

SOME of the confusion that besets the average mind in its consideration of the social problem arises out of a misconception of the real relation of the employer and employed. Socialistic teachers have presented this relation as involving a condition of "wage slavery" in which the boon of work must be solicited from the owner of capital. If the position of employer and employee be regarded in its true relation of cooperation, the problem is at once simplified. We do not have to consider two classes, one the wage-paying and the other the wage-receiving, but of both classes, employer and employee, is dependent upon wages paid by the consuming public—the real employing class.

LOOKED at in this way we at once discover that the consuming public is the real employer; that the capitalist is not the employer but the associate of labor in the work of production. The two classes comprise the wage-receiving and the other the wage-paying class (in form at least.) This should not obscure the true relation. When Labor agrees to cooperate with capital a form of partnership is established which is morally fair and defensible, or would be under conditions that were themselves fair and defensible.

BUT in agreeing to a contract to work for a stipulated rate of wages Labor suffers under a tremendous disadvantage. Wages are determined by the man out of job and he is present in "good" and "bad" times. The man out of work is a condition resulting from land out of use; the two are inseparable concomitants, for it is land in use that employs both Labor and Capital.

IT may be argued that if Labor is to be paid in proportion to its contribution to production there is no standard by which his proportion is to be measured. We hear therefore of terms like "A fair day's pay," "living wages," etc. These are phrases of alleviation—they do not touch the problem at all. Nor does any legislation that attempts to enforce them. Yet viewed in the realities, it is a question of land, labor and capital, with land the determining factor. Because these three factors must cooperate in production, whatever goes to the silent factor, Land, as payment to the landowner is a deduction from the earnings of Labor and Capital. The silent partner contributes his land, it is true, but that is a legal fiction; it is not *his* land and he did not make it, for it is God's land for the use of all His children. And despite Scriptural injunction which supports these statements the Church has little to say about it.

REGARDED in this way the problem becomes immensely simplified. But ignore this relation, as socialists and some economists do, and we are involved in a perfect maze of complexities. Karl Marx, with his ponderous economic confusions, is responsible for much

of this. He is directly responsible for the school of teachers who in the number and character of their palliatives have sought to supplant him. Yet the problem is in reality so amazingly simple with its three factors, Land, Labor and Capital, that their failure to sense it is astonishing.

IT is true that other misunderstandings have entered to confuse the causal relations—and much has been made of them. The possession of money which merely enables its possessor to command capital, fanciful distinctions between what are called industrial and financial capital—all are meaningless phrases—and have been used to be-devil comprehension. It has even been urged that money—a mere medium of exchange or standard of deferred payment—"has taken the place of land as a symbol of power" (see Dome Bede Jarrett and other socialist writers). As if the process of production had finally excluded the land as a necessary medium! And writers, one after another, blind to the fundamentals, kept adding—and are even now adding—to the general confusion.

NEAL CAROTHERS, Professor of Economics at the Lehigh University, is one of the sanest critics of the present administration and the whole system of economic planning. His articles in the *Herald-Tribune* are full of meat. Besides, he seems to have a familiarity with Henry George's teachings which aids him in his outlook on what is being done. In one of his articles (see *Herald-Tribune* of Aug. 5) entitled "Where Communism Failed," he discusses the various Utopias proposed from time to time, such as Sir Thomas More's work, Harrington's and others. He says: "Only Henry George has been able to visualize a Utopia without collective ownership." He says: "Socialism is the religion of millions who cannot understand a paragraph of all Marx wrote." And referring to the many plans of the Washington administration he says: (See *Herald-Tribune*, Aug. 12) "The quaintly humorous truth, I think, is that there is no such thing as economic planning in this country. * * * Like the Holy Roman Empire, which was not holy, was not Roman, and was not an empire, the new economic planning is not new, is not economic and is not planning. What we have had in the last eighteen months is some highly experimental and unplanned regulation of finance and business." Never has the truth been better stated.

SOME one ought to write an article on economic planning and its limitations. We pick Prof. Carothers for that task. He has laid the foundations in what he has already written. Referring to the kinds of planning which have been successfully tried, he carefully enumerates them, and says of them: "They merely translated into law the tendencies that economic forces were already anticipating, or that continued development required, or they abolished some outworn survival of the past.

Thus was serfdom abolished in Russia, slavery in the United States and the Corn Laws in England."

EVIDENTLY the kind of economic planning that succeeds is one that follows the natural order, and we are back again to the old laissez faire doctrine which the economic doctors in Washington tell us has broken down, whereas in truth it has never been tried. If the economic planners would settle down to the conviction that what interferes with the plan of nature in production and distribution, are the obstacles surviving from the past that hamper nature's planning, they would discover the limitations imposed upon them and re-assess their whole programme of artificial planning.

WHY have all the Utopias failed, practically as well as theoretically, in books as well as in the many experiments that dot the history of mankind? Because they have all neglected to take into account those economic laws that determine the progress of society, the natural forces at work, the real and wholesome lure of private property, the acquisitive nature of the individual, the cooperative spirit that cannot succeed without a universal or very general cooperation of the larger elements of human society. In other words, the seeds of their dissolution lie in their artificiality. Nothing in the economic world can succeed that is built up by artificial means, that is remote from the great social current of mankind. This is why colonies function for a time and die. Some, like our own Single Tax enclaves, have a modicum of principle that assure a longer life and a certain degree of successful operation.

WHAT we are trying to say, and what we are conscious of having said very feebly, is that all planning, on a large or small scale, must in its operation obtain general assent, must move in accordance with the progress of mankind, must leave the economic man free to cooperate with those impulses that are at the basis of the great social advance. And this expressly or by implication excludes any rule by force, but involves the principle of individual freedom. Nothing less than this can be permanent or enduring.

OF what interferes with this advance Henry George men are fully cognizant. It is true that liberty is forever being lost and forever being found again, but constantly renewing itself like the eagle. If we must abandon the idea of progress as a continuous and uninterrupted evolution from one eminence to another, ever upward and onward, a concept familiar enough in the eighties, we need not reject a theory of progress that, despite interruptions, points to a golden age as the ultimate goal. We know that God has not blundered, we know that there is a purpose in nature, that the garnered store of knowledge, ever increasing, is being harvested for the better

and fuller use of the coming man. To doubt this is atheism of a sort, as profoundly at variance with an intelligent conception of creation as the atheism that cannot divine an intelligent creator of the universe. And any one who divines a maker of the universe must also divine, though things be seen as through a glass darkly, a purpose at the end of the journey, a culmination in the rapt splendor of an age of which poets and prophets have sung.

HOW short is time in the years behind and the years that stretch before us! How many years of martyrdom extend from the advent of man on the globe and the years in which he shall come into his own, in which the forces for his deliverance shall be finally loosened and he shall read, with eyes no longer blinded, the enigma of man's presence on the earth! Back of all that the followers of Henry George work for is this vision of the world to come, of which this strange man in his strange book "Progress and Poverty," had divine glimpses!

American Single Taxers Gather at Chicago

ON the eve of the Ninth Annual Henry George Congress, the officers and convention committee of the Henry George Foundation are anticipating one of the biggest and best conventions ever held by American Single Taxers. From all sections come reports of lively interest and plans for representation at the gathering, which will convene for the usual three-day period on Monday, October 8, at the Congress Hotel, Chicago. More than two thousand invitations have been mailed and acceptances and reservations are being received daily at the Pittsburgh headquarters.

The programme this year is an unusually attractive one with a number of prominent figures in the movement scheduled for discussions covering a wide range. The possibilities of Single Tax progress through political action and the power and prestige of public office will be brought out in connection with the address by Mayor William N. McNair of Pittsburgh on the theme "Economic Policies of the New City Administration," Mr. McNair a life-long Single Taxer and a very popular speaker and propagandist, having assumed office last January as the first Democratic Mayor to be elected in Pittsburgh in a quarter of a century.

Several speakers will bring special reports from the European scene. Charles O'Connor Hennessy, President of the International Union for Land Value Taxation and Free Trade, who is fully posted on the English situation, will discuss "Tories vs. Georgists in Great Britain." President George E. Evans of the Henry George Foundation, now Superintendent of the Bureau of Building Inspection in Pittsburgh, has just returned from a visit to England and Scotland and will discuss "Economic