

the difficulties of establishment in a remote region, in addition to the difficulties of effecting a great change in economic and industrial habits, were to prove too much for the enthusiasts for "integral co-operation."

Neither the INDIVIDUALISTIC Group nor the ASSOCIATIVE Group, whose leading members have been thus briefly described, contest the legitimacy of the private exercise of the functions of land-holding, capital-holding, and employing. It is the distinguishing peculiarity of the third group that it does so. Not only does the SOCIALISTIC Group demand that the equivalent of the share of labour in production should be paid to labour, but it demands that private control of the means of production should cease.

(j) The *Collectivist* would take the instruments of production from the hands of the present holders and place them in the hands of the government in trust for the people, the organisation of labour being effected by the government.

(k) The *Communist* would decentralise the government and the organisation of industry alike—the people being divided into communities whose industry would be more or less self-sufficing—the entire available means of each group being available for the subsistence and communal action of the group, while each individual member would be expected to contribute in labour according to his capacity.*

(l) The *Anarchist-Communist* is only distinguishable from the *Communist*, as defined, by his opposition to authority in all forms. The *Communist* would not have an industrial master, but he might have an industrial chief. The *Anarchist-Communist* would recognize worth without rewarding it otherwise than by respect, but he would recognize no authority. The difference is partly political, since to the *Collectivist's* and *Communist's* dictum, "No exploitation of man by man," the *Anarchist-Communist* adds, "No government of man by man."

While these schemes may seem very foreign to our present industrial life, yet the ideas which they represent in extreme forms are germinating among us, and the social forces whose movements we have to estimate are moulded on some one of these lines. Either they are making for increasing the power of the State over industry, like the Socialists; or they are making for the diminution of it, like the Anarchists. They are making towards the fraternal co-operation of those who hold the means of production with those who exercise those means, or they are making for the transformation of society by the suppression of existing classes.

From the strictly economical point of view, the question narrows itself down to this. Which method of distribution is the most economical? And in order that we may be able to answer that question, we must know what is the precise character of current distribution. It is necessary in fact that the same elaborate care which has been devoted to the study of prices, should now be directed to the study of wages.

* Only one communist industrial society exists in England, that of Furniss & Co., Moorhay Farm, near Sheffield. The society carries on the business of quarriers, farmers, and market gardeners.