

quickly. If, on the other hand, the medicine fails to cure, or even aggravates the illness, the expense is foolish and it would be the height of folly to rely upon it in an emergency.

So we shall explore the question: Are wage and price controls effective medicine for the illness? Does the bottle contain a potent remedy, or is it filled with the false potions of quackery?

A doctor diagnoses illness from his knowledge of a healthy body and how it functions. The economic doctors must do likewise. So our first step is to study the anatomy of a healthy trading economy.

THE ANATOMY OF TRADE

OURS IS a nation of 158 million persons. Like any other giant and complicated machine, its operation can best be seen by focusing our attention on its small, integral, and essential working parts, so that we may clearly observe how they relate to one another.

So let's start with Jones, a pioneer in the primeval forest. He hunts and fishes and grows some crops in his little clearing. He tames a few animals and uses them for toil or to provide food.

Then along comes Smith to be Jones' neighbor. He, too, hunts and fishes and farms. But Jones is the better hunter, and Smith is the better farmer. As they follow

their respective abilities, Jones comes to acquire an abundance of furs, but is short of corn for his meal; Smith has a goodly supply of corn, but is short of furs. So one cold day in winter, Jones—warm in his furs, but hungry—wanders over to see Smith, who is well-fed but shivering in his cave. Jones proposes to trade some furs for some corn.

The two men may higggle and haggle over the terms of the trade. The margin for bargaining may appear to be wide in this instance, in contrast to real life in our complex economy. No alternative market exists for the product each has in surplus, except to keep it himself. But on closer scrutiny, we find that each has an effective bargaining tool against the other: Each knows that the other realizes the advantage of making a trade, as compared with keeping his surplus product. Each knows that there is little sense in driving so hard a bargain that it kills off a trade. Each realizes the absurdity of continuing to suffer for want of what the other has for trade. So we may assume that a trade will somehow be arranged between them.

Now, what terms of the trade between Jones and Smith might be called fair and just?

The question of a just price presumes certain antecedent questions: Says who? In whose judgment? By what right to speak? Justice always presumes a judge with some