

of Forty-Eight did not found the Farmer Labor Party. As for ourselves, we went to Chicago as a body prepared to make our own platform and we took part in the proceedings of the convention by invitation, in the hope of swinging the members of the convention to our side. In another column will be found the history of what occurred from the pen of one who participated in that adventure, Frank Chodorov. It would do Mr. Beckwith a lot of good to freshen his knowledge of what actually occurred.

BUT as the following seems to reflect upon the great teacher who has gone it may be well to quote it as an example of how little qualified Mr. Beckwith is to speak on the subject. He says: "Even Geiger was drawn aside by the false lure of politics." Nothing could be farther from the truth. The reason that impelled us was the desire to accentuate the truth Henry George stood for. We failed by the narrowest of margins to capture the great convention of the Committee of Forty-Eight and the Farmer Labor contingent, with neither of which elements we had anything in common, and neither of which Oscar Geiger had any hand in forming. Nothing remained for us but a straight-out, uncompromising declaration of independence. This could only be done through the organization of a separate party. The motive that inspired Oscar Geiger even at this time was *education*, and it seemed to us that the party method best conserved this purpose. We still believe that this was true at the time. What Mr. Beckwith says, with a certain self-satisfaction that is a little irritating, since it reflects upon the wisest leader of our movement since Henry George, is not likely to inspire respect for the judgment of our Stockton contemporary.

WITH General Johnson predicting that many features of the Recovery Act are destined to be permanent, and Prof. Tugwell hinting at the purely emergency character of these measures, we continue to be perplexed, as we have been from the beginning. Prof. Tugwell assures us in his very latest pronouncement that these were "essentially temporary methods of adjustment which could be modified or abandoned as industry attuned itself to an economy of abundance."

BUT accepting the Tugwell theory of abundance sometimes called overproduction, as responsible for the condition in which we find ourselves, we are again a good deal puzzled as to why and how industry should become "attuned to it." In fact Prof. Tugwell has left us in the same maze that he himself is in. He states that "the American people have given no mandate for the abandonment of our traditional business system." Wherefore then the abandonment?

OF course Prof. Tugwell reiterates his coarse abuse of the critics of the "New Deal," whom he accuses of moral turpitude. "Tory obscurantism," "wicked," "indecent," "obscene," are a few of the phrases which occur in a recent speech of the Assistant Secretary of Agriculture, all directed against those who for any reason fail to agree with him. We say now that no such preposterous statements have ever emanated from any administration. Washington has made us a laughing stock. It is difficult to see how Roosevelt can escape the responsibility for all this. We call upon him now to repudiate these utterances and to remove Prof. Tugwell from office. If a man in a responsible government position can so insult the American people it is time for the President to openly disavow him or share the responsibility. We are tired of seeing Franklin D. Roosevelt escaping behind the screen of his brain trust.

HE is directly responsible for all these absurdities and abominations, the withdrawal of land from use, the destruction of crops, the killing of little pigs, the processing tax, the oppressive regulations of the NRA—all the monstrous programme of interfering with or restricting production when the people are in need of food and the products of industry. Not Tugwell but the President! Not his underlings, but Franklin D.! And when the anger of the people breaks let us assign the responsibility where it belongs—not on the Moleys, Tugwells, Johnsons, Richbergs, but on Franklin D., the inviolate!

OF course the political economy of Prof. Tugwell in the address mentioned is the queerest thing imaginable. He says: "Under this rule they would let the farmer starve—they would let the drought ravage the prairies; they would tell the farmer it was just too bad that he was being destroyed." Who are "they" and under whose rule is this being done? We say now that nearly everything that is being done is abhorrent and monstrous. But we do not stop with telling only this to the farmer. We say the enemies of the farmer are land monopoly and taxation, the latter including the tariff which raises the price of everything the farmer must buy. If this administration really desired to do anything for the farmer they would advance upon these and kindred evils. But do we hear anything from Franklin D. Roosevelt on the subject of taxation or land monopoly? We do not. This is "Tory obscurantism" with a vengeance!

WE are often assured that the Administration know the remedy. If so it is very successful in concealing it. Will these self-styled New Dealers go down in history as the Double Dealers? If for purposes of their own they elect to conceal the true remedy then we cannot judge them as honestly mistaken but as Cagliostros deliberately committed to a programme of deception.

SOME of the confusion that besets the average mind in its consideration of the social problem arises out of a misconception of the real relation of the employer and employed. Socialistic teachers have presented this relation as involving a condition of "wage slavery" in which the boon of work must be solicited from the owner of capital. If the position of employer and employee be regarded in its true relation of cooperation, the problem is at once simplified. We do not have to consider two classes, one the wage-paying and the other the wage-receiving, but of both classes, employer and employee, is dependent upon wages paid by the consuming public—the real employing class.

LOOKED at in this way we at once discover that the consuming public is the real employer; that the capitalist is not the employer but the associate of labor in the work of production. The two classes comprise the wage-receiving and the other the wage-paying class (in form at least.) This should not obscure the true relation. When Labor agrees to cooperate with capital a form of partnership is established which is morally fair and defensible, or would be under conditions that were themselves fair and defensible.

BUT in agreeing to a contract to work for a stipulated rate of wages Labor suffers under a tremendous disadvantage. Wages are determined by the man out of job and he is present in "good" and "bad" times. The man out of work is a condition resulting from land out of use; the two are inseparable concomitants, for it is land in use that employs both Labor and Capital.

IT may be argued that if Labor is to be paid in proportion to its contribution to production there is no standard by which his proportion is to be measured. We hear therefore of terms like "A fair day's pay," "living wages," etc. These are phrases of alleviation—they do not touch the problem at all. Nor does any legislation that attempts to enforce them. Yet viewed in the realities, it is a question of land, labor and capital, with land the determining factor. Because these three factors must cooperate in production, whatever goes to the silent factor, Land, as payment to the landowner is a deduction from the earnings of Labor and Capital. The silent partner contributes his land, it is true, but that is a legal fiction; it is not *his* land and he did not make it, for it is God's land for the use of all His children. And despite Scriptural injunction which supports these statements the Church has little or nothing to say about it.

REGARDED in this way the problem becomes immensely simplified. But ignore this relation, as socialists and some economists do, and we are involved in a perfect maze of complexities. Karl Marx, with his ponderous economic confusions, is responsible for much

of this. He is directly responsible for the school of teachers who in the number and character of their palliatives have sought to supplant him. Yet the problem is in reality so amazingly simple with its three factors, Land, Labor and Capital, that their failure to sense it is astonishing.

IT is true that other misunderstandings have entered to confuse the causal relations—and much has been made of them. The possession of money which merely enables its possessor to command capital, fanciful distinctions between what are called industrial and financial capital—all are meaningless phrases—and have been used to be-devil comprehension. It has even been urged that money—a mere medium of exchange or standard of deferred payment—"has taken the place of land as a symbol of power" (see Dome Bede Jarrett and other socialist writers). As if the process of production had finally excluded the land as a necessary medium! And writers, one after another, blind to the fundamentals, kept adding—and are even now adding—to the general confusion.

NEAL CAROTHERS, Professor of Economics at the Lehigh University, is one of the sanest critics of the present administration and the whole system of economic planning. His articles in the *Herald-Tribune* are full of meat. Besides, he seems to have a familiarity with Henry George's teachings which aids him in his outlook on what is being done. In one of his articles (see *Herald-Tribune* of Aug. 5) entitled "Where Communism Failed," he discusses the various Utopias proposed from time to time, such as Sir Thomas More's work, Harrington's and others. He says: "Only Henry George has been able to visualize a Utopia without collective ownership." He says: "Socialism is the religion of millions who cannot understand a paragraph of all Marx wrote." And referring to the many plans of the Washington administration he says: (See *Herald-Tribune*, Aug. 12) "The quaintly humorous truth, I think, is that there is no such thing as economic planning in this country. * * * Like the Holy Roman Empire, which was not holy, was not Roman, and was not an empire, the new economic planning is not new, is not economic and is not planning. What we have had in the last eighteen months is some highly experimental and unplanned regulation of finance and business." Never has the truth been better stated.

SOME one ought to write an article on economic planning and its limitations. We pick Prof. Carothers for that task. He has laid the foundations in what he has already written. Referring to the kinds of planning which have been successfully tried, he carefully enumerates them, and says of them: "They merely translated into law the tendencies that economic forces were already anticipating, or that continued development required, or they abolished some outworn survival of the past.