

poverty, is clear; since in such case no one would hold lands except for use and the masses of men, having free access to unoccupied lands, would be able to exert their labour directly upon natural bounties and to enjoy the full fruits and products of their labours, beginning to pay a portion of the fruits of their industry to the public treasury only when, with the growth of the community and the extension to them of the benefits of civilisation, there would come to their lands a rental value distinct from the value of the products of their industry, which value they would willingly pay as the exact equivalent of the new advantages coming to them from the community; and again in such case men would not be compelled to work for employers for wages less than absolutely just wages, namely, the equivalent of the new value created by their labour; since men surely would not consent to work for unjust wages, when they could obtain perfectly just wages by working for themselves; and, finally, since, when what belongs to the community shall have been given to the community, the only valuable things that men shall own as private property will be those things that have been produced by private industry, the boundless desires and capacities of civilised human nature for good things will always create a demand for these good things, namely, the products of labour—a demand always greater than the supply; and therefore for the labour that produces these good things there will always be a demand greater than the supply and the labourer will be able to command perfectly just wages—which are a perfect equivalent in the product of some other person's labour for the new value which his own labour produces.

NOTE BY MR. C. B. FILLEBROWN.—There has recently appeared from the pen of a Catholic layman a book in which the author tries to extenuate the importance of Monsignor Satolli's decision by intimating that it represents only the simple individual opinion of the four professors. Loyalty to truth dictates that this criticism should be here offset by some pertinent facts in the case.

Monsignor Satolli in a former visit to the United States in 1889 and as the guest of Archbishop Corrigan, had ample opportunity for investigation of the land question from the viewpoint of the United States and of Rome. Hence he had four years of time in which he might have made a preliminary examination. Monsignor Satolli was credited with having been one of those consulted when the Pope's Encyclical, *Rerum Novarum*, of May 15th, 1891, was in preparation, and was therefore the better able to judge what was in accord or in conflict with it.

Among the important duties of his mission was to bring to a satisfactory conclusion what was then known as the McGlynn controversy. Dr. McGlynn, at the request of the Apostolic Delegate, submitted to him through his counsel, Dr. Burtzell, a statement in Italian of his views on the subject of private property in land. On this statement Monsignor Satolli consulted four of the professors of the Catholic University. The decision of Monsignor Satolli that there was nothing contrary to Catholic doctrine in the opinions of Dr. McGlynn as exhibited in that statement was official, and was followed by the return of Dr. McGlynn to active duty.

One of the most luxurious picture palaces in the heart of the West End is at present in liquidation. The ground-rent which has to be paid and the initial expenses of building have prevented the venture from being remunerative. A solicitor who put £20,000 in another well-known London concern is, I am told, unlikely to see his money back.

—DAILY SKETCH, Dec. 17th.

Mr. Philip Snowden, M.P., speaking at Blackburn on October 6th, said that it was not unlikely that Mr. Lloyd George might have something to say about facilitating the acquisition of small holdings by farm labourers. Unionist landowners wanted to get rid of their land because they knew quite well that drastic land reform was going to come.

THE BLACKLIST

By Henry H. Hardinge

(Reprinted from the PUBLIC, November 21st)

There are two kinds of blacklist. One is of individual creation; it has its origin in fear, hate, spite or revenge, or all four. The other is the unconscious creation of society itself, and fortifies, bolsters and vitalizes the blacklist of corporations. While corporations are not natural persons they are operated by natural persons; and spite, revenge, magnanimity, guilt, love and hatred, all personal attributes or personal defects, influence them.

The industrial blacklist depends solely upon the social blacklist. If one disappeared the other would also. Nothing is more certain than this, that the blacklisted man or trade union cares for blacklists only because industrial opportunities are few. "More men than jobs" is the crux of the whole industrial problem. Were it not for this chronic economic disability, the blacklist would not be worth talking about, and the labour injunction would be a joke. An industrial plant is picketed only because the strikers want their jobs back, which proves that such jobs are scarce. If they were plentiful, a worker would never care to return to a job so unsatisfactory as to have caused him to strike, but if he did not care the employer would, and would make terms at once, fair enough to induce the striker to return.

Our social blacklist is operated by land speculators. Yet they are without malice, venom or rancour. They do not intend to injure anyone. Nevertheless the injury to society, especially the industrial end of it, is incalculable. Not by their profits. The profits of land speculation, great as they are in the aggregate, are but a small fraction of the loss to society. It is not what speculators make, but *what other people lose*, that does the damage. Society could much better afford to collect the whole ground rent of this country and throw it into the sea on a national holiday, and amid great public rejoicings, than to allow it to fatten private purses and tempt to gambling in land values. If this were done, if the rent of land were all collected and destroyed regular, the owners of the earth and its resources would have to use, sell, or abandon them. "Dig" or get off the claim, would be then the universal rule, and Labour alone can dig.

This policy, simple as it is, would solve Labour's problem. It would convert all social idlers, rich and poor, into social assets.

A blacklist in a normal society would be both silly and impossible—silly, because no employer would go into one if he knew that employees would laugh at him; impossible because in the face of inexhaustible opportunities for both hired men and employers, the employer's point of view would be absolutely reversed along with his economic interest. Instead of trying to keep strikers out of work, his chief concern would be to get them back to work and keep them at it.

Empty the labour market and keep it empty, and you will destroy the evil element in it. Empty it, and the chronic disadvantage under which Labour now operates will forever disappear.

Blacklisting is irrational. So is the private appropriation of rent. Neither is fair, nor can either be defended in the forum of morals. They are related as are cause and effect. Land value taxation would end them both.

We have received a copy of the PORT ELIZABETH ADVERTISER, Cape of Good Hope, November 22nd, containing a long and interesting article on the taxation of land values by Mr. Lazarus.