

war with the defenders of existing institutions.

Mr. Darling held but one political office, that of Deputy Attorney General of the State of New York, though he was the Land Value Tax Party's candidate for Congress in 1910 and for District Attorney of New York County in 1913.

Two of the victories to Mr. Darling's credit was that for free speech in Philadelphia, in which city he conducted two campaigns against the Director of Public Safety, and another inducing Mayor Gaynor to issue his famous order guaranteeing the right of citizens to hold street meetings without a permit. He fought the Sullivan Law prohibiting the right to keep and bear arms.

Mr. Darling was a forcible public speaker, and his knowledge of the Single Tax and practical economics was such as few possess. Though neither a profound nor exact scholar, his range of reading was wide, and his judgement of abstract moral principles pitilessly unerring. Many things might be said of "Joe" Darling, much in criticism, but he had a right to ask both friendly and unfriendly critics to say of him what Heine requested be said of himself: "He was a brave soldier in the war for human freedom."

THE PRESIDENT SEES IT

That free land is the regulator of wages is brought out very clearly by Woodrow Wilson in his *History of the American People* (Chapter 149) in which, referring to a period in our history, he says: "The New England men wanted the settlement of the West held back as much as possible. So long as land was to be had there almost for the mere asking, at no cost except that of the journey and of a few farmer's tools and a beast or two for the plough, the active men of their own section, whom they counted on as skilled workmen in building up their manufactures, must be constantly enticed away by the score and hundred, to seek an independent life and livelihood in the

West; high wages, very high wages, must be paid to keep them, if indeed they could be kept at all; and the maintenance of manufactures must cost more than even protective tariffs could make good."

It will be observed that it was recognized by the early New England protected manufacturers that free natural opportunities and not protective tariffs made high wages. They did not urge protection as a means of keeping up wages, but as a compensation for the higher wages they were forced to pay.

A TRUE CLASS CONSCIOUSNESS.

Single Taxers are disposed to deprecate the efforts of Socialists to stimulate class consciousness, on the ground that it foments "envy, malice and all uncharitableness" and leads nowhere. They believe that mankind will be regenerated by its virtues, not by the accentuation of its vices.

But there is a kind of class-consciousness which Single Taxers might properly cultivate. It is the kind based upon the recognition of the fact that there are really only two classes in the world—those who live by selling to others permission to use the earth and those who live by selling their labor to owners of the earth. There is usually little difficulty for anyone to tell in which of these classes he belongs. As soon as recognition of this simple line of division comes, many things now mysterious will be made plain.

Among other things, it will be clear why, whenever an onslaught is made upon protection, the delusion returns with redoubled force. It will not do to delude ourselves that the strength of protection is merely mercenary or corrupt. It is rooted in the belief of millions who unselfishly support it because they think it benefits others. They justly point an accusing finger at the unutterable slum squalor of British cities and attribute some of its hopelessness to free trade, which they erroneously assume to be Britain's policy. But if it were true that

Great Britain had totally wiped out its import duties and collected its revenue entirely from its internal revenue duties, while its working classes might be slightly benefited, it is doubtful whether its "submerged tenth," or "fifth," as it is in some sections, would be helped.

What is the basis of the instinctive shrinking which all workers feel for labor saving machinery and for freedom of imports? Is it not the instinctive recognition that they have only labor to sell and that whatever economizes labor is cheapening it in the interest of the landlords? And as free trade is at bottom a labor saving device may that not be the reason that the masses everywhere shun it? May we even go a step farther and say that while free trade is a logical part of our logical system based on the recognition of the natural rights of all in the land, that it is not a logical part of our topsy-turvy system, which makes the few the lords of the many by giving the few control of the fundamental source of life?

In the last analysis, it is only those who own the earth, who can create effective demand; when their needs are satisfied, unemployment begins. Of course they need many to minister to them in intermediate ways but they are the apex of our inverted social pyramid. Every labor saving device tends to satisfy their own and their servants needs with less labor. No matter how their slaves may strive to stimulate their jaded appetites satiety is finally reached and then comes "over-production."

Every time we approach the subject of social maladjustment, we come away with the same feeling that no reform however just or logical in itself can be other than a mockery or a curse, until the "primal, eldest curse," the exclusion of so large a proportion of mankind from its rights in the earth, commands the assent of the people.

IS POLITICAL ECONOMY SCIENCE OR PURE FAKE?

A "science" which its votaries refuse to define, and sometimes confess is undefinable, whose terms hardly two of its professors agree to define in the same way; a "science" whose followers confess is without fundamental principles—this is the thing that is being taught in our universities and colleges by men who are getting real money for it.

In place of statements applicable to a science or body of principles we learn (The Economics of Enterprize, Herbert Joseph Davenport) that "it is superlatively important to recognize that a complete acceptance of the private and acquisitive point of view is the only procedure possible in the analysis of the phenomena of society organized upon lines of individual activity for private gain," in which, behind a wall of words we may descry the final abandonment of any theory of a natural law of distribution.

Economics consisting merely of the veriest bric-a-brac of disconnected notions, has no fixed place as a territory to be explored. It is an interchangeable term for any intellectual adventure into the realms of Finance, Politics or Agriculture by one calling himself a political economist. That makes it political economy. There are no principles. Prof. Newcomb himself says that there are no economic principles to save statesmen the labor of working out each case on its own merits.

This is an admirable caution of safety and convenience, and avoids a world of trouble. If Galileo had said, "There are no principles of astronomy which will save theologians from working out their problems on their own merits," he would have escaped the rack, for he would have had nothing to retract. And if similarly before the Inquisition of public opinion the political economists be cited they can all, individually and severally say, laying their hands upon what serves them for a heart: "We have announced no principles; we have nothing to retract."