

the members of the Society of Jesus. We therefore welcome the Resolutions of the recent Jesuit Educational Association Convention at Loyola University, Chicago. These resolutions urge upon Catholic bodies the study of social problems, and use the following significant language:

"Upon the progressive solution of social problems, industrial, societal, political (civic, state, national and international) depends the whole fabric of Christian civilization. Observant contemporaries of the World War, the Russian cataclysm and the current Mexican disorders ask no further proof for this statement.

"Social problems, unlike problems of the exact sciences, can be rightly solved only by constant reference to and application of ethical and religious principles. Interest in social problems is a distinctly apostolic interest, a postulate of the priestly vocation.

"Apathy on the part of our college students and graduates toward social problems is all too common. Their contributions and our own toward the solution of social problems should be vastly greater.

**G**RATIFYING indeed are the words, "constant reference to and application of ethical and religious principles." How otherwise can the social problem be solved? Approached in this spirit the solution cannot long be obscured. And the apathy on the part of college students and graduates toward social problems, which the resolutions of the Jesuit convention declare is "all too common," arises from the lack of deep conviction on the part of public educators who approach these questions in a spirit of dry formality lacking in any sense of their responsibility to the community. The resolutions state the matter forcefully. It is only by bringing to these problems a deep conviction as to their ethical and religious considerations that the true solution can be found. We commend to the attention of the reverend fathers Henry George's letter to the Pope published under the title of "The Condition of Labor." In it they will find how these often perplexing economic and social problems are answered by an appeal to the religious consciousness; they will find nothing that conflicts with the canons of the Church, as the American Catholic Church has itself declared through its highest authority, and much that is reminiscent of the teachings of the early fathers on the institution of private property.

**T**HE recent Labor Party Conference at Margate, England, went on record in favor of land nationalization with compensation to the landowners. Col. Josiah C. Wedgewood opposed the plan of land nationalization as involving compensation, and was supported by his fellow Georgians who urged the policy of taxing the landlords out. Ramsay Macdonald declared: "To me compensation is not a bogey. If I can get a thing done by reasonable compensation and cannot get it done without compensation, it is purely a business consideration." Which would be true if he and not the people of Great Britain were to pay the bills.

**T**HE Plan recommended in the Report has provisions for Boards of Agriculture and Boards to fix a "Living Wage," and other boards to regulate this, that and the other thing. It is an amazing revelation of ignorance. There is no recognition of natural laws, no comprehension that things regulate themselves, that with freedom established by the government collection of economic rent, wages would be all that labor earns. Is Justice such a profound and complicated thing that all the economic ramifications of trade and production must be regulated by Boards and Commissions? Mr. Macdonald said that the Report was "not meant as a lasting and final pronouncement," thus leaving the way open for another switch of policy.

**W**E wish all our readers could have been present at the dinner in this city when Charles O'Connor Hennessy and Anna George deMille told of their experience in Denmark. It was an inspiring occasion, as the enthusiasm of the speakers and the facts they presented gave renewed hope to those present for the progress of our cause. These addresses appear elsewhere in this issue in a report of the dinner, and we hope they will be read carefully.

Though there seems to be a general indifference in this country toward economic problems, we can rejoice that there is one spot where the doctrines of Henry George are a vital issue and are making substantial progress. Here are some indications: the reception that was accorded to the daughter of Henry George at the conference of the Danish housemen; the procession that accompanied her through the streets of Copenhagen when she laid the wreath in memory of her father on the Liberty Memorial; the portraits of Henry George in the high schools and the peasants' homes; the proffered use of the government's radio to broadcast Senator Hennessy's speech; the presence of cabinet officers at the Conference; and the graceful tender of the Parliament Buildings for the sessions of the Conference. These things alone (apart from the legislation in our direction described in a recent issue) indicate that the Danes realize the high importance of Henry George's message.

**I**T has been our desire to present a full report of the Hennessy Dinner because it was a notable occasion. We have therefore omitted little in the report of the addresses, each representing the speaker's point of view. We desire, however, to register our emphatic dissent from much of what was said by George L. Record. For temperamentally in his view of George's message, and politically in the policy he would pursue for the attainment of the ideal, we see only an unreasoning pessimism and practical futility.

**P**OLITICAL futility too, we mean. And we point to Mr. Record's own state as an example. There

was a time when the Progressive Party of that state, under the leadership of Messrs. Record and Colby and others, seemed on the point of making certain important advances in our direction. Evidently, there was something wrong with the method, for not only did the movement come to naught, but the Progressives ceased to be a functioning body.

**W**E are glad to have Mr. Record declare for the full reform without compromise in the field of propaganda. Evidently he is not in favor of minimizing the doctrine in our educational methods, or teaching it piecemeal as a mere fiscal reform. So far we are in agreement. Nor are we opposed to accepting legislative measures going in our direction. The plain commonsense of the matter is to accept what we can get with a polite "Thank you for so much." But that it lessens the efficiency of political leaders to be known as thoroughgoing Single Tax men we do not believe. And to imagine that the idea can be put over by attacks on the minor forms of monopoly without enlightening the voter upon the relation these bear to the major monopoly, that of the land and all natural resources, is to cherish a delusion.

**W**E submit, too, that the analogy Mr. Record draws of the Single Tax and anti-slavery movements will not bear examination. Seward told Emerson, "You make history and we profit by it." We cannot say what the result would have been had Lincoln ranged himself on the side of Phillips and Garrison, and demanded the abolition of slavery. Perhaps he might never have been president. But as it was, despite Mr. Lincoln's somewhat timorous treatment of the question, the attack on slavery and Lincoln's own attitude, did help to precipitate the Civil War. And we do not know, and never can know, if the political programme of Abraham Lincoln would have succeeded or not, since the war came, utterly wrecking all these nicely laid plans, and abolition came, not as a successful outcome of Lincoln's policy, but as a war measure forced upon a half reluctant North.

**W**E wonder where Mr. Record has been all these years when he says, "I have never been able to talk to a miscellaneous audience upon the Single Tax with any feeling that I put it over at all, and I say that I have never seen anybody that could take a miscellaneous, untrained audience, and put over the Single Tax." Did he never hear Henry George do it? Or Father McGlynn? Or John S. Crosby? Or the hundreds of others who in halls or from cart tails were able to make converts? Where then did most of our converts come from? If we have failed to make them, "the fault is in ourselves"—for others have done it. All will bear witness that they have seen it done. It is true it cannot be done by fiscal appeals

alone, and Henry George did not rely exclusively on such appeals when he sent men away from his meetings convinced crusaders for the great truth which some of them heard for the first time. It is precisely because Mr. Record—and we say it in no unkindness—has minimized the truth he knows, in accordance with the policy he has declared that when we speak as an economist we can say one thing, and when we speak as a politician we can say another, that he has failed to "put it over."

## Far-Fetched Objections to Conscription of Wealth

**S**ENATOR JAMES A. REED'S statement assailing the recommendation by President Coolidge for conscription of wealth and labor in event of another war exhibits either a complete misunderstanding of the President's proposal, or a willingness to misrepresent the conditions that may reasonably be expected to result from their adoption. Coming from one who has opposed American entrance into the League of Nations and the World Court because of his alleged fears that the United States would be drawn into armed conflicts that might arise between other nations, this objection against a practicable method for equitable distribution of the cost of conducting war is enlightening, as showing how thoroughly mistaken are the opponents of all-inclusive conscription in their opinions as to the operation of that policy. It is possible that the danger of such conscription might not operate to create a sentiment strong enough to prevent a declaration of war. It is impossible that the alarming results of universal business paralysis, and industrial chaos, should follow the taking over for public purpose of the machinery and labor necessary for the production of all war material.

"At the mere approach of war every dollar would go into hiding," asserts Senator Reed. This is merely his guess, but suppose it were true, what of it? The factories and all the vast equipment for producing munitions and clothing for the army would remain. The labor necessary for their operation would all be in the United States. Under the direction of the Chief Executive a currency system for the payment of the workers would take the place of the money hidden away. The expenditures for the late war were paid for by government promises to pay, called bonds. If the owners of money withdrew it from the banks a perfectly satisfactory substitute could be supplied in the shape of a government-managed currency. Instead of being used to make excessive profits out of war-material contracts, the industries needed would be operated under government direction, with elimination of profits for the duration of the war.

The notion that industry and trade in general would stop because certain productive agencies were taken over