A word more of copartnership, by way of conclusion.

The question that is very often asked is: In what way is copartnership superior to the present wage system? The main advantage, it is said, is that it can bring about a much more rapid advancement to labour which the raising of wages can never give. It is argued that so long as land and capital are in the hands of a limited few, and labour merely rewarded by wages, the betterment of the material lot of labour cannot be anything but slow. A trade union by virtue of its capacity for haggling and haggling may secure for its members an increase in wages; but this increase does not mean that capital and land are given a smaller reward. A rise in wages is added on to cost of production which very soon reflects in higher price for the articles produced. In that case, such a rise in wages is almost futile. But on the other hand, if the workers are given an interest in the profits of the concerns in which they are working, it is possible to supplement their total earnings which do not in any way raise the cost of production. This implies that prices are also not raised. When that share of the profit is invested in the stock of the company, the workers not only receive the capital, but an annual share of that part of the
aggregate produce which goes to remunerate capital. This again does not enter into cost. On the contrary, the accumulated profits of the workers constitute a solid contribution towards the aggregate supply of the capital of the country. This may have the salutary effect of pushing down the interest rate which may mean a rise in wages. Finally the possession of that capital by the working class, the changes that will flow from it, the shareholders rights and responsibilities, the more efficient work and the more sympathetic control - all these are expected to change the very atmosphere that now prevails in the factories. These are the manifold reasons why it is said that copartnership may secure a much more rapid improvement in the economic lot of the worker than is possible under the wage system, pure and simple. If the principle of copartnership is widely adopted in all the factories big and small, private and public, and in the vast number of smaller businesses, will it not, in conjunction with the other measures of reform, obliterate the fatal distinction that now exists between the employer and the employee? Will it not convert the various factories and workshops which are now the hotbeds of conflict and contention, into veritable places of harmony and spontaneous cooperation?