

former times, whenever and wherever his exactions made life intolerable, men migrated to other areas beyond the reach of vested rights and perfect monopoly. But they took with them the very system that had caused their misery.

At last parasitism has reached its final stage. There are no more unowned areas to which oppressed populations may flee. The earth is as large as ever, and there is abundant room with ample means for subsistence. But the parasite, glutted with goods beyond his power to consume or his ability to handle, he forbids production, exercising his sacred privilege as owner of the earth. Friction is slowing the wheels of industry, while government applies more power without avail.

This condition brings into view an unprecedented phenomenon—millions of the people on the verge of starvation with nowhere to go and nothing to do. Government finding it impossible to raise revenue from the wages of idle labor, resorts to borrowing and to sales taxes, instead of collecting economic rent from the owners of the earth.

Preposterous as it would seem to an ultramundane mind, government even borrows money and levies taxes in order to hire the parasite not to permit labor to produce food. The official idea seems to be that if the bread eater pays more for his bread, he will get more bread for his money!

While imports are penalized and exports subsidized, as if man were perishing of excess goods, a grave crisis nears. For the first time in history slaves seek masters without avail. Disaster approaches, while old-time oracles babble like children, and government resorts to devices that have already failed a thousand times. The curtain falls and an epoch closes.

What next?

After full fruition, parasitism has reached its limit in the attainment of perfect monopoly backed by government. But society can no longer function, for this monopoly constitutes a judgment of ouster against mankind; a writ of ejectment from the face of the earth. Man, born in debt, has neither where to lay his head nor how to earn his bread. How shall he turn? There are only two roads open: one to despotism under dictatorship; the other to the freedom of *laissez-faire* democracy—not "rugged individualism," but the policy of letting labor alone.

All natural laws are simple and obvious; but logical thinking is difficult to man. Millions are out of work. What to do about it? The correct and logical solution is for society to let them work, for no man was ever unemployed but that government made him so. This solution was never thought of by any government. Dole, alms and bailing water out of the ocean are official nostrums that seem wise to statesmen, but not to bees or termites, with longer racial lives.

Having tried all things that ought not to work, what next? If government could be persuaded to abolish all taxes and collect economic rent for its own expenses, this measure alone would be the greatest step ever taken by man. The inevitable consequences would be:

1. The freeing of idle lands for idle hands, so that every man would have a home and be employed. Land and opportunity would become available, as if a new continent had been discovered.

2. Wages would rise, owing to the scarcity of men, because of vast numbers being drawn to free land and new opportunities.

3. Prices would fall, owing to increased production.

4. Poverty, pauper, and parasite would disappear together.

This is the road to peace and plenty without dictatorship or civic circle-squaring, called economic planning. This is the road to liberty for the living and away from the despotism of the dead. This is the road to happiness, sanity, enlightenment, civilization, safety and security. This is the road to democracy, but it has never been trodden.

There are but two roads. Which will mankind take?

Where Marx Agrees With George

BY BOLTON HALL

WE have Socialists, Communists, Trade Unionists, Employers Federationists, Anarchists, Free Traders, Tariff Reformers, Revenue Protectionists, Money and Credit Reformers, Prohibitionists, Religious Bodies, Georgians, etc., etc.

The pity is that workers for reform are so divided in their aims. Is there a possibility of reaching some common agreement; of co-ordination, of bringing plan out of chaos? All these may be divided into two classes: those who believe that ideal conditions are to be sought through authority and those who believe that liberty is enough. In chemistry a certain element will clarify a clouded mixture; in mechanics, the principle of economy secures simplification.

Our Socialists and Communists follow Marx, and both George and Marx largely agree on the evils of Land Monopoly, Taxation, and Protection. The first plank of the Marx and Engels Manifesto demands the diversion of the People's Ground Rent into the public treasury. The following statements in "Das Kapital" by Marx (Vol. I, pp. 842, 829, 830; Vol. III, 896-7-8, 956) also practically accord with George's teachings. "The expropriation of the mass of people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production." "Where land is very cheap and all men are free . . . not only is labor very dear, as respects the laborer's share of the

product, but the difficulty is to obtain combined labor at any price."

"The starting point of the development that gave rise to the wage-laborer as well as to the capitalist, was the servitude of the laborer. . . . The expropriation of the agricultural producer of the peasant, from the soil, is the basis of the whole process." (Page 739.)

"In England . . . the great feudal lords created an incomparably larger proletariat by the forcible driving of the peasantry from the land, to which the latter had the same feudal right as the lord himself, and by the usurpation of the common lands." (Page 741.)

"The proletariat created by the breaking up of the bands of feudal retainers and by the forcible expropriation of the people from the soil; this 'free' proletariat could not possibly be absorbed by the nascent manufacturers as fast as it was thrown upon the world. On the other hand, these men suddenly adapt themselves to the discipline of their new condition. They turn en masse into beggars, robbers, vagabonds, partly from inclination, in most cases from stress of circumstances." (Page 758.)

In the Communist Manifesto of 1847, issued in London following a ten days' discussion by a Committee of which Marx and Engels were both members, the very first operative clause of that document called for "Abolition of property in land and confiscation of ground rents to the State."

In the International Socialist Review (Vol. VIII, pp. 643-646), Marx wrote: "In the society of today the means of labor are monopolized by the landed proprietors; monopoly of landed property is ever the basis of monopoly of capital by capitalism."

On Taxation and Protection, Marx says: ". . . Modern fiscal policy whose pivot is formed by taxes on the most necessary means of subsistence, thereby increasing their price. . . . Its expropriating efficacy is still further heightened by the system of Protection. . . . Protection was an artificial means of manufacturing manufacturers, of expropriating independent laborers, of capitalising the natural means of production and subsistence." He clearly distinguishes between landlord and capitalist. "Private land has nothing to do with the actual process of production. Its role is confined to carrying a portion of the produced surplus value from the pockets of the capitalist to its own." "Rent, instead of falling into the hands of the capitalists who extract it from their laborers, is captured by the landlords, who extract it from the capitalists." But while Marx aimed at abolishing "Capitalism," George attacked the evils attached to "Capitalism" through our land laws and other monopolistic laws.

"The landlord does not only receive interest on the capital of other people that costs him nothing, but also pockets the capital of others without any compensating return."—Capital, Vol. III, chap. xxxvii, paragraph 12.

"They (capitalist tenants) shouted for a reduction in

their rents. They succeeded in individual cases. But on the whole they failed to get what they wanted. They sought refuge in a reduction of the cost of production, among other things, by the introduction of the steam engine and new machinery. . . . Here high ground rent is directly identified with a depreciation of labor, a high price of land with a low price of labor."—Vol. III, part VI, chap. xxxvii, paragraph 24. (See also paragraph 20.)

"It (landed property) represents merely a certain tribute of money which he (the land owner) collects by the force of his monopoly from the industrial capitalist (and) the capitalist farmer."—Same work and chapter, paragraph 5.

Concerning the effect of Socialist regulation of industry, the futility of which the Georgeist is constantly emphasizing, Marx says: "The compulsory regulation of the working day in respect to its length, its pauses, the hour at which work shall begin and end, the system of relays for children, the prohibition of the employment of children below a certain age, and so on—necessitate an increased use of machinery,—a greater outlay of capital. As far as concerns the intermediate forms between manufacturer and domestic industry, and domestic industry itself,—they can no longer compete."—Vol. I, part IV, chap. xiii, sec. 8E, paragraph 18.

"The capitalist performs at least an active function himself in the development of surplus value and surplus products. But the land owner has but to capture his growing share in the surplus product and the surplus value created without his assistance."—Vol. III, part VI, chap. xxxvii, paragraph 45.

Showmanship in Education

BY WILLIAM W. NEWCOMB

WITH mankind searching as never before for its Shangri-la, with this new awareness of the people in the social ills of our times, with the Press still "free" in the democratic countries, it behooves us to leave no stone unturned in preparing leaders to promulgate the Science of Economics. Now, that the other sciences are pretty generally accepted by the masses, the problem of leading these same people into the knowledge of this science becomes simplified. We have reached that time, I believe, when we should make our reply to those who have studied our text (and countless other books on "economics") who are always saying to us Georgeists: "Now, what are you going to do about it?"

Is it not our moral obligation to enlighten the newspaper and magazine reader, the movie, play-going and forum audience, the radio and television public? Enlighten them on what? The School! The Henry George School of Social Science should become as well known to the man in the street as any of our great universities.