

and its outgrowth, chattel slavery, have more than their direct evil results to answer for.

HERE is a syllogism which we commend to professors of political economy and statesmen of all nations: The first law of civilization is cooperation. Ergo, anything that interferes with cooperation is an obstacle to the advancement of civilization. Among the things that interfere with cooperation, make it difficult or prevent it altogether, are (1) the private appropriation of the rent of land and private control of natural resources; (2), tariffs, whether for protection or merely for revenue, and (3), wars, which are wholly destructive of all cooperation.

THIS is all any statesman needs to know, but it is just what all statesmen do not know. It will probably surprise most of the heads of government to learn how brief a programme founded on this syllogism will do for their purpose. It would also surprise them to learn how brief a programme would send their names thundering down to posterity as first among the world's emancipators!

IF cooperation is the law of civilization, how utterly futile are the machinations of cunning statesmen looking to national advantage or pre-eminence in power. Every such attempt must defeat itself, for it looks not to cooperation but to selfish rivalry. There is "a place in the sun" for every nation, and no nation can shut out the sunlight from another, or monopolize a greater amount of "sunlight" for itself, without injury to its own interests. But that is chiefly what the statesmen of various countries have been trying to do. All the arts of diplomacy have been bent in this direction; all the various devices to enrich themselves have seen nations impoverished by the very methods by which they sought to impoverish others.

IT follows that if cooperation is the law of civilization, its real field is the society of nations economically bound together, organized for mutual help and reciprocal exchange. Its field is as wide as the world. This does not mean any artificial union of states. Nations are bound together by economic alliance that natural law has declared from the beginning—an alliance that is not the creation of governments, and not even needing their sanction, but inherent in the nature of things and depending upon individual buyer and seller.

THIS cooperation of society, of man as a trading animal looking for some one who may do the things needing to be done, or qualified to provide what he needs, lends enormous strength to the theory of human brotherhood. There is no room for enmity when it is realized that men of all nations are bound together in an economic alliance, one with another. It is only when governments seek to

ignore this natural alliance that they face disaster or come to grief.

FREE traders have written well and earnestly, but this larger aspect of the question has seldom been sufficiently emphasized. Indeed, to most people the vision has been denied. But it means more than the destruction of tariff barriers—it means living in accordance with the laws upon which the perpetuation of civilization depends. And indissolubly associated with it must go the common participation in that social fund which arises from the growth of civilization which economists call rent, and which is more popularly called land value. For the cooperation called civilization breaks down or is destroyed when the social fund is monopolized by the few, or is unequally distributed.

MUCH of this vision is clouded by the more obvious aspects of industrial life, which seem to distort the picture and dim the perspective. Chief of these is the apparent helplessness of the man who works for wage. Yet this is only one of the results of the failure of society to grant the right of access to natural opportunities. Mines, forests, building lots, agricultural areas, have been withdrawn from use save at prices that labor cannot afford to pay. For the wage worker the world has been made that much smaller. The field of cooperation has been circumscribed. The laborer finds fewer bidders for what he has to sell—his labor. The remedy is to throw the opportunities open to use and to increase the area over which cooperation resulting from the union of labor and land may start afresh. Think what the effect would be were it to be announced tomorrow that a new continent had been discovered! But here at home is news that should be even more welcome. For here lies a continent ready to our hands, a continent that needs not to be subdued or wrested from a state of nature, but beckons to us right at our doors with all its infinite riches. And all that is needed is the exercise of the power of taxation to sum up into use the vast unused portions of this outspread continent!

THOSE who think they are thinking are prone to remind us nowadays that this is the machine age, and that this fact offers an explanation of the hard times and unemployment. It does not occur to them that during the prosperous times of two or three years ago—we were as prosperous as these same men understand prosperity—we had nearly as many machines—we have not added much to the number. Wherefore this sudden dislocation between producer and consumer where machines lie idle and men beg for the privilege of working them? It is not the machines but the plight of the consumer—who, were his demand effective, that is if he were able to buy goods that were produced in response to a demand that would set the machine at work—that evidences a break in the economic

machinery, an interruption of the true functioning of buyer and seller. A failure to sense this as the real cause leads to what we may call the socialistic interpretation of the phenomena. We have never listened to a Socialist talk without hearing something of the supposed effect of machinery. If we remind him that a sewing machine, in the machine sense, is as truly a machine as is the locomotive, we submit ourselves to raucous laughter. Yet they are both part of the process that lightens labor, and were its full effects not minimized by other causes would tend to prevent all unemployment.

FROM the earliest times every age has been a machine age. The progress of prehistoric man has been roughly divided into (1) the Stone Age, (2) the Bronze Age, and (3) the Iron Age. The man of the Stone Age relinquished his ruder methods when he discovered that his machines (his implements) could be made of bronze, and later of iron, in more enduring form. Roughly speaking, he continued to discover improved machinery in this order: stone, bronze, iron. Every time he discovered a new machine, or new material for his machines or tools, the human race moved forward. He never thought of looking at the process as a calamity. It was reserved for a more subtle generation to regard this law of human progress as operating in some way to make it harder for the worker. We do not believe that the men of the Iron Age commiserated with their brothers and expressed regret that they had not lived in the simpler age of stone before bronze and iron implements had thrown them out of employment!

NO machine ever threw a single man out of employment. What occurs is the temporary displacement of labor. But this is inevitable and in the long run tends to right itself in the effective demand resulting from decreased cost of manufacture. Narrow-minded trade unionists do not set this—so they fulminate against the machines and the employers. These men are the direct descendants of those who mobbed the Hargreaveses and Arkwrights for inventions which in the long run enormously increased employment. Labor unions have their justification, but their real genesis lies deeper than William Green suspects. Least of all is the machine the enemy of labor. Bitterly as many of the leaders of labor are opposed to socialism, their attitude is really the socialistic one. They add enormously to the socialistic appeal. They keep up their shadow-boxing with an invisible enemy and keep repeating their insane twaddle about the machine. How many men did the locomotive put out of employment? How many the sewing machine? How many the linotype? And learned writers echo all this twaddle by characterizing ours as the "machine age," and stopping there, leaving the cause of unemployment and widespread industrial depression resting upon this fragile foundation. Suppose the masses should take seriously these learned gentlemen

and start out to demolish the institutions which centuries of progress have built up?

THERE is this to be said, if not precisely in extenuation of the attitude of labor and the host of writers who think machinery is in some way inimical to labor, but as in a measure explaining this curious misunderstanding. John Stuart Mill came near the truth when he said it was doubtful if machinery had lightened the labor of the working masses. The reason, which Mill himself did not clearly see, was that perhaps the greater share of this improvement in industrial processes goes to swell economic rent, or the value of land, and this is monopolized by the few. Every labor-saving device contributes to the further enrichment of this small group controlling the natural resources, and labor, to which otherwise the entire benefit would accrue, sees a large and perhaps the largest portion of this increase of wealth gravitate into the hands of the privileged few.

CAPITAL, or forms of capital allied to land monopoly, or armed with some sort of legal privilege, is able to secure for itself a portion of this constantly increasing wealth due to improved machinery. But it is doubtful if capital *per se* can command any of it. It may for a time, because of labor's divorcement from land, the sole means of employment, obtain control of the labor of the workers, but not for long. Eventually capital is as weak as labor itself until it moves for the control of some natural resource. Not even combinations without some legal or natural monopoly, though they may thrive for a time, can earn large dividends unless the services they perform are outstanding. Woolworth and the chain stores, largely due to mercantile genius, are examples of combinations that exist because they deserve to exist. It might be argued that even here not a little of their success lies in the fact that they minister to the poverty of the people, and that in a state of universal abundance they could not hope for the same success. With this contention we are not disposed to argue. Certain it is that some force is lent to the argument by the fact that Woolworth, the chain stores and the "automats" have felt very lightly the present depression.

GOVERNOR FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT, of New York, is no wiser than his fellow Governors in his official remedies for unemployment. He suggests an increase in income taxes to provide funds for public improvements on which the unemployed may be set to work. To this and kindred proposals it may be anticipated that the Communists, being no more reasonable than other folks, will offer strenuous objection. Yet it is of a piece with communism, of course—a fact which advocates of forcible division of wealth will not be able to discover. It is unpleasant to refer to Mr. Roosevelt and his fellow Governors, advocates of these and similar schemes, as Communists;