

of and are dependent upon, his social environment. And thus the issue is joined between those whose motto is "all for each and each for all," and those who cry, "Give to the individual what he creates, and to the community what it creates." My own opinion is that for all practical purposes in this present stage of civilization, the Single Taxer makes the more timely recommendations. However, I am not here debating the issue; I merely state it.

To "the man in the street," of course, all this seems *doctrinaire* and impractical. Those lacking in imagination accept things as they are, and look with a mixture of suspicion and perplexity at the "dreamer of dreams." Nevertheless it can be safely asserted that visionaries, seers, men of imagination, or prophets, whether in the fields of Religion and Morality, Statesmanship and Politics, or Science and Art, have been, and, I presume, will continue to be, the main forces in the history of mankind. Paul expresses the idea thus: "That which is seen is temporal, but that which is unseen is eternal."

In this age of miracles we have almost forgotten how to be astonished, and one scarcely ventures to cast a doubt on the feasibility of anything. All things are becoming possible. On the material plane wireless telegraphy and aerial navigation, in matters of the mind hypnotic suggestion, and what shall we say of higher things? Medical Science and Psychology are confirming the truth of such old maxims as "A merry heart doeth good like a medicine." We are learning in a new way that Hope is a tonic and Fear a poison. As has been said:

"Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to Heaven."

Hence arise schools of Christian Therapeutics, and talk of auto-suggestion and the sub-conscious self.

All this is, of course, only a new way of looking at an old subject. It throws some light, however, on a question I proposed for Economists in my last contribution to the Review, viz., how great a factor in industrial efficiency the emotions were. The state of mind has been shown to have much more to do with the bodily activities than many people have supposed, and it is a question how far employers should reckon with joy, cheerfulness and interest as factors in their employees' productivity. Unfortunately the modern factory system does not conduce to any of these healthy states of mind, and one is tempted at times to agree with Thoreau, or to look longingly at the Roycrofters' picturesque protest against modern industrialism. In many respects our industrial methods compare unfavorably with the more primitive methods that preceded them. The excessive specialization in modern industry tends to make the man a part of the machine he operates, cultivates an indifference to the monotonous daily drudgery, and promotes anything but joy and interest in the work in hand. Not only this, but the growing separation, also, between those who own the instruments of production—the capitalists,—and those who operate them—the wage-workers,—often leads to a substitution of antipathy for sympathy; and efforts to "skin the boss" replace efforts to improve and increase the business. One of the most serious developments in the