

## Jew and Christian

### THEIR COMMON SIN AND THE COMMON PENALTY

HOWEVER great the differences that separate Jew and Christian, they have this in common: the Jew professes allegiance to his Torah, and the Christian, in professing allegiance to the Bible necessarily accepts that part of the Bible which constitutes the Torah.

Does either Jew or Christian pay more than lip service to some of the most vital edicts laid down by the Great Law-Giver?

If not, and if the basic principles from which spring those guiding edicts are sound, is it necessary to look further for the cause of the sufferings to which both Jew and Christian are subject in many of the nations of the earth today? The answer to this question is found in the one great truth so often proclaimed by Moses, and since his day endorsed by all students of history and philosophy,—that the violation of any law of God (or, law of Nature, if one prefer to so regard it) must eventually be atoned for in suffering; and that, conversely, compliance with the law must bring corresponding benefits.

In Lev. 25:18 we read: "Wherefore you shall do my statutes, and keep my judgments and do them; and ye shall dwell in the land in safety." Is either Jew or Christian today dwelling in the land in safety? Is the promise, or sequence, between cause and effect, (if one prefer so to regard the subject) false, or have the statutes and judgments been violated?

Not to commit the common error of dealing with generalities so vague as to be valueless, let us be specific: What is the specific statute the violation of which has brought destruction to the nations since the days of Moses, and the results of which violation today bring the persecution of Jews in one country, and the persecution of Christians in another? It is the command stated and re-stated so plainly by Moses, that while private property rights in labor products should be sacredly observed (the antithesis of socialistic, communistic, fascistic, and all other collectivist proposals), the *land*, the *source* of all labor products "shall not be sold forever ("in perpetuity"). Lev. 25:23.

This was not the capricious command of a leader desirous of merely exercising authority. It was the reflection of knowledge of a basic natural law—the economic law, that to extend property rights to the inclusion of land, is to deny true property rights,—and therefore to deny human rights.

The violation of this basic principle has brought about present world conditions. It has caused restriction of economic opportunity, and is thus responsible, chiefly, for a condition that leads both to the persecution of the Jews and the dire distress of those peoples and sects themselves, who practice the persecution.

Like capital and labor, both ignorant of the economic cause of their plight, and consequently engaged in fighting each other, instead of combining against their common oppression, so Jew and Christian, equally unfamiliar with the great economic truth back of the Mosaic command, instead of intelligently combining against the common cause of their ills, leave unassailed that which pits Christian against Jew, Christian against Christian, Jew against Jew, and brother against brother, in the intensifying struggle for existence.

While the method of application obviously would not be the same in our modern civilization, as in the crude days of Moses, the principle back of the Mosaic command is unchangeable, eternal and impregnable. Modern writers have evolved modern methods of application. The method proposed by Henry George is the most practical.

GEORGE L. RUSBY.

## The Republican Party As An Alternative

REACTIONS to Mr. Hoover's suggestion, that Republicans meet in convention prior to the next congressional elections, for the purpose of discovering and revealing what they believe in and stand for, are interesting, and, at times, amusing.

Mr. Landon objects, apparently for the naive (and probably sound) reason that a revelation of what the Republican Party really stands for would embarrass its candidates in most of the congressional districts.

The blue ribbon for such suggestions must, however, be awarded to Mr. Glenn Frank. His suggestion is unveiled in his syndicated column appearing in many papers of recent date. He there suggests that, before any such gathering of Republicans, some intelligent person be employed to travel over the entire nation and "comb the brains" of Republicans for the purpose of ascertaining what they think and believe. Evidently Mr. Frank considers the task a trivial one for he contemplates its completion within a few weeks—most of which time would be taken up in traveling, leaving only a few odd moments for "combing" brains. Mr. Frank then suggests that, after this "combing", a gathering of Republicans be held at which the "combings" would be fashioned into a wig to adorn the Republican head. He hopes the result would attract those who disagree with many of the acts of the present administration.

Granting that many of us do not approve of some of the things done, or attempted, by the present administration, might I, as an old line Jeffersonian Democrat, suggest why the Republican Party can never hope to be an acceptable alternative?

As a starting point, there is no need for a combing

of Republican brains or for a convention to ascertain the controlling and basic thought ("obsession" would be a better word) of Republicans generally. A "combing" of Republican brains would reveal only what we already know, and that is that Republicans, over and above everything else, believe that building barriers to trade between nations is the sole and only remedy for all the ills with which we are afflicted. They have no other thought and they have no other remedy. For sixty years the leaders of the Republican Party have thundered from the rostrum that *the Government* could make people happy and wealthy by legislation; that by passing laws putting into effect so-called "protective" tariff, which erect barriers to healthy, normal trade between the nations of the world, we can all be made rich, healthy, happy and wise.

That Republicans generally still labor under this obsession is illustrated perfectly by one example. Some short time ago when Secretary of State Cordell Hull negotiated a treaty with Canada looking to the partial resumption of trade between that country and the United States, Mr. Hoover, then titular head of the Republican Party, before the ink on the treaty was dry, before he could have read it, to say nothing about studying it, made the enlightening comment that it was "evidence of the more abundant life—for Canadians." There you have the apogee of asininity and the nadir of thought. It is enlightening because it illustrates the natural and instinctive reaction of all real Republicans to any effort to encourage trade between the nations of the world. Implicit in its fatuous folly is the thought that trade between nations is an evil to be avoided and discouraged and that it is against our interests to have other nations prosper—true Republican doctrine, and, by the same token, asinine economic thinking. Compare such muddled, vicious and dangerous thought with the truth uttered so clearly by David Hume over one hundred sixty years ago. Hume said:

"I shall therefore venture to acknowledge that, not only as a man, but as a British subject, I pray for the flourishing commerce of Germany, Spain, Italy, and even France, itself. I am at least certain that Great Britain and all those nations, would flourish more did their sovereigns and ministers adopt such enlarged and benevolent sentiments toward each other."

This Republican doctrine that trade between nations is an evil, is the very centre and political soul of every dyed in the wool Republican. It will be the cornerstone of any structure Republicans may build. Believing it to be a deadly poison, responsible in large measure for the trouble the world finds itself in, how can I, or anyone else, turn to the Republican Party as an alternative? If I had a sick child and was not satisfied with the attending physician would I turn to another physician whom I knew used but one prescription calling for heavy doses of a deadly poison?

If the Republican Party desires to attract voters now without its folds it must definitely abandon its belief that prosperous neighbors are a menace and that trade between nations is an evil to be fought. It must accept the truth that we are more likely to prosper if our neighbors prosper and that growing trade between the nations of the world is the most effective insurance against war as well as the most effective assurance of world peace and our own prosperity and well being.

JOSEPH F. COWERN.

HENRY GEORGE is greater than ever! Little by little, the world is feeling the influence of his noble thinking! His great work has been translated into every language and has profoundly modified legislation in the last thirty years.—POULTNEY BIGELOW.

WHENEVER the ownership of the soil is so engrossed by a small part of the community that the far larger part are compelled to pay whatever the few may see fit to exact for the privilege of occupying and cultivating the Earth, there is something very much like slavery.—HORACE GREELEY.

THERE is much said of "Irish landlordism," as though it were a peculiar kind of landlordism, or a peculiarly bad kind of landlordism. This is not so. Irish landlordism is in nothing worse than English landlordism, or Scotch landlordism, or American landlordism, nor are the Irish landlords harder than any similar class.

SOCIAL PROBLEMS, BY HENRY GEORGE.

YOU should talk Single Tax from the housetops! You ought to have your principles engraved in the sky in letters a mile high! Don't stop! Keep on fighting! Ground rent, instead of being paid to landowners should be paid, in place of taxes, to the government! The depression would be over in a month.

BERNARR MACFADDEN.

ANYONE who really fears a revolution in America ought to reread Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," one of the great social documents of all time. . . . I first read "Progress and Poverty" thirty years ago. . . . In all these years I have never known his premises to be shaken in the least.—KATHLEEN NORRIS.

WERE all taxes placed upon land values, irrespective of improvements, the scheme of taxation would be so simple and clear, and public attention would be so directed to it, that the valuation for taxation could and would be made with the same certainty that a real estate agent can determine the price a seller can get for a lot.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.