

hy machinery, as socialists urge, hut all work cannot be made equally pleasant. To parallel Lassalle's contention, to the scavenger it will not matter that he is better equipped than the scavenger of a century before; it will matter that he is not so comfortably occupied as his neighbor who is a clerk in the central bureau of the Commonwealth Scavenger Service. Compulsion, the ordering of new recruits to this or that occupation, could not long be tolerated. Could the problem be solved by varying the wages to balance disagreeableness? What, in short, is the socialist principle of justice in distribution?

*The socialist state would face many difficulties. Alike if capitalists were compensated and if they were not, whether controlled by government departments or by commissions, in determining what to produce and how much, and in the allotment of tasks, the difficulties appear insoluble.*

To many socialists the old solution of equal sharing still appeals most strongly. It has the merit of simplicity; if it worked at all it would be easy to work. It is, in fact, largely from sheer despair of the other solutions that some have been driven to advocate it. "The impossibility," confesses a Fabian Essayist, "of estimating the separate value of each man's labor with any really valid result, the friction which would be provoked, the inevitable discontent, favoritism, and jobbery that would prevail—all these things will drive the Communal Council into the right path, the equal remuneration of all workers." The complete disregard of the standards of need and of merit stamps this standard as unsatisfactory whether from the standpoint of justice or from the standpoint of practicability. Its adoption could weather the discontent of the abler members of the community only at the cost of a slackening of effort which would make the maintenance of efficiency in production impossible.

The traditional communistic standard is "to each according to his needs." This solution would be the standard of a community served by the genie of the lamp, able to call wealth into existence by a wish. To a limited degree, indeed, it might prove practicable; to a limited degree it does prove practicable to-day; the amount of police protection or use of the king's highway a citizen obtains is not based on equality or merit but on need. This degree of communistic distribution is, however, feasible simply because limited, and because the expense is met by levies on competitively earned wealth. Even were it desirable to adopt as the basis of distribution a standard which