

HERE are a lot of officials and their advisers gathered together. They see something is gravely wrong. They want to do something about it—let us at least give them credit for that. And they begin by ignoring every economic law that has ever been propounded. The law of competition that secures the satisfaction of individual desires and is the very life blood of industry, ministering to the welfare of the whole. They reject this law utterly. The law of economic rent which even if the recovery programme could effect relief would be absorbed by the element in production known as land, going neither to wages or interest. *That* they never seem to have heard of. Unless they recognize the relation of the law of wages to the law of rent—Henry George's great discovery—nothing they can do will be of any permanent benefit.

DO they know that every attempt to regulate wages or prices has failed? Apparently they never heard of that! So they go ahead in their mad way trying everything that has been tried and failed. Only they will not try the one remedy that lies before them. "I do not go all the way with him," said President Roosevelt of Henry George. Which means if it means anything that he goes part of the way with him. We are beginning to doubt. To go part of the way with him would be to do more than can possibly be accomplished by any of the wretched schemes on which he and his advisers have embarked. Is he then a tenderness for the landlord class? Would he rather seek their good countenance than go down in history as the Great Deliverer.

AND what about the tariff? Roosevelt indicated during the campaign his general inclination toward free trade, or at least the lowering of the tariff barriers. What has he done? Were those only brave words? Has he nothing now to recommend? Has he any tariff policy at all? Is he afraid of both the protected monopolists and the landlord interests? Or is it that he just doesn't know?

MAY we conclude with the following verses, which if not poetry are sense, and are addressed to whom they may concern:

Who stood for the rights of man
In the days when he was young—
Who built for the better plan
Of freedom the poets have sung,
His voice no longer is heard—
For the older manners and modes
He has no friendly word—
He is busy drafting codes!
Oh what a world it will be
In which to work and reside
When mankind finally
Is sufficiently codified!

Reflections on the Recovery Act

WE are all ready to assist one hundred per cent to over-come the depression, but how are we going to go about it to do a real job?

Granting that the intentions which prompts the efforts to bring back prosperity to the nation are most commendable, I fail to see how governmental control of labor and industry alone can solve the question of securing greater opportunities for the employment of labor, as long as the ever-increasing land values created by the combined efforts of labor and capital in the production of wealth are being permitted to go wholly uncontrolled into the coffers of those who lay claim to the ownership of the earth, and thus hold the only opportunity for the greater joint application of labor and capital.

Understanding the value and need of land to labor, that labor can not find employment except upon land, or in the transformation of the things which are produced by nature with the aid of labor upon land, be this wealth, or that portion of it which in the form of capital is employed by labor for the further production of more wealth, and considering the proposition of governmental control of industry as it comes to us through the press, the following questions come to my mind:

1. If we all put our shoulder to the wheel of this industrial control action, dividing the work with our brethren, how much more are we going to produce by merely dividing the work with the now unemployed, and how is this increase in production, if there be any, going to be divided so that labor and capital in the form of wages and interest receive greater returns?

2. Will not an increased production with no additional outlet or market for goods tend to lower rather than to raise the value of the increased production, lowering the prices of commodities instead of raising them as hoped for?

3. Assuming that the cost of production is artificially increased as proposed by this raising of wages, etc., is it possible that the demands for the goods produced thereby will be increased, and if so, by what magic can the higher prices of commodities become a greater inducement to secure them? On the contrary, will not the higher prices of things retard the sale and purchase of goods?

4. Will not the increase in compensations to labor equalize the increase in cost? If so, what and where is there any gain?

5. Is it in any way possible without a freer access to the natural opportunities for employment of labor, now fully controlled by either the government or land-holders to produce more and gain a greater degree of independence for both labor and capital, unless the natural resources are proportionately liberated?

6. With the natural resources under complete control by the government or landlords, how may labor find an added opportunity to engage itself for profit without being

obliged to pay tribute to those who have corralled the natural opportunities and means of employment?

7. Assuming that by the proposed arrangement wages are raised and prices advanced, that capitalists and laborers work hand in hand for the amelioration of conditions, will not these desirable aims bring about a greater demand for the use of land and cause an increase in land values in proportion to the increased demand for its use?

8. What, if any, regulation is proposed by the "new deal" which will prevent the landholders from absorbing all of the benefits of this unity of operation of labor and capital, which must logically increase the demand for land?

9. As the results of labor's efforts aided jointly by capital upon land are the only means of production of wealth, then the greater joint efforts of both must logically result in a wider demand for use of land, is not the present set-up of control of labor and industry alone, without any regulations or control by which these producing forces may have a freer access to the source of supply—the earth—without paying an ever greater tribute to the land holders for the privilege of getting to that source of supply, is not all this a rather one-sided affair?

10. Is it fair, just, or equitable, to leave to those who control the natural opportunities for the employment of labor and capital the uncontrolled right to charge whatever it sees fit, or what the traffic will bear, as a tribute from the producing forces of wealth?

11. Is there in the proposition of industrial control any provisions which will prevent the now controlled capitalization of land values, based upon the rental value of land, in accordance with the demand for its use, going wholly to the owners of land?

12. If the cost of production in the form of wages and interest is to be controlled and subjected to governmental supervision, should not land values, as part of the cost which so largely enters into the final cost of the production, also be controlled or regulated, or is there any just and equitable reason why labor and capital should be obliged to bargain with the uncontrolled holders of the natural opportunities, at a capitalization based upon the annual rental value of land for use, which according to late statistics is somewhere near fourteen billion dollars?

13. If by the joint efforts of labor and capital the rental value of land is enhanced, should not that percentage due to this united action find its way back as a reward to the producers in the form of wages and interest, rather than as speculator's profits to those who furnished neither tools nor labor?

14. Does it seem right and just that the government take by taxation private funds for the purpose of entering upon public enterprises and works, where the benefits created go entirely to advance the value of the holdings of the landlords and afford them a greater opportunity to exact from both labor and capital an added price for

the privilege of enjoying the improvements created jointly by labor and capital?

15. Would not the collecting of the economic rent, created by the people collectively, serve to liberate the use of land to both labor and capital, destroy the speculations in land values, free the land, and thereby distribute and stabilize the opportunities for employment?

16. What advantage or gain is there to the nation in expending millions of dollars in draining swamps and irrigating deserts, when millions of unoccupied acres, lying immediately adjacent to our great centers of population, are being kept idle, and out of use? If taxed and thus forced into use, these would afford employment to millions, without the expenditure of another dollar of the taxpayers' money.

17. How can any industrial set-up, even if aided by nation-stirring slogans, be expected to bring about desired results, when the dictates of nature, justice, and equity are deliberately ignored?

18. Why not levy a tax on increased land values resulting from highway construction? This will be a bill for value received, and no honest man understanding could object to that.

19. Is it possible that throwing bananas and coffee into the sea, pulling up every third row of cotton, and paying \$3.00 per acre for weeds in place of wheat, setting fire to hay stacks, and all such other acts of destruction of the things which an all-wise Creator has provided with a benevolent hand for the enjoyment of His children, can possibly serve to bring back prosperity?

20. What is the difference between these acts and the advocates of the I. W. W. extremists?

These and like questions are being asked by men who believe that by the ways of justice to all we may restore prosperity to the country, without the control of industry which must of necessity lead to socialism or worse.

When, and as we learn to think and reason in terms of what is rightfully mine, thine, and ours, then and there only will the question of employment be solved.

As I analyze the proposed control of industry, I fail to find anything in it which will lead the country permanently out of its toils, and can only see a land-holder paradise in the making, as long as labor and capital and their joint productions of wealth are the only factors placed under governmental control and supervision.

M. J. VANLEEUEWEN.

THE Chicago exposition was opened by a ray of light from Arcturus which started forty years ago but easily beat any economic light that may be headed toward Congress.

THE tax on cosmetics is levied on the notion that since "beauty is but skin deep" it might as well be skinned deep.