

Is it with this conglomerate mess that Mr. Gannett expects the Republicans to ride into power?

**T**HE real solution of our difficulties is so simple in its essentials. Where do we find even a hint in any of these contributions of the distinction between public and private wealth, of the values created by the activities of the community and other values produced by the labor of individuals? Instead of this we are deluged with words. We hear much from Senator Borah of "monopoly," but monopoly of what? Does he mean monopoly of natural resources? If so why does he not say so? That is the giant monopoly. Other monopolies are almost negligible or dependent upon this fundamental monopoly. Is there a word anywhere from these Republican spokesmen that this is a human problem and concerns man's relation to the earth? Until a practical solution of this question is found nothing else really matters much.

**P**ERHAPS the most pitiable figure in American political life is Senator Borah. With a sincere desire to improve conditions he flounders ludicrously in seas of confusions. The plank for which he asked recognition in the Republican platform urged the application of the criminal law against monopoly. If he knew what monopoly was he would know that that was not the remedy. Every monopoly exists by reason of legal privilege. They flourish only within the shelter of special privilege created by law. The primary monopoly is the monopoly of land about which Mr. Borah says nothing.

**H**E speaks of "price fixing" which he would correct, placing it under the ban of the law. He has seen the futility of price fixing under the NRA and has very properly condemned it. But he does not see that the law of competition tends to correct all such abuses automatically. Of course such competition must be free and certain obstacles must first be cleared away. But Mr. Borah can see no remedy other than the most stringent regulation, including a resort to the criminal law. Think of discussing monopoly intelligently and at the same time ignoring tariffs, taxes, and the private control of natural resources! Poor Borah!

**W**ALTER LIPPMAN is only a little better than Borah. He says that "probably the whole thing (price fixing) is based on a false theory." Then he proposes a programme for the conservation of natural resources. He says: "If there is overproduction of coal in the sense that more coal is mined than can be sold at a profit then it may be better to induce the States, perhaps even to subsidize them, to buy out the marginal mines

and close them down and take care of the displaced miners until they have been transferred to other jobs."

**W**HEN we consider the millions of people who will be cold this winter for want of coal there is an unconscious wickedness—a certain thoughtless cruelty in this recommendation, which is to be attributed to no unkindliness of heart but to what Dr. John Dewey calls "cockeyed economics." And this muddled economic thinking will continue until certain fundamental natural laws are recognized and we begin to formulate conclusions based upon human rights and common sense.

**T**HERE is little difference in essentials between the economics of Lippman and that of Tugwell. They both ignore fundamentals. Land has no place in the economic category of either gentleman. Mr. Lippman commends with limited encomiums the planning of the administration but takes no account of the planning which was begun before economics were formulated or books on the subject written. The planning was done by the Almighty himself in the natural laws governing society. He formulated these laws at the same time He planned the movements of the stars.

**I**T is Henry George's great merit that he did not start out with a plan of his own. He started out to discover the plan of God in society. We think he did a fine and almost perfect piece of work. He linked the Ricardian law of rent with the law of wages—that was his most important discovery. And if men and women had been able to understand it the Tugwells and Lippmans would have passed out of the picture. But it was within the rule of destiny that his triumph would not be immediate. And for this Machiavelli has furnished the reason.

**T**HIS Florentine philosopher and diplomat, who lived about the time of Columbus, in his book "The Prince," for which he has been reviled for centuries, said in substance that there are three orders or classes of men. One man understands things by studying them for himself. Such men are exceedingly rare. Another understands them after they are explained to him. Such form a select and highly meritorious minority. A third does not understand them at all. Of such are the masses. The Machiavellian political policy is based on this classification of men. The wise prince will adopt the interest of the first class as his own. The third class is negligible—not to be depended upon as friends and not dangerous as foes. They may desert a prince if they like him not but the superior class in such case will not only desert him, but conspire against him, which the masses cannot do effectively.