

## The Social Problem in Israel and Other Nations

**I**N essential features, the social and economic problem of ancient Israel, was the same as in other countries. All nations are overtaken, soon or later, by the double pressure of heavy taxes and concentrated land ownership. But among Gentile peoples this problem has been expressed in secular phraseology; whereas, in ancient Israel the problem clothed itself in religious terms, owing to the peculiar course of social development among the Hebrews. No other national evolution has enthroned a cult of desert origin over cities representing a previously rooted commercialism. This peculiar structural fact in Hebrew history made it possible to formulate reactions between the nomadic and the territorial points of view in terms of cult-rivalry. And thus, while the social and economic problem of ancient Israel was the same as in other parts of the world, there is a difference in the forms of expression, whereby the God-idea was uniquely welded into the process which at length gave rise to Judaism and Christianity.

"God and the Social Process," by LOUIS WALLIS.

**P**PRIVATE ownership in the soil has obtained among all nations; but, at the same time, it has always gravitated into the hands of the few. The problem was attacked in vain by Greece and Rome through readjustment of debts and interest. France guillotined her landed nobles, and reapportioned her soil among the peasantry. Russia's landed nobility was expropriated in the Red Terror. America more recently has undertaken to stay the concentration of land by legal moratoria and national guaranty of mortgage bonds. The mass of Great Britain's population was long ago swept off the soil into overcrowded centers where the productive capital of the middle class pays ground rent, and also carries a mounting burden of direct taxation. Since modern society has not thus far discriminated the moral and economic factors of its collective problem, we cannot, with frankness, go back twenty-eight hundred years into the past and blame the prophets of Israel for not opposing the institution of human slavery; nor should we pick flaws when they assail the concentration of private land ownership among a small clique of nobles, while ignoring the deeper question of individual proprietorship in the earth as a moral issue. . . . One of the greatest problems which ultimately confront all nations is that of recognizing the social character of land, while simultaneously guaranteeing secure and absolute private possession; so that the benefits of personal enterprise and work may accrue to the individual. But this problem has never been solved by any nation at any time during the course of history.

"God and the Social Process," by LOUIS WALLIS.

## Not A Free Advertisement

**A**BOUT a generation ago, it was common to hear people say that Miller & Lux could drive their herds a thousand miles through California without leaving their own lands. Miller & Lux, Inc., still control immense tracts of land throughout California. Through the Hearst papers they are exploiting these lands—"Controlled Irrigation Farm Lands." Get in on the ground floor. "There are prospects of recovery." Even "fool" Henry George folk know that the first indication of any kind of "recovery" at once is reflected in the price and rent of land. The *Los Angeles Times* says "Sit tight. Don't let go your holdings." They will have to come to you before they can "recover." Take your "share" of that "recovery" before the producers of future wealth get it.

Of course, thinking people know that the exploiters cannot grab wealth before it is produced, but they are few in number. The "masses" believe that wealth is handed down from those above in the social scale. It is they who "pay wages," and furnish employment. But the real exploiters know how to do the trick. They know that the only necessity is to get hold of the source of supply of all wealth—land. So today Miller & Lux, Inc.,—through ads in the Hearst papers—say "Put part of your funds into Controlled Irrigation Lands." Let us not forget that slogan. It is going to become very popular—in California! Sunny California waxes mighty torrid at times, especially in the "rich San Joaquin Valley," where these M. & L. lands lie unshaded out of doors in blistering heat. So there are those "Controlled Irrigation" channels through which these lands might be made profitable—or otherwise. That the lands in that Valley are rich in every quality necessary for agriculture, every one knows—who knows California. During the winters, when there is abundant rainfall, those lands blossom forth with the most gorgeous wild flowers—hundreds of varieties—that may be found anywhere on earth. But—from May until February—those lands are waterless as dust, except where there is "Controlled Irrigation," chiefly "controlled."

I wonder if the "ad" writer for Miller & Lux, Inc., is just naive, or if he is "putting over some Single Tax propaganda" on the boss. (If the latter, God bless him, however absurd the hope.) For here is a quote from the ad in the Hearst papers:

Many investors have found these Miller & Lux lands unusually profitable investments . . . They do not intend to farm the land themselves, but, based upon the experience of others, they expect it to yield a profitable return on their investments. No matter what might happen to their other holdings, they know that at all times the land is *there* . . . and it is *theirs!* . . . None of these men (and there are more like them) farm their lands. None of them expect to. Miller & Lux has helped them to get experienced farmers to operate their holdings and

do so at a profit while maintaining these properties as sound . . . and very "tangible" . . . assets.

Except for the absence of the display, the foregoing is a literal quotation from the ad. The italics are theirs and the separated "full points," too. And why "tangible" is in "quotes" I give up, unless it be to infer that there is nothing "tangible" about land as an investment, except that upon it some form of labor will be applied in the production of wealth. But we are assured that these investors do not intend to use these lands in that way. Miller & Lux will help them "to get experienced farmers" whom the said investor can "farm." So there you have it. Yet some "innocent" like myself might ask, if the "experienced farmer" farms the farm, and the investor farms the farmer, to whom will go the wealth which the "experienced farmer" farms from the farm, if not alone to the farmer of the farmer of the farm?

LAURIE J. QUINBY.

## Single Tax And Cuspidors

JAMES MICHAEL CURLEY, as Governor-elect of Massachusetts, was being interviewed by a *Boston Globe* reporter. The occasion was one of note in that James Michael had just defeated the offspring of the Hamiltonian Federalists in the rock-ribbed Republican State of Massachusetts in the year of our Lord one thousand nine hundred and thirty-four. The victory was doubly sweet because "Jim" had also, just a few weeks before, soundly trounced his own Democratic party in its attempt to relegate "Jim" to the limbo of "also-rans." The Rooseveltian New Deal constituted the top, bottom and sides of "Jim's" campaign, morning, noon and night: the New Deal was vindicated and James Michael was victorious. Massachusetts, long noted as the State of mind—as the home of the Cabots and the Lodges—as the seat of the Harvard Preparatory School for all who would enter the Kingdom of Heaven—had swallowed the New Deal, hook, line and sinker.

It is customary for newspaper reporters to ask Governors-elect, Mayors-elect and Town Constables-elect, to reminisce. The procedure lends an Horatio Alger atmosphere to the news-story which customarily features successful elections to public office. It inspires all boot-blacks and newsboys to go and do likewise; if this procedure was not faithfully followed our nation would soon be sadly lacking in Presidential, gubernatorial and mayoral timber, and what a plight THAT would be!

So "Jim" Curley reminisced.

'Twas back in 1898, m'lads, when "Jim" shoved off into the slippery sea of politics. His twenty-four years found him with the oratorical ability of the customary City Councilor candidate limited to a five-minute vocabulary. His political partner, Tom Curley, had an eight-minute vocabulary. Any platform performance which

extended beyond these sidereal limitations found both Jim and Tom speechless.

These budding statesmen 'ad aspirations (as the Englishman says) and wished to stage a two-hour rally. What to do about it? Luckily they had heard a long-winded soap-box orator energetically expound the marvels and panaceas pertinent to the Single Tax. What the subject was all about—what it meant—didn't matter. The Single Taxer could talk—and how! He was the solution to Jim's and Tom's two-hour dilemma. So-o-o-o, the Single Taxer was invited to be the piece-de-resistance at the rally. Listen, now, to Jim's own description:

"It was a hurly-burly meeting because our opponents had first hired the hall. But they had not paid for it, though they had moved in their liquid refreshment. So we got the hall and their liquor and we were first there. There was a fight but we held the hall and all that went with it.

"But while our Single Taxer was speaking one of the enemy hurled a heavy steel cuspidor. I saw it and jammed him (the Single Taxer) down in his chair just as it flew over his head to take out the window, casing and all. He wouldn't finish his speech."

End of quotation.

Gadzooks! Single Tax was killed, at its Bay State birth, by a lowly cuspidor hurled by a cuspidorian. 'Twere better so, m'lads, otherwise the New Deal would never have seen the light of day, and Jim Curley would never have had excellent campaign material against the profound mentality of the Harvardian offspring of the Cabots and the Lodges, and Jim Curley would never have been the Governor-elect of our State of Mind. Cruel fate can, indeed, be kind at times.

Query: If one cuspidor can forestall Single Tax from 1898 until 1934—and if we have one million, nine hundred seventy-six thousand, three hundred and twenty-eight cuspidors in Massachusetts—how long will it be before Single Tax will be adopted in the grand and glorious Commonwealth of Massachusetts?

It is your Deal and political Clubs are trumps.

THOMAS N. ASHTON.

## Wise Words From A Jewish Organ

IF the Jewish National Fund were to collect the full annual rental value of the land which it owns, it would have today at its disposal a larger fund with which to purchase additional land in Palestine, and thus be able to redeem more land for Jewish settlement in the Jewish homeland. In that case, it would not have to be as entirely dependent upon individual contributions as it is today, though of course the Jewish people all over the world would continue to contribute to this perhaps most beloved of Jewish funds and swell its coffers by the pennies, dimes and quarters which are thrown into J. N. F. boxes.

### NOT FULL SINGLE TAX

That the community should collect the full rent of land, since the