

no objection to the possibility of work, since work is a necessity of life. What this article really means, however, is that a cooperating nation must accept the obligation to provide full employment within its borders, because everyone in the country has the right to a job. If it does not mean that the state is obligated to provide the job, it is a useless declaration. It is obvious that everyone, if he is alive and free, has the opportunity of going out to try to find employment; and if there is no position that suits him, to develop something at which he can be self-employed. The United Nations statement, however, is in a different category. It says that there is a state-declared right to work, which means that the state must supply some job whenever any person applies for it.

Invitation to Slavery

ARTICLE 21 states that the parties to the Covenant also recognize the right of everyone to just and favorable conditions of work, with a minimum remuneration which will provide all workers with fair wages and equal pay; to a decent living for themselves and their families; to limitation of working hours and periodic holidays with pay. If this right is to come from the state, then the government must control the standards of all em-

ployment and set a minimum wage which becomes the "fair" wage which provides what those in political power decide is adequate for a "decent" living. That, of course, would plunge the government into every phase of the economy. According to Sir Stafford Cripps, who should know what he is talking about in this area: "No country in the world . . . has yet succeeded in carrying through a planned economy without the direction of labor."

Are we then to accept the governmental direction of labor as the meaning of "the right to work"? Is this a reasonable and desirable substitute for the American tradition of letting each man work as long and as hard as he likes at the task of his choice for as much return as others will voluntarily offer him for his product and services? How can the state promise a job to every applicant unless it controls all the means of production? If the state promises jobs, can it permit aggressive competition among workers for any one job? Can it permit private employers to compete for the services of the more efficient workers by offering higher wages? Is such a giant state cartel or monopoly suddenly to refute all history and become a blessing of efficiency and abundant production? Is this the kind of opportunity toward which responsible men would struggle? Is this to be