

lives. Socialists demand the nationalization of the tools of production. What more natural, then, than for machine workers to wish a share in the machinery that they create and operate.

II.

Are only the Socialists machine mad? Has not machinery come to be one of the gods that all progressive people worship? This is largely due to the rivalry for commercial supremacy between the United States, Great Britain and Germany. Extensive manufactures are dependent upon much complicated machinery. And yet, if one hath eyes to see, there is another problem, the real problem, back of all the whirring, clanking machinery, the blazing furnaces and molten metals, and the longer we look the more plainly it is to be seen.

Iron and copper, coal and oil—what are these in their final analysis but raw material, and what is raw material but land? It is absurd to talk about controlling the machinery of the nation, until we have learned to control the raw material, out of which every cog and wheel must be fashioned. How much more sensible, instead of placing an income tax on "vast aggregations of wealth," to first tax the sources of these accumulations—land of all kinds. For it is the power to withhold from use the fountain heads of wealth that makes monopoly so impregnable.

THE PERPLEXED PROFESSOR.

(For the Review.)

By NICODEMUS.

The late Phillips Brooks on one occasion assisted an intoxicated man to his home.

When they had arrived at their destination, the man in his cups said to Mr. Brooks, "I wish you would tell me your name."

"Oh, Never mind my name," replied Mr. Brooks. "Just call me Paul."

"Say, Paul," replied the stranger, "did you ever receive any reply to the letter you wrote to the Corinthians?"

After the manner of Mr. Brooks, I am compelled to say, "Never mind my name, just call me Nicodemus."

As professor of Economics in the College of Imoma, I am expected to guide a number of students in the study of that beautiful science which deals with our social relationships and our economic methods. But, alas, instead of being allowed to follow freely the truth wheresoever it would lead, I am hampered and fettered, and expected to adapt my teaching to the economic prejudices and superstitions of the patrons and supporters of the institutions.

When I was a youthful student, we used to repeat with great gusto,

"*Magna est veritas, et praeualebit;*" but in this institution, from the hints and warnings I have received, it is evident that "veritas" must step down from its exalted pre-eminence, and take a second place to Plutus, so that now we have to say: "*Magnus est Plutus, et praeualebit.*"

I find myself placed between the cross fire of my own convictions and the prejudices of the patrons of the institution.

If I am to live at peace with my conscience, then I must follow fearlessly the pure light of truth; but if I am to live at peace with the patrons, then I must betray the truth and chafe under ignominious restraints. Macauley was quite right. If there was any money invested in the Ptolemaic theory of the Sun moving round the earth, the colleges would still have to teach that absurdity.

Why not step down and out? Yea, truly noble that would be. "*Dulce et gloria est pro patria mori.*" With swelling pride we used to repeat that high sounding phrase, when the enemy was a thousand leagues away. But when a man has passed the meridian of his days, and when he has the dearest in life depending on him, the *dulce et gloria* must give place to the *prudentia*. When young, elastic and full of strength and hope, with my fortune and my cares all under my hat, then the *prudentia* might go to the winds, and I might repeat, "*Justicia fiat, caelum ruit.*" To become a martyr and to have the laughter of the world for my pains, would be truly heroic; but I have to make the humiliating confession, that I shrink at the thought of making others suffer.

I have been long convinced that the common method pursued in colleges in the teaching of Economic Science is far from satisfactory. In too many cases the memory is exercised much more than the other faculties, while the powers of analysis, comparison and independent judgment are seriously neglected. The professor does the thinking while the student is expected to be merely an absorber—a sort of intellectual sponge.

I determined, therefore, so far as possible, to compel the students to do their own thinking. This was accomplished by a process of Socratic questioning, first placing the question before the whole class, then calling on the students to answer, not in rotation, but by selection; then following this with other questions necessarily sequent thereto. In case of contradictory answers, I compelled the students to defend their positions, till they were confirmed or corrected. We may not cover so much ground; but we dig far deeper and the training of the logical faculties is vastly better. It is not so much what you teach, but how you teach, that is important.

I can give only brief sketches of the difficulties we encountered.

One of the first important difficulties in the class related to the limitations of production. "How much can men produce? How much can production exceed consumption? Can humanity produce enough in one year to supply the consumption of two years, ten years or a hundred years? Mr. Jones, I would like to have your opinion."

"That depends," replied Jones. "The pyramids have lasted some ages, but when it comes to pumpkin pies, they soon disappear in our house."

It did not require much questioning of this kind to arrive at the conclusion that, notwithstanding the increased power of machinery and co-operation, humanity cannot produce crops or clothing for much more than one season, and that it is utterly beyond human power to produce enough to keep the next generation in idleness.

"Suppose we give a man the whole earth, with all its potentialities, the mines, the lands, the water-powers and so on, how rich would he be? Mr. Smith kindly answer."

"It is impossible to tell," replied Smith. "He would be richer than any king in the world."

"Would he have to raise a crop season after season, and cook a meal three times a day? Would not his wealth exempt him and his successors from toil during all the ages?"

"Certainly," was the reply.

"And if we all owned the whole earth jointly, would we not be able to live without toil, in the same manner as this hypothetical rich man?"

"Most assuredly not," replied Smith.

"Does all the class agree with this answer? We are told that if we give all the earth to one man, he and his successors, will be freed from all necessity to toil through all the ages to come; but if we give the whole earth to every one, then these new owners cannot enjoy the same power as the first supposed man. How do you explain this contradictory condition, that all the world cannot do what one man can do? Now, Mr. Jones, what do you say to that?"

Very little questioning of this kind soon established the fact that, while one part of humanity may live without toil, it can do so only by imposing the work on the rest, compelling this part to do double duty. Nor did it require much more questioning to ascertain the fact that, so long as we allow one part of humanity the power to charge the rest for access to the natural bounties, just so long do we divide society into two distinct classes. Instead of dividing the work with equity, and rewarding each according to his work, we compel one part to do all the work, and allow the other part to claim a large share of the product.

This was offence number one. I had approached dangerous ground and some one reported that this doctrine had the tinge of socialism or that it was socialistic.

The next subject that led to difficulty was the meaning, the potency and the immeasurable benefit of exchange. For centuries humanity has been divided on the subject of the atonement, one part affirming that its benefits are unlimited, free as the sunshine to those who will partake of them, the other part affirming that the number to enjoy its blessings, has been strictly limited from all eternity. In the same manner the world has been divided into two contradictory schools, the one maintaining that the benefits of exchange are universal, the other asserting with great positiveness that these benefits have strict geographical limits.

The discussion developed in this manner. I asked this question, "Of all

the agencies, which aid man the most to multiply his power of producing wealth, which one is it that primarily is the most important? Kindly prepare to discuss this at our next session."

The answers were varied: machinery, locomotion and navigation, highways and railroads, printing, co-operation, mastery over the physical forces, etc., etc.

"Machinery, you say, Mr. Snarr. If a man lived isolated from his fellow-man, how much machinery could he use?"

"Perhaps a stone or a club, but not much more," was the reply.

"Then under what conditions would you expect to see man use a locomotive or a modern newspaper press?" I asked.

"Only when he could secure enough customers to pay for the engine," replied Mr. Snarr.

"Customers, what does that mean?"

This, of course, led to the conclusion that, before men could use machinery or otherwise utilize the natural forces to any extent, they must specialize occupations and exchange services or products. There must be a constituency, with division of labor and freedom to exchange. By this method of analysis it was established that of all the agencies used by man to multiply his production, primarily the most important, in fact, that which was essentially the first, was specialization and exchange, the one depending on the other, as the two blades of a pair of scissors.

"How long could a man live if he were cut off from this method of exchange, and were compelled to do everything for himself? What do you think, Mr. Sinclair?"

"Well, Robinson Crusoe lived that way for some years," was the reply.

"Did he not obtain some implements and supplies from the ship? Had he not already learned a great many facts about the nature and preparation of food, clothing and other things?" I asked. "Did he enjoy many luxuries?"

"Not many luxuries," he answered.

It was soon learned that without mutual co-operation by specialization of function and exchange, civilization and progress would have been an utter impossibility; degradation, barbarism, ignorance and want the most dire would have been man's doom. Production, without exchange, means poverty and degradation; production, with exchange, opens the possibility to the highest developments of civilization and prosperity.

"Suppose ten men go camping, each with his own tent. Then ten men will separately pitch their tents, ten men will have to draw water, ten men will collect fuel and make fires, etc., etc. But let them form one camp, then one man will draw water for the ten, one man will collect the fuel, one man will kindle the fire, one man will do the cooking, etc. In this way each man becomes equal in efficiency to ten men, and ten men multiply their efficiency thus becoming equal to a hundred men. Or let a thousand men try each separately to convey his freight across the Atlantic in his own boat, would one out of a hundred succeed? Probably not. Certainly no insurance com-

pany would guarantee them at less than a hundred per cent. But let these men combine their efforts in one vessel, and the loss of such efforts would not equal one per cent." All this was elicited with a good deal more by appropriate questioning.

"Between the efficiency of labor in isolation and labor in co-operation, what is the ratio? Miss Lorrimer, ten times or a hundred times?"

"I cannot possibly name the figure, because it is often a ratio between absolute zero and a considerable quantity," replied this young lady, who had displayed considerable ability.

"Well give us a few illustrations to prove your point."

"I have a watch, a piano, a good, well furnished home to shelter me, access to libraries, where I can commune with the choicest spirits that have ever graced this earth, railroads and steamers to carry me to any part of the inhabited earth, a newspaper with an epitome of the world's history brought to my door every morning, and a host of other blessings far too numerous to mention. Not one of these could I have in a state of isolation. I do not see how we can measure the ratio between something and nothing."

"How did all this method of separate production and exchange originate? Did it come from the decree of some king or parliament, or how did it come about? What do you think, Mr. Lawson?"

"Because the people saw that they could accomplish much more in this way," he replied.

"That does not fully answer my question; people often see things without adopting them. What would you think of a people who would not adopt this method?"

"I would say they were destitute of common sense," was his answer.

"Then you say that this method came from the practical judgment, or the common sense of the people. But that does not tell us where the common sense originated. Kindly tell us that."

"Oh," he replied, "It must be that God made man that way. I would hardly think that the Creator would give man eyes and brain without giving him common sense to guide him."

In conclusion of the lesson, we arrived at this result: That the method of separation of function and exchange, with its immeasurable benefits, had originated in infinite wisdom for the development and maintenance of a civilization, and that any man who tried to impede or obstruct this method of exchange was the enemy of progress and the enemy of God.

"At our next meeting we will discuss the agencies that promote exchange and the agencies that prevent or obstruct exchange."

To the question, what are the agencies that facilitate exchange, the following answers were given: Highways and conveyances, canals and railroads, locomotives and ships, money and banking, tunnels and bridges, language and printing, etc.

The obstructions were as follows: Muddy roads and snow blockades, invading armies and naval blockades, mountains and gorges, broken bridges, robbers, etc.

That is very good. It is quite correct that snow-blockades, invading armies and blockading fleets obstruct exchanges. Can you not think of another obstacle, not natural but wholly artificial, erected by men themselves?

After some guesses, a young man called out, "A protective tariff."

"Then would you place a protective tariff and a fleet sent to destroy the nation in the same category?"

"Well," he replied, "is not the object of a hostile fleet to stop exchanges and does not a protective tariff do the same thing?"

This question I allowed the students to discuss for some time.

"Then you are all agreed that muddy roads, broken bridges, hostile fleets and protective tariffs must all be placed in the same class?"

"Do you mean to tell us, professor," said one young man, "that our Congress would first spend a mint of money improving harbors and then establish a blockade to prevent their use? Do you mean to say that the best friends of the country, men of the highest patriotism, would deliberately adopt the methods of the worst enemies of the country? Is that really so?"

"Well, where are you going to classify the tariff? You know that harbors, steamers and other means of transportation all aid exchanges. Where are you going to put the tariff, among the railroads and steamboats, agencies to facilitate?" I asked.

This young man was the son of one of our wealthiest cotton manufacturers, who was at the same time one of our most liberal supporters. For years this gentleman had been a foremost champion for protective duties.

When this young man went home he did not fail to represent that the professor had taught that a protective tariff must be classified with muddy roads and hostile fleets, so that a man asking for a duty to be increased to protect his industry, was actually to be placed in the same class as an invading army or a hostile fleet.

Shortly afterwards I received a message that the president of the college wished to see me. He was very polite, but at the same time he succeeded in making me understand that it would be a suicidal policy for the college to alienate its most liberal supporters.

"Oh, truth," I had to exclaim as I wended my way home, "how thou hast had to fight thy way. Thus Herod tried to murder the infants."

But there was more trouble in store; the protectionists were not the only ones to be placated. I read to the class one day an extract from a speech by Mr. Balfour, the British statesman, in which he stated that there was no difference between the value of the land and the value of other things. I asked the students to prepare to discuss that question at our next session.

"Did you find any difference, Mr. Lawrence?"

"Yes sir, we can import potatoes and clothes into the middle of the city but we cannot import town lots. There is competition for commodities; but not the same competition for lots of land."

Other answers followed.

"The value of eggs and butter disappears as they become old; but the value of the best lots grows as they become old, provided the population increases."

"We can build houses; but we cannot build land."

"As population increases labor makes commodities more abundant and thus increases their aggregate value; but as population increases, the land must become more scarce and more dear."

"Railroads should make goods more cheap; because they reduce the cost of carriage; but railroads raise the value of the land, which they make more suitable for business."

In the discussion of these propositions, I tried to concentrate the attention on this important fact: The value of the land is a communal value; the value of the house results from individual toil and is an individual value.

Following this I asked them to bring me for our next meeting a list of the constructive or beneficial agencies, and also a list of the destructive agencies.

Among the constructive agencies the following were reported: Human labor, animal labor, fertilizers, explosive agents, division of labor and exchange, the use of electricity, heat and light, mechanical forces, etc. The destructive agencies were: moths, cut-worms, summer frosts, diseases, conflagrations, droughts, warfare, potato-bugs, etc.

"Where do you place the land-speculators, constructive or destructive, with the busy bees or with the potato-bugs?"

The answer was spontaneous and unanimous. There was but one place for the land-speculator to go, namely, into the same company as the potato-bug.

Again I have been kindly invited to see the president. He has affectionately asked me to consider how disastrous it must be to the institution, if I am to offend the patrons thereof.

Yes, there are times when silence is golden.

And while there might have been a vacant professorship in a certain rather redoubtable institution of learning I have to confess that the professor still holds his job. And the question arises, who are the real teachers in our universities and colleges?

A REFORMER'S GRACE.

"We thank Thee, our Father, for this, our 'daily bread.' We do not forget, however, that many of Thy children know not how nor where they may obtain their next meal. But we realize that such is not Thy Divine Will, inasmuch as Thou hast made ample provision, in the fertile earth, for the material needs of all Thy children. Inspire us, therefore, O God, to work diligently to the end that the equal rights of all Thy children to the use of the earth may be recognized and established by all nations, thereby fulfilling Thy Divine Will and hastening the coming of Thy Kingdom on earth. Amen."

W. A. HUNTER.