

institutions, those above enumerated are the principal ones.

The special privileges provided by legislative action at Washington are in a different class from those which have become a regular part of our system of taxation but are none the less to be condemned. The most flagrant of these in recent times was the appropriation by Congress and approved by President Hoover, of five-hundred-million dollars of tax payers' money for the specific purpose of stabilizing or artificially enhancing the price of wheat, cotton, and other farm products. It was presumed by the makers of this law that it would have the effect of giving artificial advantage to the farming class, which would offset in a measure the special privileges which had been given so generously to Eastern interests by means of the protective tariff. The plea for this farm legislation was repeatedly based upon that consideration. It so happened that even the immense waste of money involved by the farm marketing act was negligible as an influence in the world wide markets and that it did not affect in any considerable degree the law of supply and demand upon the prices of the agricultural products which were supposed to be favored. But the very fact that this legislation was put through with little opposition furnished a very good illustration of the fact that special privilege legislation is regarded as perfectly legitimate. And this has been further illustrated in monstrous degree by the New Deal legislation under President Roosevelt.

There is everywhere consciousness of a mysterious force which is responsible for easily acquired fortunes on one hand together with an increase of unemployment and consequent lower incomes on the other hand. Each succeeding census report makes more appalling this undemocratic and unjust condition in our social fabric.

If prosperity is to be secure, there must be an end to special privilege of every kind, and a system of taxation inaugurated in place thereof which shall be based upon justice to all. Henry George has demonstrated how this should be done.

A Glance at Aldous Huxley

BY FRANK W. GARRISON

SOMETHING has happened to make the world appear more bearable to Aldous Huxley, in spite of the deepening chaos. An escape from frustration signalizes his new book of essays, "Ends and Means," where an attempt is made to survey present-day problems and formulate an approach to a solution.

The contention that the means employed always determine the end arrived at, that a good end cannot be won by bad means, is as easy to accept in theory as it is hard to put into practice. In Huxley's case his conviction has led to an uncompromising pacifist stand,

and a partial detachment from the tenets of Fabian Socialism, accepted by so many of his contemporaries. Yet he does not seem to have been influenced by the writers of the individualistic school who explored the science of political economy in the 18th and 19th centuries. There are no references to Quesnay or Turgot, to Cobden, Herbert Spencer or Henry George.

Huxley makes the common mistake of assuming an opposition of hostility between competition and cooperation. Cooperation consists in an exchange of goods and services, by individuals or companies. It includes trade and business relationships of all kinds, and it is clear that these relationships will increase as economic barriers are removed, i. e., as competition is promoted. If cooperation is to be enjoyed in its fullest extent, competition must be unrestricted. This is the goal of *laissez-faire*. It would put an end to prohibitions and partial laws, just as it would restore the natural flow of population and transform the present system of land tenure, bringing it into harmony with the ideal of equality of opportunity.

That access to land is the basis of independence is indicated by the history of the common lands in England, and is being illustrated afresh in the anthracite regions of Pennsylvania where public opinion makes it possible for discharged miners to help themselves to coal seams on land that belong by statute to the owners of the mines. A revised land system might provide an alternative to factory work and thus, at a single stroke, modify the problems of low wages, long hours, and many phases of exploitation that seem to compel government interference. The ending of trade monopoly and land monopoly would, it is safe to predict, lessen the accumulation of wealth and power at one end of the scale while tending to remove the causes of poverty (with its concomitants of degeneration and crime) at the other end.

If Franz Oppenheimer is correct in his theory of the origin of the State, the real purpose of government is not to increase human happiness but to accumulate in the hands of those who control the political machinery as large a proportion as possible of the wealth produced. Military prowess and a swollen bureaucracy, essential parts of the system, are incompatible with self-government in industry and the extension of individual rights. Nothing would have a greater decentralizing effect than the repeal of privileges and the consequent opening of the field of economic opportunity to all manner of talents.

Huxley moves but hesitatingly in this direction. He sees equality best served by "a society where the means of production are owned cooperatively, where power is decentralized, and where the community is organized in a multiplicity of small, interrelated but, as far as may be, self-governing groups of mutually responsible men and women." It may be said in passing that there can be

no monopoly of the means of production in the absence of land monopoly.

"If we want," he continues, "to realize the good ends proposed by the prophets, we shall do well to talk less about the claims of 'society' (which has always, as a matter of brute fact, been identified with the claims of a ruling oligarchy) and more about the rights and duties of small cooperating groups." Better still, to consider the rights of men and women, whose true interests are threatened at the threshold of life by State education, the logical end of which is now apparent in the countries ruled by dictators. Huxley calls attention to the fact that the decline of democracy coincides with the rise to political power of the second generation of the compulsorily educated proletariat.

As in the case of the long list of troubles associated with the industrial revolution and the factory system, the seeming need of State interference in education is but a symptom of the disease of poverty. The remedy is an enlargement of economic opportunity, by removing the man-made obstacles to self-employment and co-operation. Private education would help to sap the foundations of militarism, and would substitute diversity for standardization.

Equal freedom in the production and exchange of wealth would not only tend to establish harmony in industry, but would diminish international friction, by allowing people and goods to move freely, and by providing access to raw materials on even terms for all nations. To arrive at the millenium, something more than economic justice may be needed, but it is the first requisite, and each instalment will liberate a portion of the moral and intellectual forces by which the advance may be hastened.

The Meaning of Graduates

OVER six hundred of those, who had just completed the course in fundamental economics at the Henry George School of Social Science, foregathered at the Engineers Auditorium, New York, on December 13. Several hundred former graduates and friends helped to make this an inspiring assemblage. The speakers were two graduates—Dimitri Sousslof, an engineer, and R. Joseph Manfrini, head of an investment brokerage firm.—Mrs. Anna George deMille, Dr. Henry George, 3d, Congressman Charles R. Eckert, Col. Victor A. Rule.

What do such graduation exercises mean? Similar assemblages, though not so large, were held during December and January in dozens of cities where classes are held. Dinners, speeches, resolutions, plans—the mass expression of a community of interest. Gatherings of people, however, are not difficult to create, since people are gregarious, nor are the methods of arousing enthusiasm unknown to us Americans.

But these graduation exercises are somewhat different from the commonality of mass assemblages. They are the expression of a newly acquired loyalty. We go to school and college reunions because of our loyalty to our own youth. We go to business meetings primarily for selfish reasons. We are loyal to our trade, to our favorite charity, to our bridge or golf club, and we get pleasure from meeting those who have similar loyalties.

But a meeting of people who have nothing in common, except that they recently read a famous book, attended ten discussion groups under various teachers (strangers but ten weeks ago) in various parts of the city—people from all walks of life and with different social, political and educational backgrounds—is rather unique. A new loyalty has been developed—a loyalty to an ideal. They cannot know all the people at the gathering, they do not come to meet people at all. They come because in so doing they express a desire to record themselves in favor of a philosophy to which but three months before they were total strangers. They have learned the meaning of—and the way to—economic freedom. Their presence alone at these graduation exercises is their pledge of allegiance to this ideal.

The inspiration that comes from meeting many people who, no matter how divergent their personal interests may be, accept this new loyalty is as nothing compared to the inspiration such gatherings give to those who have been in the work for many years. Said an old-timer in the lobby of the Engineers Auditorium: "I have never been at a Single Tax gathering where there were so many new faces and so few of the old faces."

At these graduation exercises, from the card index file of the graduates at headquarters, from the records of the increasing number of classes, from the mounting numbers of those taking the correspondence course, from the new names of workers and financial contributors, from all the indications of growth which characterize the Henry George School of Social Science, comes the conviction that—

TRUTH MARCHES ON.

FRANK CHODOROV.

Philadelphia School Commencement Dinner

THE Philadelphia Extension of the Henry George School of Social Science held its sixth Commencement Dinner at Van Tassel's Restaurant in that city on December 11. There were present about 150 diners, and graduation certificates were awarded to thirty-nine students.

James S. Farnum, President of the Student Alumni Council, under whose auspices the dinner was given, made a brief speech of welcome and turned the duties