminal father for his gold ring : but can we honourably afford it ?

The brilliant pageantry of money-power is dazzling and alluring but accumulations of money-power, invested funds and bank balances, although eloquent of the inequality in distribution, are utterly misleading as evidences of wealth, and no just gauge of what we, as a community, can afford. Of this, let us bear in mind, the one and

only gauge is our labour power fully employed to the satisfaction of our reasons and our consciences.

We certainly have afforded the necessary labour power to maintain the dazzling pageantry of millionaires, but can our reasons or our consciences approve of a million and a half of our wealth producers standing idle, and little girls in ragged stockings and soleless shoes gazing through glistening windows at the shame of Christendom.

* * *

“Sentimental twaddle,” say you. May-be! But is it not, for all that, hideous truth?

Markets and Foreign Trade.

Are we not obsessed with "Markets?"

When a cabbage is grown, the concern of the grower is not "By whom is it needed for food?" but "Having cost so much, where and for how much can it be sold? Will it show a margin of profit?" The cabbage becomes a mere instrument of "plunder." If there is no profit, cabbages are not worth growing. It is not the concern of the grower, or anyone else, that there shall be a supply of cabbages for those who need them. The grower's concern is "How many people are there who can afford to pay for the cabbages they want?" If the people can't pay for cabbages, let the people go hungry and the cabbages rot.

Is not that the everyday philosophy of trade ?

Is it either intelligent or humane ?

Would it not be wiser to grow the cabbages that are required, and distribute them to those who need them, as part of a reasonable share in the wealth of the community ?

So with other commodities. And by the time we are all supplied with the requisites of a decent standard of living, we shall all be fairly busy without calling out for markets, and without wasting energy on elaborate advertising and spectacular salesmanship.

If markets are an obsession, foreign markets and foreign trade are a mania.

There are a number of commodities which we, either, cannot produce at all, or cannot produce in sufficient quantities, and to obtain these commodities a certain amount of exchange with

foreign producers becomes necessary.

In days gone by, our seafaring merchants, by making lopsided bargains with the simpler races of the earth, were able to bring home more wealth than they took out, and so enriched themselves and their home community. But in these days, the growing familiarity of the simpler races with the ways of the plunderers, and competition between the plunderers themselves, have destroyed this happy hunting ground; and now, if commodities are wanted from abroad, an approximately equivalent value in wealth must be given in exchange, and the only way to provide that equivalent is to produce it by labour from natural resources.

It would, therefore, appear reasonable to restrict our foreign trade to the import of such things as are really necessary and the export of the needful

equivalent, in the most advantageous form, instead of leaving it to the present haphazard practice of any individual importing or exporting anything that offers an opportunity for plunder.

It may be necessary to import cotton and tobacco from America, but why import motor cars, tools and machinery, which, if we give our minds to it, we can produce just as well ourselves, and waste endless energy in securing, by exchange, from far quarters of the globe, some form of wealth that America will accept as an equivalent, only, in the end, to have our plunderers peevishly calling out for a reduction in the standard of living of our workers, to rectify the folly of their own manoeuvrings, undertaken entirely for their own gain, without any intended or real service to the community.

When a motor car is imported into

this country from America, considerable energy has, in all probability, been expended in advertising and salesmanship, to effect the sale. Its transport across the Atlantic represents a further waste of energy. Then, in some form of wealth, an equivalent must be returned. There are few forms of wealth, that we can produce, that cannot be equally well produced in America, but, by dint of more energy wasted in advertising and salesmanship, some form of wealth may be found that America will accept, when energy has again to be wasted in transport. Or we may fail to satisfy them with our manufactured goods and have to meet an adverse balance by sending gold. Having no gold of our own, we must get it by exchange from abroad, say, from South Africa, and to get it must send an equivalent in acceptable goods, and again there is waste of energy in advertising and

salesmanship, and in transport of the goods to Africa, and the gold from Africa to England, and England to America.

Some may be disposed to put forward the contention that the transport is not wasted energy, because our ships get the carrying and the freight ; but if the carrying is unnecessary, the freight is only plunder, and the energy is still wasted, no matter who gets plunder out of it.

If all the energy wasted, from start to finish of such a transaction, were devoted to the improvement of our productive methods, not only could a superior car be produced, in spite of any possible natural disadvantages under which we may labour, but a better standard of living could be attained for our workers.

Does it not seem rather silly to waste so much energy with no other result

than the giving of opportunity to plunderers, with the accompanying risk of their embroiling us with our neighbours, in their over-eagerness to secure the plunder.

As education and organization spread amongst the peoples of the world, the opportunity for lopsided bargaining will shrink, and shrink, until no other course will be left to any community, but to produce their needed wealth by honest industry. To fight against this tendency means ever more and more energy wasted in futile competition. Would it not, therefore, be much wiser to accept the situation and cut out this waste of energy, importing only such commodities as we cannot produce ourselves, and as far as possible from countries who need our home produced goods in exchange.

And further to this end, let the whole of the imports and exports of the

country be organized and controlled by the most capable men we can find, on behalf of the community, and not left, as at present, to wasteful and ineffectual chance.

Then if it were found necessary, in order to obtain what was needed to make a disadvantageous exchange and give rather more than was received, the loss would be distributed over the whole community, and would be met by the sacrifice of a few luxuries, instead of by a reduction in the standard of living of the workers in some particular industry.

Would this not be more righteous, as well as wiser ?

Dispossession.

Owing to the almost insuperable difficulty of making laws and regulations to fit all circumstances and contingencies, it rarely happens that a law, seemingly good, does not, under varying circumstances, operate unjustly or undesirably in favour of some individuals at the expense of others, even if it does not actually lend itself to the active oppression of the weak by the strong and unscrupulous.

We consequently find a number of thoroughly honest individuals innocently and legitimately enjoying benefits from defective laws, and upon whom any reform, although for the benefit of the great majority of the community, will inflict an undeserved hardship.

Such has been the effect of our laws of property, especially in regard to land.

In theory all land belongs to the King or State, and, in the absence of any other legal holder, still so reverts.

In days gone by, the King's overlordship was much more manifest and lands were granted by him in return for definite services to be rendered ; but by changes in conditions, and in the respective power of King and people, this custom of service has fallen into disuse ; but the ownership continues and has, for all practical purposes, become absolute.

Such absolute ownership and its accompanying rights of use and disposal have been so long recognized as the custom and law of the land, that no one can be blamed or regarded as unjust or dishonest for holding land, or claiming a clear right and title to its use and disposal, no matter how un-

satisfactory to the rest of the community the operation of the laws may be.

But such laws, far from being based on any moral or divine sanction, as some would appear to believe, are merely regulations made by the community for the well-being and convenience of the community, and, therefore, rightly alterable by the community, if its well-being and convenience are not served.

A community to exist must have land, and the land of the community being permanent and strictly limited in quantity, it surely is more rational that the community as a whole should hold the land and permit the use of it by the individual, than that it should belong to individuals, to be used for the plundering of the community.

Some land has a sentimental value to certain individuals.

“ God gives all men all earth to love,
But since man's heart is small
Ordains for each one spot shall prove
Beloved over all.”

Such value having no equivalent in any form of material wealth, should, if happiness be our aim, be, as far as possible, sympathetically respected, especially as the sentiment being, strictly personal, this special value is only co-existent with an individual.

Practically all other land and all other forms of property, of which the community may find it necessary to dispossess the owner, are held by the individual as an instrument of plunder, for the purpose of securing an income, or, in other words, to maintain a certain standard of living for himself and his dependents: which suggests that, in considering compensation where dispossession becomes necessary, it might be wiser to be ruled by the effect dis-

possession will have upon the standard of living of all affected individuals, rather than to give an actuarially calculated equivalent in money-power, which might be used for continued plunder to the disordering of the more equitable distribution of wealth purposed by the dispossession: which purpose would be much better served by assuring to the individual such a standard of life as would be justified by what the community could afford, in view of the standard of life he had enjoyed, and whether such standard arose from plunder only, or partly from some service of value to the community, and whether the individual would be willing to continue, or undertake, some such service.

But whenever the necessity arises to dispossess the individual of property, which he has legitimately regarded as his own, it behoves us, if we are to regard ourselves as just, honourable,

and civilized beings, to act in a spirit of courtesy and kindness, and not of plunder or vindictiveness.

To better appreciate this difference of manner, let us picture someone sitting at ease in a chair, with feet resting upon a second chair, to whom cometh another seeking chairs, and saying, "Excuse me, I am very sorry to disturb you, but there is a shortage of chairs: might I take this one." "Certainly," is the reply: "I should be very sorry to think I was depriving anyone of a seat."

Thus, with thanks and exchange of courtesy, the redistribution is effected with mutual respect and goodwill.

But, if he that seeketh chairs, comes to him who sits at ease, in an aggressive mood, saying "No wonder there is a shortage of chairs when selfish people want two apiece"; and

proceeds, without ceremony or apology, to drag away the chair. Then is aroused the "manly indignation" of the other in "defence of his rights": and with "Leave that chair alone: I have as much right to it as anyone else," he resists, may-be with unseemly force; and no matter which of the two obtains the chair, each sets down the other as an ill-mannered beast, and they part with mutual vindictive dislike.

"Blessed are the meek."

War.

Within a few hours of the declaration of another war, hundreds, if not thousands, of women and children will be dying in agony from poison gas.

Can any possible circumstances justify such cold-blooded and calculated murder of the so-called enemy women and children, or the exposure of our own to such a risk ?

As the result of a recent mock battle, it had to be admitted that London could not be defended by aircraft, against an air attack.

The bombing aeroplane is a purely aggressive weapon.

Its reply to attack is not defence, but reprisal ; by out-murdering murder ;

and we may be quite certain that on the declaration of war, our air force will not await the enemy attack, to justify reprisal, but will, immediately, set forth on the diabolical mission of indiscriminate murder of men, women and children.

It is futile to argue that the attack would be directed against points of military importance. Let us suppose the quarrel to be with France. Is there a port on the French North coast, or on our South coast, that would not be of some military importance; and is there such a town that could be deluged with poison gas without the massacre of women and children.

Can our consciences, oh, friends and fellow citizens of this, so-called Christian land! permit us to be parties to preparations for this diabolical frightfulness, even if war is never to come.

In our name and by our authority,

scientists are searching for, and our young men are practising the most efficient method of distributing the most deadly means attainable of indiscriminate murder.

We cannot avoid responsibility : we are, all of us, including you, ye women of England ! with your newly acquired voting power, potential murderers ; plead what excuses we may.

Can any possible conception of honour, can any consideration of sovereignty, of trade, or of freedom be possibly urged in justification.

Better that the British Empire fade into the limbo of the past, together with our trade and our freedom, than that they should be maintained by means so unutterably foul.

And this hideous stain upon our honour and our civilization is so needless. Let us send our delegates to the League of Nations charged to proclaim

that we will no longer be participants in this accursed thing. We will, upon no consideration whatever, resort to war : but will submit to arbitration or international courts every dispute, whatsoever, and with whomsoever ; and loyally abide by the decision ; and in proof of our sincerity, will hand over our fleet to the League, to be manned and used by them, as they may think fit, as the nucleus of an international police force to deal with disorder, and will contribute liberally to its maintenance.

And war will be no more !

For is it conceivable, that having already, in word, repudiated war, as all have done, any great nation would not respond to such a demonstration of good faith ; but would continue preparations to murder in support of its selfish aims ?

Do not all men and women of faith

and goodwill look eagerly, anxiously, although, perhaps, a little doubtfully, for relief from this terrible and evil shadow of war : and would there not arise, when the first shock of surprise and doubt had passed, such a stupendous crescendo of praise and thanksgiving as would effectively drown any peevish protestations of the timid or forebodings of the jingoes.

Long has it been our somewhat vain-glorious boast that "Britannia rules the waves." Would it not be a far grander ground for pride and one that could never be taken from us, if we could say "Britannia freed the waves."

Oh ! for a statesman with the vision and the courage to lead us to this culminating triumph of civilization ; and earn for himself a name to be handed down from generation to generation, blazoned in gold through

all the ages, scarcely second to that of
Jesus of Nazareth, Himself.

* * *

“What impossible rot! The man
must be an absolute fool.”

May-be, reader, but before you
throw away the book, read again the
foreword, and ask yourself, with all
the earnestness and sincerity you can
muster :

Is it possible that, after all, the fool
is right ?

The Folly of Liquor.

Will anyone attempt to maintain that the consumption of alcoholic beverages is not attended by many grave evils and dangers.

The extent and effect of the liquor traffic in this country can be a matter of pride to very few ; and, perhaps, the majority would agree that the community would be better without it, altogether.

But it is very natural that those who have enjoyed the indulgence in moderation, should resent the suggestion that they should forego, what, to them, is a harmless, if not beneficial, pleasure, because some others cannot help making fools of themselves.

But there must be many moderate

drinkers, who would have no objection to seeing their children growing up as abstainers : and would it not be a wise course, even if we leave the moderate man to the enjoyment of his occasional glass, to save the children from the all-too-manifest temptations and dangers.

Let the toper tope ! but let it be enacted that no person born after a certain date, say, five, seven, or ten years prior to the passing of the act, shall partake of any intoxicating liquor, and that it shall be illegal, under heavy penalties, for any person to give, sell, or offer to such person, or to persuade such person to partake of, any intoxicating liquor.

Mothers and Fathers ! would you not welcome such a protection for your boys and girls.

Such an enactment would not militate against any other temperance

legislation—prohibition, local option, public ownership—which might be attempted ; but would steadily build up a mass of public opinion, which would, in a generation, sweep away a scourge, with which only war is at all comparable for evil.

On Scapegoat Hunting and the Pitiful Failure of Socialists.

What keen sportsmen we are after
“scapegoats.”

Whenever any event offends our sense of rectitude or earns our moral censure, whether it be a world war, a political scandal, a shady business transaction, or petty larceny by a confirmed criminal, there is at once a hue and cry after someone sufficiently blameworthy to be punished, our offended righteousness to avenge : to hang the Kasier ; to hound the politician from public life ; to exact restitution from the business man ; to jail the criminal ; and, having found our scapegoat, we settle down in self-righteous superiority, thanking God that we are not as other men are.

The Kaiser has, long since, been exonerated from sole responsibility for the war ; opportunity and associates lead up to a scandal ; pressure of circumstances and personal environment bring about shady transactions ; and defective upbringing and hard and adverse conditions drive men to crime.

If we carefully and honestly examine the circumstances, and endeavour to estimate the innumerable influences leading up to a final offence, and the measure of responsibility resting upon all who have been in contact with the offenders, or have had influence for bad, or have neglected opportunity of influence for good, upon them, or upon their environment, or upon general conditions affecting the issue, we shall find the responsibility so widely spread that, at the end of the trail, we shall always find one of the culprits in our own backyard.

If we take that culprit thoroughly in hand, we shall have little time or need for scapegoat hunting.

But very few take the trouble, even if possessed of the necessary clearness of thought, to thus analyse responsibility, and it is so much easier, and so much more gratifying to one's self-esteem, to denounce the faults of others, than to correct one's own.

Sweeping condemnation being seldom, if ever, entirely just, many a well meaning reformer does more harm than good to his own cause by ill-judged and exaggerated vituperation.

The great weakness of the socialist movement, at the present time, is the pitiful failure of many, if not most, socialists to appreciate the sublime grandeur of their own creed.

Socialism stands for the public ownership of the means of production and distribution, but beneath this

economic formula lies, as its basis and justification, the great fundamental ethical truth, for although not yet fully recognized, truth it is, that the nobility of man is a sounder basis for social organization than his selfishness and greed.

The very essence and foundation of socialism is consideration for others ; love and kindness ; the elimination of the primal law of plunder for selfish ends, in favour of rational and scientific marshalling of possibilities for the good and happiness of all ; to regard life as a problem, capable of a glorious solution, and not as a sordid battle.

Heirs to the traditions of "plunder," Justice appeals to us as a noble aim, something above the mere sordid needs of life, something that can be demanded on principle, and fought for, for ourselves and others ; whereas Love appears but a weak sentimental

thing, for it cannot be claimed as a right, or taken by force, but can only be won by the giving of love—not a thing for the virile man to seek.

Nevertheless, has not Love been acknowledged and proclaimed by all the greatest philosophers and teachers, through all the ages, as “The Greatest Thing in the World”: and only by recognizing it as the foundation on which to build, can humanity hope to rise to the loftiest heights of civilized development.

But taking only a limited survey, and seeing only part of the vision, some of our would-be reformers, realising the inequalities and injustices of the present system, and how heavily they fall upon certain sections of the people, go forth in a bitterness of spirit entirely preclusive of the far nobler conception of Love, to demand Justice for the victims, and, searching for a scapegoat,

proclaim the "Class War": than which, what could be less in harmony with the basic principles of socialism: one section of the community in antagonism to another; each striving to secure the power to plunder the other. The very essence of "The good old rule."

Similarly arises, with some, a mistaken sense of duty to support and defend any action, wise or otherwise, taken by workers to defend or improve the conditions of their own particular group or union, regardless of the effect of such action upon other workers or the community at large. In which connection it should be borne in mind that, valuable as the Trade Unions have been in improving social conditions, and excellent as many of their activities are at the present time, they are essentially a development and an integral part of the present system of "plunder"; their main purpose being, by combination, to secure power to enable them

to take, under "The good old rule," a better share than each, independently, could hope to secure.

Although the trend of Trade Union policy has, of late, been toward socialism and improved social organization throughout the community, it is only so in so far as general development favours the interests of any particular group or union.

The Unions are very jealous of, and very slow to surrender, any advantage to themselves, even to other unions, as many bitter disputes between rival unions for the right to some particular form of plunder, all too clearly bear witness.

Trade Union action should, in fairness, be judged by the standards of "The good old rule," not the standards of socialism; and on the other hand, socialism should not be held responsible for Trade Union policy; and dis-

regard of this distinction frequently leads socialists into illogical positions and, unfortunately, fosters the misunderstanding of socialism, and brings discredit on the movement.

Other over-eager reformers, with similarly circumscribed vision, perceiving certain individuals in possession of the "Means of production and distribution" which socialists claim for the community, demand "confiscation without compensation." To these let it be suggested that the Co-operative Societies own a very pretty property, very suitable indeed for nationalization. Let them apply their proposals to that property, and see where it leads them.

However unfairly privileged some may appear to be, under true democracy, all, both great and small (for Democracy includes the Dukes) must be sympathetically considered, as already urged in the chapter on "Dispossession."

Another manifestation of the unexorcized spirit of "plunder," is the favourite exhortation: "Stand up for your rights, and resist oppression."

Is there anything good or generous, noble or heroic, beautiful or righteous, about looking after your own interests?

Has not this been the excuse for all the wars and most of the mean actions of which modern man has been guilty, and the very watchword of the system of "plunder"?

"Stand up for the rights of others, and be very careful not to encroach on them, yourself." Is not that a better way?

But if Socialists have failed to grasp the full beauty and significance of their creed, is there not another instance of a very similar failure?

Have not the Christian Churches in their anxiety to impress upon us the transcendent importance of the Spirit-

ual teachings of the New Testament, and their own particular interpretation thereof, rather overlooked the almost equally important ethical or worldly application of those teachings ; and too easily concurred in the very limited acknowledgment of obligation that the average individual is prepared to make, extending to little more than certain canons of personal morality, and the observance of some recognized forms and ceremonies : “ I do this and I do that ; I can't be expected to do more ” : which, honestly analysed, assumes very much the appearance of a sub-conscious bargain, in the true spirit of business : “ That is a fair price for a heavenly mansion ; I don't feel inclined to give more.”

Are not most of us, more or less, guilty of that attitude of mind ?

Or if the worldly implications of the New Testament teachings of love of

our fellow-men be pointed out to the ordinary business man, is not the almost invariable comment : " Oh, yes! that is all very well in theory, as something to think about, but you can't carry on business on those lines." But can that be accepted as an excuse for ignoring the teachings ? Are those teachings merely precepts, without application to everyday life ? Or are they intended to be acted upon, and if they are inconsistent with business methods, is it the Christian teachings or the business methods that are at fault ?

Have not the Christian Churches failed to give us a clear pronouncement on this issue ?

Again, would anyone passing from the midst of " Fashionable Society " to the slums of one of our great cities, be constrained to exclaim : " Here we have Christianity practically applied, this is, indeed, a Christian country ! "

No ! if Christianity be put to such a test, it must be found wanting ; and if our social and economic conditions are not consistent with the teachings of Christ, is it not the manifest duty of the Churches, insistently, to call for the amendment of those conditions : and if the way to such amendment lies, as it most assuredly does, through political action and wise legislation, can the Churches, if they stand aloof, be surprised that they should, by many sunk in the morass of poverty, and by those who are striving to amend the conditions, be regarded with mistrust and contempt.

The Christian Churches stand upon their trial ; can they escape the condemnation : “ I was an hungred and ye gave me no meat.”

If in the ordering of human concerns, the Christian Churches would devote as much energy and enthusiasm to the

promulgation of the great outstanding precepts of Love, with all their implications, as they have done to the propounding and defending of their own theological dogmas : if Socialists would trust to the loftiest conception of their cause instead of degrading that cause by borrowing the methods of the " System of plunder " : and if all of us would put our trust in truth and reason and our noblest motives :—

“ What Might Not Man Make of Man ?

* * *

Is it possible that, after all, the fool is right ?