

WHAT is involved in this economic concept? That just so many jobs exist, less in an old and settled country and more in countries not so old and settled—for reasons not clearly indicated. Just what is the proportion of jobs to population in either case, we are not told. The theory seems to be that jobs decline as population increases, not because access to land becomes more difficult as it rises in price and more and more of it is withdrawn from use, but because the number of jobs is arbitrarily fixed in the nature of things, though varying in good and bad times. As two objects cannot occupy the same space at the same time, and there are just so many spaces, so to speak, in this employment question, it must follow that if a woman steps into the place occupied by a man, the man must step out. Mr. Hinman has said it: "A man and a woman cannot occupy the same job." Accepting the premise, the conclusion follows, of course.

IT will probably surprise Mr. Hinman to be told that jobs are infinite. There is no limit to them save only as they are limited by the fencing in of natural opportunities, and that is an artificial limitation. Land furnishes the only opportunity for employment. Mr. Hinman sees that in new and unsettled countries jobs are plentiful and he is strangely misled as to the cause. Adam Smith, writing over a hundred years ago, noted the phenomenon of high wages and workers fully employed in the colonies of the New World. He attributed it, with his usual keenness of judgement, to the cheapness of land and easy access to it—the primary determining cause of high wages and constancy of employment.

OBSERVING the phenomenon of falling wages and unemployment that often accompany population, economists like Mr. Hinman accept what appears to be the obvious solution of unemployment. Surely if there are only so many jobs—so many unfilled spaces to be occupied, so to speak, in a given population,—a doubling of the population ought to cut employment opportunities to one half. Yet who is not aware that no such thing happens. And why? Because every man that is employed in producing anything is making a demand on the labor of some one else—and thus creating jobs for others. This is what economists call "effective demand." It follows, therefore, that the more population the more jobs. It is only when rent begins to press upon wages and land speculation sets in that the "effective demand" is reduced. Industry halts and wages decline. Women and children are crowded into the labor market at lower wages than men with families can afford to work for, and the condition is presented, for an explanation of which Mr. Hinman, instead of seeking the deeper solution, seizes upon the fanciful interpretation of a certain fixity in the number of jobs in a given population, determined, it would seem, by divine predestination!

THE death of Samuel Gompers removes from the labor movement one whose talent for generalship is not likely soon to be equalled. But this is the most that can be said of him. As much as the great "captains of industry" he was a monopoly builder. He sought to perfect an organization strong enough to extort from capital more than the return determined by the natural flux of labor and capital. At best, or worst if you please, such organization could include but a very small percentage of those remuneratively employed. And the advantage wrested from capital by the organized group must be at the expense of the unorganized in higher prices for commodities and higher cost of living. To this extent the influence of Samuel Gompers was an evil one. In so far as he led workingmen to think in terms of labor monopoly, he was a greater enemy of labor than any of the capitalists anathematized by the American Federation.

SAMUEL GOMPERS used to point with pride to the fact that he had prevented many strikes. No doubt this was so. But the temporary absence of strikes marks merely a truce between two hostile forces. The ultimate resort is a strike, as every one understands, just as the ultimate aim of great armaments between nations interested in the same stake, is *war*. To maintain that industrial peace can be brought about by an armed truce between capital entrenched and labor militant, is an idle dream. What Mr. Gompers and those who think with him are preparing for is war, not peace. Peace is not possible where the producing forces of the world stand divided and where Labor striking blindly at the capitalist man of straw sees not the figure of Monopoly with hands abstracting the joint earnings both of Labor and Capital. Mr. Gompers and those who think with him lend to Socialism nearly all its strength, and because Mr. Gompers hated the Socialism which he was helping unconsciously to strengthen, Socialists were right in despising him.

IT was believed that the leader of the American Federation of Labor saw what was involved in the conflict between Labor and Capital. It will be recalled by readers of LAND AND FREEDOM that he was stirred to something like anger into replying to our criticism of his position. It had been rumored that he was a Single Taxer. He was very proud of his friendship with Henry George and referred to it on several occasions. It did not seem to us that his pronouncements gave any hint of his having acquired anything of value from that acquaintance. We challenged the fiction that had been industriously built up around him and that credited him with a belief in the economic philosophy of the Great Emancipator.

IF Mr. Gompers were a believer in this philosophy, he was a sinner against the light. But now that he is gone and rests secure from praise or blame, it may be well to

announce our belief that a real disservice was done him by the friends who were accustomed to speak of him as a believer in Henry George. It is a very serious charge that a man knowing a great truth should persistently ignore it. His name may now be rescued from that imputation. He did not merely ignore the truth because it was to his interest to do so. He really never understood it. That much must be said in all fairness to his memory.

WE have received the following letter from a subscriber whose name we withhold: "On page 183 of the last issue of your publication appears 'Peace with Injustice,' which I have read without pleasure but without surprise, for it is in harmony with an earlier editorial.

"On page 179 Mr. Baldwin publicly announces condemnation of the taxation of land values. Your criticism of Lord Robert Cecil must therefore be extended to include the majority of the British electors and without doubt the American electors as well.

"A real critic is one who improves upon that which he criticises. Will you therefore kindly nominate a person more entitled to receive the prize for his actual accomplishment toward international peace than Lord Cecil, and oblige."

THE challenge is a fair one. To a Single Taxer the answer would appear to be perfectly obvious. We do not agree that the League of Nations as now constituted is an especially powerful agency for the preservation of peace. Since its organization there have been too many little wars that it has shown itself powerless to prevent. When Mussolini boldly challenged the authority of the League and bombarded Corfu, it managed to save its face only by a make-shift compromise. Spain makes war upon Morocco and the League is silent; it was silent, too, in the series of events that culminated with the Egyptian crisis. But even if the League of Nations really amounted to something, Viscount Cecil would be an unhappy representative of the compact. He is himself part of the government that helped to strangle Egyptian aspirations for greater freedom. He defends that policy with the smug phrases which are familiar words in his mouth. "Relations between England and Egypt," he tells us, "are of a very special character." It was not an "international matter."

WHEN Henry George sent a copy of *Progress and Poverty* to the Duke of Argyll he said: "I knew the Duke of Argyll only by his book. (The Reign of Law). I had never been in Scotland or learned the character as a landlord he bears there." When our correspondent commends Viscount Cecil as an apostle of peace he may be similarly unacquainted with his record and that of his family. Cecil has been the staunch upholder of all that makes for social injustice and therefore of the fundamental cause which drives the nations into conflict. He has been for years the chief defender of the monstrous wrong that

makes the masses of the Englishmen trespassers in the land of their birth. He was the leading opponent of Lloyd George's attempt to impose a small tax on the incomes of those landlord parasites of which the Cecils are a type, who live on the earning of what the British aristocrat calls the "lower orders." Were Viscount Cecil a mere passive recipient of landlord loot and not an active defender of the system that permits these titled idlers to live without work, something might be said in his defence. But to call this man standing for the things he does "a worker for social justice" is to do violence to the meaning of words.

AFTER all, we who stand for social justice know the meaning and causes of war. No one who accepts the philosophy of Henry George needs to be told what is its primary cause, whatever may be said concerning contributory causes. They know that no enduring superstructure such as the League of Nations can be built upon present foundations.

THE *Commonweal*, of London, England, quoting what we had to say about Viscount Cecil, adds this interesting note regarding the Cecil family which may be of interest to our subscriber:

"Lord Robert's brother, Hugh, declared a while back that he did not believe that God gave the land to the people. He wouldn't. Their father once stated in the House of Lords that the farmer provided the capital, the laborer provided the labor, and the landlord *provided the land*. Sir Anthony Welden, the historian, relates how the Cecils got some of the land they call theirs:—

"Sir Robert Cecil, created Earl of Salisbury by King James I, to whom he was Lord Treasurer, advised the King in rewarding his poor Scotch suitors with lands, but Salisbury had one trick to get the kernel and leave the Scots but the shell, yet cast all the envy on them. He would make them buy books of fee-farms; some £100 a year, some 100 marks (13s. 4d.), and he would compound with them for £1,000, which they were willing to embrace because they were sure to have them pass without any control or charge, and £1,000 appeared to them, that never saw £10 before, an inexhaustible treasure. Then would Salisbury fill up this book with such prime land as should be worth £10,000 or £20,000, which was easy to him, being Treasurer, so to do; and by this means Salisbury enriched himself infinitely, yet cast the envy on the Scots, in whose name these books appeared, and are still upon record to all posterity; though Salisbury had the money, they, poor gentlemen, but part of the ways. . . . So was the poor King and State cheated on all hands."

A list of the grants of Crown and Church lands obtained by this family would fill two pages of *The Commonweal*. Suffice it now to say that the Marquis of Salisbury holds 20,202 acres, with a yearly rent-roll of some £66,826; but this does not include the valuable estates in the Strand and Charing Cross Road, London. The bulk of the estate was stolen from the Church—the Cecils have always been strong Churchmen—but it is quite clear from the evidence of history that God did not give the Cecils these broad acres."