

Today we see the nearly whole world arming for war, each country is trying to have more and bigger and better guns and battleships than its neighbors, and yet the whole idea of war is abhorrent to the average man. I feel sure that none of us would welcome a war, and I doubt if we would find one in a million in this country or in the whole world who likes the idea of war for its own sake.

But preparations for war of such magnitude as we see today can mean only that though everyone is opposed to war, still there is an acute fear that war will come.

Now war does not come without a cause. Why is it that people will consent to go to war if they lose it? Perhaps a desire for prestige, a longing for power are slight factors, but these would never be enough to cause any nation to go to war if they were not backed up by other immensely more powerful forces. These other determining causes are economic, and the ones which we hear most frequently are the pleas of over-population and need of raw materials, or new markets. A country will claim that it cannot provide from its own resources food and a livelihood for its people, and therefore, feels that it must go and is justified in going to war with other countries, if necessary, in order to obtain these things.

For centuries serious, thoughtful people noting how the struggle to secure a livelihood constantly becomes more severe for the great majority of the people, and seeing the growing misery and poverty of the poor, and realizing that most of the misery and poverty in the world is undeserved by those suffering it, have been striving to find the cause of this poverty; knowing that no remedy can be applied to any condition with any certainty until the cause of that condition is known.

In 1789 Malthus, an English Economist, believed that he had solved the problem, and formulated the theory which ever since has born his name, his theory was that the cause of poverty lies in the fact that populations naturally tend to increase faster than does subsistence, and that therefore all countries tend to become over-populated. He cited the American colonies to prove that population increases in a geometrical ratio doubling itself every 25 years while, he said, the subsistence which could be obtained from land, even under circumstances the most favorable to human industry, could not possibly be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio.

(An arithmetical ratio increases by addition, 1 - 2 - 3 - 4 - 5, etc. a geometrical ratio increases by multiplication, 1 - 2 - 4 - 8 - 16 - 32 etc.)

If this premise were true, that population increases faster than does the ability of the world to support that increased population; then it must also be true that in time the world will contain more people than it can comfortably support, and the proportion of people out of work must continually increase because there will not be enough for them to work upon.

In every civilized country in the world today we see millions of people out of work, men begging for a chance to work, but told that their services are not needed. This condition is found not in any one place, but it is general-found in every country of the world, at least every civilized country. Therefore, its cause cannot be any local condition, but rather a condition which is world wide. Since if the world were overpopulated, so many of the symptoms of distress would be the very same as those we have today, it is very easy to jump to the conclusion that the theory Malthus postulated is the correct one, and that the claims made by the various nations that they need more room in order to support their people may be true.

But when we examine the doctrine carefully and try to apply it to the facts as they exist we find that it does not fit. As to whether or not the number of people in the world today is any greater than in any previous epoch we can only guess, but we do know that in spite of the hundreds of thousands, possibly millions of years that human beings have been upon this earth, it is still very sparsely populated.

The population of the whole world today is estimated to be about two billion people; the area of Texas is 265,896 square miles. If the population of the whole world were moved to Texas, it would mean only 11.7 people to the acre, or that every family of four could have a plot of land for themselves of 70 x 210 feet. Does this indicate overcrowding in the world. When one considers the development of industry today and the resources of Texas, with its oil and gas wells, its mining and fisheries, its wheat and cotton and grazing lands; I believe that if the most fertile lands were left for agriculture, it would be possible for the whole population to live in Texas on what our modern industry could produce there, but at any rate there is no question that with each family having for itself a plot of 70 x 210, the population of the whole world could reside in Texas without any crowding, and they would have the whole remaining world to draw upon for sustenance. Taking the world as a whole then, we can see that population has not outrun subsistence yet by any means.

Any long range study of populations shows too, that populations do not increase in a geometrical ratio, as Malthus claimed.

In China the descendants of Confucius enjoy peculiar privileges not granted to others, and therefore, it is probable that practically every person in this family will make himself known in order to secure these privileges. About 2150 after the death of Confucius his descendants were counted. Now if populations doubled over 25 years as Malthus contended, the descendants of Confucius should have numbered then 859,193,106,707,670,189,710,525 people, instead of which they numbered about 22,000.

But it may be contended that this is the record of but one family; and for many reasons it may differ from that of the records of other families. Therefore, let us look at the record for the U.S. from our first census down to the last one. These figures are for 20 year periods instead of 25 years, because our census is taken every 10 years. These figures to be at all accurate should have deducted from them all of the immigrants arriving during the period stated, as well as all of the descendants of those immigrants, because by coming here they have to that extent decreased the population elsewhere.

1790	3,939,214	17 states
1810	7,378,291	26 "
1830	12,866,020	28 "
1850	23,191,876	36 "
1870	38,553,371	46 "
1890	62,629,714	48 "
1910	91,972,266	48 "
1930	122,775,064	48 "

The number of foreign born in the U. S. at the time of the census was about 15,000,000. If we suppose that their descendants amounted to but half as many, this would mean that our population figure for 1930 without these foreign born and their descendants would amount to only about 100,000,000.

for 1930 without these foreign born and their descendants would amount to only about 100,000,000.

Studying this table we see that during the 40 years that the U. S. has contained 48 states (the only figures which count because the area increased with each census before that) that even when one includes the immigrants, our population has not doubled once in 40 years. If since 1910 our population had increased in a geometrical ratio as Malthus contended, then in 1930 it should have numbered well over 200,000,000 instead of only 100,000,000 as it is. The population of the U. S. has not increased in a geometrical ratio nor has the population of any country for which I can find figures.

How about ability to support these populations. Nowhere can we find any basis for the assumption that subsistence "at best" cannot be made to increase faster than in an arithmetical ratio. A machine recently installed by the U. S. Steel is said to require but six men to produce with it what former machines require 600 men to produce in the same time. Here the possible increase in subsistence has not been 100% but rather 100 times (10,000%) as much as formerly produced by the same labor. This record is probably equalled by the Rust cotton picking machine, and now machines are constantly being invented which will increase production enormously. This is true even in agriculture, the least mechanized of all our industries.

The richest countries of the world, those where the natural resources are the greatest, are not necessarily those best able to support their own people--the greatest wealth is found in those countries in which labor is applied most efficiently to the natural resources. Compare the State of Washington with Mexico,

The density of population in each country is approximately the same. Washington has 23.4 people to the square mile, Mexico has 21.3. Certainly the natural resources of Mexico are not inferior to those of Washington, they probably are much greater; yet the per capita wealth in Washington is \$3199., while that of Mexico is \$31.27, less than 1%. Can the poverty in Mexico be due to over-population or to lack of resources? If this were so then the poverty in Washington would be equally as great, the standard of living equally as low, but since its population is denser than that of Mexico and its resources probably less. It is true you will find cases of extreme poverty in Washington, but the average standard of living is much higher than in Mexico, and the possible standard of living very much higher than it really is.

Or take again the population figures of the U. S. as compared with our national wealth. I found these figures for a 22 year period. (Could not get figures for a 25 year period). These figures of course, include land as wealth, which is incorrect, but since the proportions are probably about equal for both 1900 and 1922, they will still apply.

1900	population	75,994,575	National Wealth	\$ 88,517,307,000.
1922	"	105,710,630	"	320,803,662,000.

Judging from these figures one might suspect that Malthus got his ratios twisted, that he had meant to say that population increased in an arithmetical ratio, but that sustenance increased in a geometrical ratio, but of course, that would have upset his theory. The per capita/wealth in the U. S. in 1900 was about \$1167.50, in 1922 it was about \$3034.75. Certainly if there was any increased poverty in the U. S. in 1922 over what there was in 1900 (and no one denies that it was increased very greatly) its cause was not increased population and lack of sufficient to feed it.

And yet, in spite of these figures and all of similar ones, which can be easily ascertained by anyone, we find the belief in the Malthusian theory running through the economic thought of the whole world today, directing its actions. It is true that most economists now agree that the Malthusian theory is incorrect, but even though the doctrine itself is denied, the spirit of the doctrine is still retained, especially in the minds of the people and their legislatures, and also in the arguments of many of the economists themselves.

It was Italy's excuse for its attack upon Abyssinia. But just how did the conquest of Abyssinia help the unemployed or improve the conditions of the average man in Italy? Such raw material as Abyssinia had to sell any Italian could buy before the war if he had the money; nor is it probable that he can buy these things any cheaper now that Abyssinia is conquered unless the tariffs between Italy and Abyssinia are reduced; but tariffs can be reduced without a war, and as for making room for Italy's surplus population, Italy herself has only 349 people to the square mile, less than 2/3

the population of New Jersey, and you yourselves know how thinly New Jersey is populated if you get away from the metropolitan districts. Why should not Italy's surplus population find room in Italy itself? But 6% of Italy's people own 75% of the land there. Is it any wonder that the remainder of the people feel somewhat crowded. Men's ideas on these subjects are distorted by false usage of speech. They speak of Abyssinia as a new Italian colony and imply that because of this every Italian will benefit in some way by the conquest of Abyssinia, but it is not explained in detail how this will be.

The Empire of Great Britain is said to cover 1/4 of the land of the globe. (We hear people referring to the Have and the Have-Not countries, and state that those which Have - more territory and resources than the others should divide up with the Have-nots, in order that the relation between the population and the sustenance of each country should be more nearly equal. And of all the countries to divide Great Britain would need to give up the most because she has the most, but if this argument were of any value than the people in the "Have" countries should prove to be better off than those in the "Have-not" countries. Is the condition of the British working man better than that of the working man in most other countries? Their history of dolce for the past few years shows you that it is not. If Britain tomorrow were to become possessed of half of the globe, the wages of the British working man would not be raised a single penny; because wages are fixed by just one thing, - the price which must be paid for the use of land, or conversely, what a man can make working on the best land which is free to him. Though the English colonies are far greater and more prosperous than those of any other country, the English people are suffering today just as much as are those of Italy, which Sir Samuel Hoare said, in a speech in the House of Commons, needed more room.

Germany today is beginning to demand the return of her colonies, using the same arguments, that she needs more room for her people, and access to raw materials. But there is not a nation in the world today which has any over-crowding that is not due to artificial conditions, nor one which needs any raw material which she cannot buy, except as tariffs prevent trade between nations.

Nor are the people in the U. S. any more logical. We see the same thought creeping up everywhere here. We have already restricted our immigration drastically, but there is a motion to restrict it still farther in order to keep out men who would compete here for jobs, implying that there are now too many men here for the work there is to do. We hear agitation for shorter hours, shorter work weeks, in order that more men can be employed; and of the arguments used in favor of birth control is that it will reduce our population. We hear constantly that women, especially married women should not work outside their own homes, but should leave all such jobs for the men. Even in the agitation for the child labor laws, though the injustice to the children is often stressed, still one of the arguments frequently used is that the children take the jobs away from the men. Even in the agitation for the child labor laws, though the injustice to the children is often stressed, still one of the

arguments frequently used is that the children take the jobs away from the men. We have our Townsend Plan and other plans for old age pensions, - pensions usually to be forfeited if the people receiving them accept paid work of any kind, - a provision made to induce men and women over 60 or 65 not to compete for jobs and to make way for the younger people. Even though other arguments, pro and con, are used in discussing these questions, we find that one of the chief supporting arguments is based on the thought that there is not enough work to go around, that there are too many people here to be comfortably supported.

There is the implication that people in these classes are injuring their fellows by working. Now no one can work and make himself living except by adding to the stock of wealth in the world, - the more any one man labors the more wealth there is in the world for all one. If, as we have tried to show, people produce their own wages as they work, then no individual could possibly injure another simply by working, no matter how many hours nor how many years he works, nor could any man by working be anything but a benefit to himself or to society in general. Labor produces all wealth, and the more labor is exerted the more wealth there will be to divide.

It is true that today we have millions of unemployed people, millions of people who cannot get jobs, but those who believe that this is due to the fact that there are too many people in the world, should look at these population figures taken from the world Almanac:

England	has	742.2	per sq. mile	Rhode Island	644.3
Belgium	"	698.8		Massachusetts	528.6
United Kingdom	"	504.7	population	New Jersey	537.3
Japan	"	433.3	in States	Connecticut	333.4
Germany	"	360.7	given	New York	264.2
Italy	"	349.1	for	Pennsylvania	214.8
Denmark	"	207.4	compari-	Maryland	164.6
France	"	196.9	son	Mississippi	45.4
United States	"	41		Washington	23.4
Mexico	"	21.3		Wyoming	2.3
Canada	"	2.8			

Some people feel that the customs and the government of a country have a lot to do with their economic conditions. Even though these things may have a trivial effect, notice England at the top of this list with 742 people to the square mile, with Canada at the bottom of the list with less than 3 to the square mile. The customs and government of these two countries are very similar, the natural resources of Canada are at least equal to those of England, probably they are much greater and yet the condition of the average working man in Canada is but little better than it is in England. If 742 people can live as well on a square mile in England as can 3 on a square mile in Canada; then certainly the poverty in Canada, at least, is not due to over-population.

If the population of the United States were to be multiplied seventeen times, we would have but 697 people to the square mile, less than the present population of Belgium, and yet we are suffering from the same economic mal-adjustment that they have in Belgium. Can over-population be our trouble? Referring again to Texas, if the whole population of the U. S. were moved to Texas, every family of four could have a plot of land of 5.52 acres, and the population of Texas then would be but 461.74 to the square mile, much less than we now have in New Jersey.

At the present time we frequently hear refererences to the necessity of continuing relief for the 5,000,000 to 10,000,000 people who, it is claimed, must be permanently unemployed here. Why is there any necessity for these people to be permanently unemployed? Are the resources of our country depleted? Everyone knows that they have scarcely been touched! Are we lacking in the knowledge and skill which will enable us to use these resources? Probably in no other country in the world do the people of that country have a greater ability to produce wealth when they have an opportunity to do so than do our own people. Here in the United States we have 122,000,000 people, - do all of the 122,000,000 people have everything they want, so that there is no work for the unemployed to do? I believe that in the whole 122,000,000 people, one could find very few persons who could not think of at least a few things which he or she would like to have if it were possible to buy them? Here are our millions of unemployed, - don't these people want to work? Every self-respecting man wants to feel that he is earning his own way.

If then, we have the resources from which to produce material things; and if we have the skill and ability to use those resources, - both of which are certainly true; if we have millions of people who would like to have the things they now lack, and have other millions anxious to go to work upon our natural resources to make these things the millions lack, what is it that causes unemployment? Now can there be a scarcity of work until all human wants are satisfied?

The reason we have unemployment in this country cannot be that we have too many people here; and yet, practically all of our relief legislation in the past and proposed for the future is based fundamentally upon this conception, as are also most of the general economic arguments heard from one end of the country to the other.

The Malthusian theory seems so easy to disprove that it would seem a waste of time to spend a whole lesson upon it, if it were not for the fact that because it seems to explain so many of our present economic symptoms, you will need constantly to be refuting the arguments based upon it. But it is not true, - no extended argument is necessary to prove that it is not true, all that is necessary is consideration of a few figures.

I have stated that Labor produces all of the wealth in the world; this statement however, tells but half the truth.

Men cannot produce something from nothing, - he cannot produce anything except from the land. Without land man not only cannot work, - he cannot even exist. Poverty and unemployment anywhere in the world, could not be due to over-population until all of the productive lands in the world were in use and the natural resources of the world insufficient to properly supply man's wants?