

flower they employed themselves for the most part with no eye to invested capital. They went to work on the land.

IF all capital invested were swept into the sea, and all land were available and free for use, everybody would be employed regardless of invested capital. Surely the genesis of production should prove the fallacy. Labor must have begun somehow without capital being previously invested. Our pioneers went out into the forest and built themselves homes which homes finally grew into cities. They had no invested capital and were not dependent upon it. They did not care a hoot about the amount of capital that Senator Bailey so confidently says determines the number of men employed. Our Senator from North Carolina, who sees some things so clearly, is grievously at fault in his political economy. What he puts forward as incontrovertably true, comparing it to the law of gravity, is simply not so. And no one corrected him, as we have said. Poor Senators!

CAPITAL is only useful as it aids labor. Wealth springs from the magic union of labor and land. So does all capital, invested or not. Labor employs capital; otherwise capital rots. To all intents and purposes it is capital that knocks at factory doors and petitions labor for employment. Under normal conditions this would be plain to see. What deceives us is that labor, being deprived of access to land, causes the true position to be reversed; labor is made to appear as the slave, not the master of capital. But in the last analysis it is labor that gives capital employment, and it would be more correct for Senator Bailey to have said that the number of men at work determines absolutely the amount of invested capital and the number of capitalists gainfully employed.

Brainy Boston Blunders On

THE present-day cry that "over-production" is the cause of idle labor—and its consequent lack of food and clothing—finds a contrary cry coming from out the pages of early history of the settlers of the Province of Massachusetts Bay.

In a tract entitled "Some Considerations Upon the Federal Forts of Banks Proposed as a Medium of Trade," etc. (Boston, 1716) we find the following:

"Tho' this Country be large, and much good Land in it, which for want of People, cannot be improved in many Generations; yet a shame it is to say, This Colony cannot provide themselves necessary Food."—"Tracts Relating to the Currency," etc. Davis).

The reason for the insufficiency of necessities, among the colonists, is laid at the door of the monopolists of land as the tract goes on to say:

"In the first Setling this Country, Land was easy to be attained, and at a low price, which was an Inducement to multitudes to come

over Servants: But now the Land being so generally taken up, few come over that can live elsewhere. . . . If the Country should put a Rate upon such Tracts of Land as lie convenient to settle Townships upon, in order to make them willing to throw them up to the country; such yearly Rate would be more Justifiable, and more Equal, than to Rate a poor Man 10s. that has much ado to live; those Estates being valued worth *hundreds of Pounds* by the Owners thereof, who keep them only in hopes that as other Places hereafter shall be settled, they may Advance upon the Price, yet Pay no Rates for them: And in the mean time their poor Neighbours must pay perhaps a greater Rate than would be put upon him in the most Arbitrary Kingdom in Europe"

(Printed by T. Fleet and T. Crump, at the Defire of some of the Inhabitants of Boston. 1716")

Attorney Paul Dudley (subsequently the Attorney-General for the Province) opined in 1703 that:

"This Country will never be worth Living in for Lawyers and Gentlemen, till the Charter be taken away."

Attorney Dudley may have had sufficient reasons for differentiating between "Lawyers and Gentlemen"—and while it may not have mattered whether others than Lawyers and Gentlemen should find the country fit to live in once the legal and leisurely elements of society were comfortably ensconced under detail dictation by Great Britain—all in all, old New England (particularly Boston) appears to have suffered from either too little amidst too much land or from too much from the same area ever since the colonists discovered that Great Britain was incompetent to manage our bursting buds of Boston genius.

Fortunately, for the Ground Hogs, the canny colonists carried this idea of a land tax into their graves. Fortunately, for the G. H's., our present-day legislators never read the history of their commonwealth. Likewise fortunately, our legislators find their limitations in parrot-phrasing socialistic sophistries aimed at "soaking the rich," and our wealthy members of society—while vaguely conscious that the "soaking" somehow fails to hurt over-much—protest a-plenty.

Today Washington's Brain Trust assures us that the processing tax on wheat and cotton will be "absorbed before it reaches the consumer," just as the sponge absorbs the rain before you buy the sponge. You get the sponge without extra charge for the water. It's a wonderful theory, but will it hold water as well as does the sponge?

Wonderful progress since 1716 when it was "the defire of some of the Inhabitants of Boston" to apply a Land Tax!—THOMAS N. ASHTON

AT the National Conference of Social Workers in Detroit Miss Jane Addams lamented that child labor and other evils which she had believed abolished for ever had returned. Miss Addams would have less cause to lament if she would let this misfortune open her eyes to the truth that she would have better results if she devoted her efforts against fundamental causes instead of external symptoms. If she intends merely to urge repetition of former mistakes then she has cause to mourn.