

Correct social relations are necessarily and primarily dependent upon universal equality of economic opportunity, upon immensely diminishing all production costs and naturally stimulating production. These are wholly contingent upon broad and open-minded legislation with these all-important ends in view.

Should we not regard the discovery of the economic cause of unnecessarily produced poverty, and the legislative application of its natural remedy, as the noblest ideal of honorable selfishness, as the highest type of practical altruism, as the most intelligently conceived dominating purpose in life to which reasoning minds may aspire?

By simply untaxing productive business and human endeavor, by *enabling* all productive gains to thus be made almost immeasurably greater and easier, to every class of producers that contribute thought or labor to human needs, the seeming, though delusive, advantage in the dangerous selfishness now reflected in grasping greed can be effectually nullified.

Only thus can strife and undeserved poverty be either lessened or abolished.

Dr. Frank Crane expressed a profoundly philosophic truth when he said, "The most enlightened selfishness is unselfishness." It is in the present highly and honorably profitable, and in the future will prove the strongest safeguard to both human and property rights. K. P. ALEXANDER

## Some Samples of the Lies used In the California Campaign

**A**MENDMENT 20 has been rejected, poverty, vice and crime will increase, as will the price of land needed for homes. Land monopolists rule, for no other class could be injured by Amendment 20.

The following lies helped to defeat the Single Tax:

1. That Joseph Fels left an endowment for Single Tax.
2. That Amendment 20 concealed its real purpose.
3. That the final goal of Single Taxers is communism.
4. That the Single Tax would be paid by tenants.
5. That city dwellers would be free of taxes, the farmers being forced to pay all taxes.
6. That bonds are secured by land values.
7. That a tax on site rent would confiscate improvements.
8. That the site rent tax has not been tried in the United States.
9. That taxing land value only failed in Canada.
10. That the Single Tax would free corporations from all taxes.
11. That Single Taxers are bolshevists, and believe "All property is theft."

These lies were invented so that land holders may continue taking eight billions of dollars as site rent, and giving nothing in return; and so that Los Angeles land values may increase from 1,000 per cent. to 20,000 per cent. in another twenty years, as they have in the past.—C. F. HUNT, in *Wilshire Weekly*, Los Angeles, Calif.

## The Industrial Conflict

### HOW THE WARRING ELEMENTS MAY BE RECONCILED

#### I.

**T**HE existing relations between corporations and their employees call for the most serious consideration. Strikes, lockouts, unemployment, business failures, not only disrupt industry but also destroy social peace and prosperity.

Each side to the controversy holds views which it believes to be right, and each has repeatedly tried to apply the methods it approves. Thus far the results of such efforts have been wholly unsatisfactory. May it not be that, in this instance, as in many others, "the looker-on sees most of the game?" Is it not more than possible that an impartial but deeply interested professional man may suggest a plan which will bring industrial peace?

The solution advanced by organized labor may be summed up in the term "collective bargaining." No doubt in some instances, much more frequent in Great Britain than in the United States, differences between an employer and his employees have been settled amicably by a compromise agreed to by representatives of the two contending parties. But how often will such well meant efforts have completely failed! Indeed, most of our strong corporations either refuse altogether to confer, or else reject the collective bargain which is offered. Organizations of employers take the stand that the owners of the industry must make the rules by which it is to be conducted. With some reason, they assert that they alone, and not their employees, know the conditions which must determine the wages to be paid and the number of hours to run.

When labor insists as a *sine qua non* upon collective bargaining, it seems impossible under existing conditions to prove it in the wrong. An individual laborer cannot bargain upon equal terms with a corporation. If an employee believes, or knows, that his services are worth more than the wages he receives, he is individually helpless. Should he go to the agent of the corporation and put his request for higher pay, he will be told, as a rule, that if not satisfied he can go, that there are a plenty of just as good workmen ready to take his place for the wages he is receiving. If the worker quits and applies elsewhere for employment, he is pretty sure to find the market price for his services no higher—more likely as a stranger, he will be obliged to start in at a lower wage.

On the other hand, not one of the plans proposed by employing corporations has proved at all acceptable to organized labor.

The proposition, emanating from Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., as an outcome of the horrible industrial strife in Colorado, has been denounced by Samuel Gompers.

Mr. Rockefeller's scheme is that all of those who work for his company, whether members of organized labor or