

the different way in which several European leaders are regarded. For example, King George is loved, Hittler and Mussolini are feared.

BUT to talk democracy to men who are economic slaves, who must beg the boon of work, or who must subsist upon charity, is a ghastly mockery. To ask of men deprived of power to control their own affairs that they participate in the business of government, is a joke, but a sardonic joke. From the substratum of social misery, which is the lot of the majority of men, we may with absolute certainty trace the rise of fascism in Germany and Italy, the decay of liberalism in Great Britain and the decline of democracy in America.

Two Presidents to Another

SAID Woodrow Wilson: "I do not want to live under a philanthropy. I do not want to be taken care of by the government, either directly or by any instruments through which the government is acting."

President Roosevelt will please note and remember the N.R.A. codes.

Again said President Wilson: "If any part of our people want to be wards, if they want to have guardians put over them, if they want to be taken care of, if they want to be children patronized by government, why I am sorry, because it will sap the manhood of America."

Professor Tugwell and the socialistically inclined Roosevelt are invited to reflect upon this.

And again we quote the last Democratic President, Woodrow Wilson: "I do not want a smug lot of experts to sit down behind closed doors in Washington and play Providence to me. There is a Providence to which I am perfectly willing to submit. But as for other men setting up as Providence over myself I seriously object. I have never met a political savior in the flesh and I never expect to meet one."

Respectfully submitted for the consideration of the President and his experts!

From a President who also lies in his grave and has been longer time dead, come these momentous words, which President Roosevelt is also asked to note and perhaps take to heart: It is Abraham Lincoln who speaks:

"The land, the earth God gave to man for his home, sustenance and support, should never be the possession of any man, corporation, or unfriendly government, any more than air or water, if as much."

Lincoln saw the land question. He would have dealt with it in the big way. To him there was no such thing as property in land any more than in air or water.

He had no doubt of the principle he laid down. Of the method to be pursued he was not so certain. He said: "A reform like this will be worked out some time in the future." He knew the movement would meet with opposi-

tion and he knew the kind of opposition it would meet. Very forcibly he says:

"The idle talk of idle men that is so common now, will find its way against it, with whatever force it may possess, and strongly promoted and carried on as it can be by land monopolists, grasping landlords, and the titled and untitled senseless enemies of mankind everywhere."

Thus spoke the Prophet-President. Is Franklin Roosevelt capable of understanding?

Save the School

WHEN two years ago Oscar H. Geiger started the Henry George School of Social Science it was with deep-seated faith that the support necessary for its maintenance would be forthcoming. This faith has been justified only in part. Such contributions as have been received have been only sufficient to carry on in a small way, and the work is seriously handicapped for funds.

We are not asking now for contributions from those able to give but five dollars or so, though these are welcome, and such responses have been generous indeed. We are appealing now to those wealthy Henry George men who are able to contribute substantial sums. Of these there must be quite a number. One or two in this fortunate class have responded. But not enough. Five thousand dollars a year are needed to do the things that ought to be done. This is the amount imperatively needed for the work.

We sometimes wonder if our friends to whom a large contribution would mean little have the vision to see the possibilities of this great experiment. Mr. Geiger has made a beginning, a small beginning, it is true, but large enough to furnish a demonstration. The enrolment of eighty students, a great number of them public and high school teachers, members of seven or eight classes, should thrill the imagination. Let us figure a Joseph Fels on the scene, and the School in receipt of \$50,000 a year! The Henry George University would be in sight and further liberal endowments would follow. What a future would be made possible—the great gospel of industrial emancipation inculcated in a great educational institution to which the youth of the country would flock!

This appeal to wealthy Single Taxers of vision—and we think there must be such—would not be complete without a word as to the Director. Of all those who have gone before, the great apostles of the movement whom we love to recall, Mr. Geiger does not rank as an orator like John S. Crosby, a crusader like Father McGlynn, a fiery enthusiast like Hugh O. Pentecost, but as a teacher he surpasses them all. Not at any time in the history of the movement has there appeared so richly qualified an instructor. With a tactfulness and art of appeal he draws these young people to him. Socialists and communists, so often impervious, answer to this appeal. Not only does he know from the fund of a deep-stored mind the things he wishes

to inculcate, but he is quick to anticipate the difficulties of his students. With painstaking care and gentle consideration he resolves their doubts. We believe many in the years to come will look back with grateful memories to this finely equipped teacher who guided them successfully through difficult paths and made them see the truth in the light of which so many perplexities disappear.

If the School is forced to suspend a great tragedy will have fallen upon the movement. It will not be known how grave a tragedy it is by those who, because they lacked the vision, failed to realize how great were its promises and possibilities.

The Great Triumvirate

THE three men who are prominent in the administration recovery programme are interesting as providing studies of character. Tugwell, Johnson and Richberg are an interesting triumvirate. While Tugwell in much of his writing exhibits a Torricellian vacuity of thought he clothes it with a professorial garb of calm superiority. He writes with a superb disdain of his critics. He indicates that those who differ with him are animated by some secretly base motive, that they wish to retain some monopolistic privilege, and that if they venture to criticise the programme it is quite clear that they are influenced by motives more or less corrupt.

Johnson, a somewhat more engaging personality, is the raging tragedian of the heavy melodrama. He is almost ferocious. But we like him. No one has ever treated economic problems in just this spirit and his rage is almost demonic. Yet it is impossible not to admire him. He puts up a good show. Napoleon said of a certain famous charge, "It is magnificent but it is not war." And we may say of General Johnson's great outbursts, "They are magnificent but they are not business or economics."

Richberg is different. He is a lawyer and will argue with you. It is true that he has a habit common to all three. He speaks of the "mudslinging of destructive criticism," and of those who look with "jaundiced eyes" upon the administration programme. But that is a common characteristic.

His economics show the same defects as his associates. He is also at fault in his history. He tells us in a recent article that "recovery has proceeded at a rate unprecedented in the up-turn after any previous depression." This is simply not so. The depression of 1857 was over in the Spring of 1858; the stagnation of 1843 was followed in 1846 by good times and the highest wages ever known; the years of 1867, 1868 and 1869 were periods of great depression, but in 1870 business improved considerably. Other periods of depression have been followed by recovery in a time much shorter than today's slight up-turn. That the N.R.A. is responsible for such recovery as we are experiencing, if we are, no well informed man will contend.

And if other countries have shown the same slight up-turn, with little Sweden ranking first, it cannot be due to the N.R.A.

Richberg differs from Tugwell when he speaks in the same article of "the administration codes of fair competition." Competition, according to Tugwell is never fair; it is always destructive and always to be frowned upon.

But what is funny is Mr. Richberg's self-contradiction. He is indignant at "little stores, shops and restaurants which go bankrupt in less than five years and which bombard Congress with complaints that monopolies fostered by the codes are driving them to the wall." He does not deny this but says: "The N.R.A. codes may sometimes hasten the end of such small and uneconomic enterprises." But he says this is a "process which has been proceeding relentlessly for many years despite the anti-trust laws."

We are still a little puzzled. It seems the N.R.A. codes are performing a really useful purpose in doing away with "small and uneconomic enterprises." If this is accomplished, and it is thought desirable, as Mr. Richberg says it is, and is "proceeding relentlessly" without the codes, the job seems to be well in hand.

But who can be sure if these small enterprises are uneconomic? Maybe some of the larger enterprises are also uneconomic. And we would point out that where ninety per cent of industrial enterprises fail it is due not to unregulated competition, nor to the absence of codes, but to the same set of economic conditions in which the majority of enterprises, large and small, come to grief.

But the following is of interest where Mr. Richberg says: "It is profoundly in the interest of large enterprises to preserve the economic health of small competitors—in order that all may enjoy the benefit of legalized cooperation in promoting their industry as a whole * * *"

The unconscious appeal here is to the law of competition and that other law which is made possible by it—the law of cooperation. Of course, Richberg does not recognize it, Tugwell cannot, and Johnson—well, Johnson doesn't care. But it is a natural law of business and economics.

This is the answer to all planning. There are such things as natural laws of production and distribution. If you interfere with them you do so at your peril. The great industrial structural edifice, the delicate laws of distribution, the law of supply and demand which is nothing less than the exchange of supply for supply, shrinks and withers at the touch of government. What millions of hands have laboriously erected the hand of a single blundering legislator can undo. Nature has its way of punishing infractions of the economic law, and any interference with it is free play. The authors of the N.R.A. will learn this to their cost.

NAMES of those friendly to our movement will receive sample copy of LAND AND FREEDOM and circular announcing special premium offer by addressing this office.