

## SCIENCE SOLVES SOMETHING

The land question, the boarding-house pie question, the sharing-of-wealth question, in fact almost any question which involves the division of anything, no longer presents an opaque front. Tax assessors and tax collectors should have no difficulty in sharing your annual earnings whilst getting more for the government and yet—believe it or not—leaving more for you.

Yep, *now* it *can* be done. *Now* it can be told. It *can* happen here.

All one needs to do is to master the Krasner formula for measuring the "horn angle." It is very simple.

If you wish to divide land, or pies, or wealth, et cetera, merely arrange the subject-matter in the form of a circle. Instead of drawing straight radical lines, as in the old, pie-cutting way, draw curved lines from the locus of the circle to the perimeter. The angle between two such curved lines is known as the "horn angle" and is measured as follows:—

"Measure the square of the difference in curvature and divide by the difference in the rates of variation. The result is an abstract number and a standard of measurement."

By applying this abstract unit of measure to whatever you are dividing you will find a most miraculous consequence.

"Unlike straight lines on which the whole is always equal to the sum of its parts, in a horn angle the sum of the parts is nearly always greater than the whole, but is never less."

On the way to the office and to the daily, prosaic duties of building municipal sewers, the writer dropped into kindly, keen and quaint Mrs. Clancey's coffee kitchen for his customary New England breakfast of pie and coffee. Quite casually the conversation turned to the topic of the day, the day being Tuesday. Mrs. Clancy aims to keep posted on every up-to-the-minute item, albeit her mathematical education has resulted in her keeping of accounts by making chalk marks on the kitchen wall. The kindly old soul insisted upon knowing the meaning of the Krasner formula, which term slipped from the writer's lips—and almost fell into the coffee—during the table-talk. It required no time at all for Mrs. Clancy to grasp the significance of the "horn angle" because she has been making radical straight lines and pie-perimeters ever since she discovered the various uses of rolling-pins.

Beginning instantanly, all pies of the Clancy cuisine will be cut curvilinear regardless of the old-time notion that a straight line is the shortest distance between two points.

"Mebbe, me bhye, I can get ten pieces out of each pie instid of six, and each piece will be larger than before although I cut the pie only six times. Anyway, there'll never be less than the whole pie and we'll all be the gainers."

The writer attempted to point out that Mrs. Clancy's great increase in business would undoubtedly result in higher rents, higher income tax and, in general, a total absorption of the benefits of her ingenious adaptation of the Krasner formula.

"Ah sure!" exclaimed Mrs. Clancy, "Ye're allus talkin' Single Tax."

## PATERNALISM

"The unquestionable republicanism of the American mind will break through the mist under which it has been clouded, and will oblige its agents to reform the principles and practices of their administration."

—THOMAS JEFFERSON.

To those who have read the revelations of "Progress and Poverty" the following true story may be of interest. The writer, having been born and bred a rock-ribbed, New England Republican; having been reared among New England's square, squat homes with their *narrow* eaves, *hard* granite steps, *small* window panes and *cold* white paint, cannot be accused of blindly worshipping a human idol if he occasionally quotes from the pen of Thomas Jefferson.

For eight years the writer has labored among the "Jeffersonian Democrats" of cultured Boston; for twenty years he has listened to the impassioned political speeches of New England "Jeffersonians" as they belabored us—and as we belabored them—in our periodic peregrinations into political piffle, hither and thither in the old Bay State.

The term "Jeffersonian Democrat" came to have an awe-inspiring air of finality. These two words alone were deemed sufficient by any one of our political enemies. We young Republicans never were taught the principles laid down by Thomas Jefferson, and it now appears that Democratic spell-binders were too lazy to read what Jefferson had written, or else they did not understand what he had said. If we Republicans had not been reared in ignorance—if the Democrats had not steadfastly failed to understand what their idol had said—much of this nation's suffering would have been averted. We were too busy quarreling with each other.

"Seeing, therefore, that an association of men who will not quarrel with one another is a thing which never yet existed," said Jefferson to John Taylor, "from the greatest confederacy of nations down to a town meeting or a vestry; seeing that we must have somebody to quarrel with, I had rather keep our New England associates for that purpose, than to see our bickerings transferred to others."

In this respect the "Jeffersonian Democrats," of the North at least, have been always Jeffersonian—even when the Republicans were right. Until the great economic unrest brought the recent change to the Bay State's political complexion, the northern Jeffersonians did in

vain dash their inch-and-a-half skulls against the granite stubbornness of the phlegmatic, smug majority. The static moment of inertia of New England Republicanism was too great to be overturned by the static squawkings of the Democratic "outs."

Came the dawn . . . and the NRA. Came another dawn . . . and the CWA. Yet another dawn . . . and the ERA. Dawns may come and dawns may go, but the alphabet goes on forever.

The Democratic originators of alphabetical combinations have, very patently, lost sight (if they ever saw it) of the Jeffersonian principle that "There are rights which it is useless to surrender to the government, and which governments have yet always been found to invade."

It is a queer quirk of human events which now presents the spectacle of Republicans vociferously defending Jeffersonian fundamentals which have been swept by the board by Jeffersonian offspring. Jefferson was a charter member in the colonial Republican activities. The Hamiltonian crew inclined to castes and kings. From the ostensible democratic republicanism of those days came our present Democratic and Republican parties. The bold theft of the term Republican, by the Hamiltonian offspring, has been an effective method for misleading the sheep of the ensuing Republican party, the leaders of which have never intended to further the republican principles to which Jefferson gave voice. The Democratic demagogues have never intended to further the democratic axioms laid down by Jefferson. Taxation expediency has become the soul of both parties.

"The negative, proposed to be given them (Congress) on all the acts of the several legislatures, is now," says Jefferson, "for the first time suggested to my mind. *Prima facie*, I do not like it."

Our modern Jeffersonians do not care a hoot—or do not know—what Jefferson liked or disliked. By alphabetical combinations they work their negatives on any and all acts of State legislature and we "take it and like it."

"State a moral case to a ploughman and a professor. The former will decide it as well," says Jefferson, "and often better than the latter, because he has not been led astray by artificial rules."

Our present-day Brain Trust has proven that Jefferson was again right. They seek artificially to improve upon the laws of the Creator.

"The tyranny of the legislature is the most formidable dread at present," continues Jefferson, "and will be for many years. That of the executive will come in its turn; but it will be at a remote period."

Remote periods come all too quickly where untoward events are concerned, and we find the remote period upon us in the short space of one hundred and forty-three years. Jefferson's admonition, to "Let the General Government be reduced to foreign concerns only," has been dumped overboard.

"If it is believed that these elementary schools will be better managed by the Governor and Council, the commissioners of the literary fund, or any other general authority of the government, than by the parents of each ward," says Jefferson, "it is a belief against all experience. Try the principle one step further, and amend the bill so as to commit to the Governor and Council the management of all our farms, our mills, and merchants' stores."

The offspring of Thomas Jefferson's party have taken him at his word and hence the triple-letter triumvirate.

It came to the writer's experience to be projected into one of these tri-letter regimes—into the very brain-center of paternalistic protection. The name of the city, which follows, is alone fictitious.

The city of Springton boasts a population of 125,000 souls, of whom its army of unemployed numbers 15,000 (only 3,000 being given jobs because of insufficient federal funds). Like all other American cities Springton has never learned the simple and correct method for levying taxes. It has been advertised to the world as being bankrupt. Food tickets are dispensed to the most needy families.

Into the picture comes our paternalistic federal government, operating under the familiar ERA. An office force of fifty employees speedily is put onto the payroll to cope with the intricate mass of detail which naturally follows such emotional officiousness in the aim to control private lives. Jobs are "made" of a nature outside the usual order to prevent the City Fathers from using federal funds for routine affairs—from saving their cash-on-hand and from being able to boast of a low, local tax-rate. Yes, even cities will "chisel in" if they are not watched.

Applicants for emergency relief jobs are invited to register, and the process demands a complete acknowledgment of total, utter and abject want. Large families get the preference in being placed upon the list of eligibles. The man with a family of ten, twelve or fourteen children (there are many so situated) is fortunate to draw a pick-and-shovel job at \$12 per week. No laborer or mechanic is permitted to work more than 24 hours weekly. No family can have more than one job per household. If a child earns \$3 per week then that sum is discounted in figuring papa's "budget hours" which our paternalistic government computes on a penny-by-penny basis. In consequence, the budget hours range from several to the maximum of 24.

Peter Piper played a piccolo in the local ERA band—a band created to provide jobs for unemployed musicians. Peter's budget hours were arithmetically found to be 11½. Now a piccolo is very essential to harmony in every self-respecting band. All went well in the concerts during Peter's first day of 8 hours. On the second day Peter had 3½ hours left in his budget-computations. Alas and alack! Peter was in the midst of a piccolo solo when the timekeeper tapped him on the shoulder to say: "Peter, your time is up." The bandmaster valiantly



tried to maintain his artistic poise during the following days when first the oboe, then the traps, then the horn, each and severally, intermittently and periodically, fell before the stop-watch of the ERA timekeeper.

Each Monday morning brought a new week, a "new deal" and a new stretch of "budget hours." Each Monday morning awoke to hear the stirring strains of Souzanian marches, popular airs and medleys artistically smiting the ear-drums of yawning business men who had no business to go to. As the 6-hour, 13½-hour and 22-hour musicians fell before the timekeeper's authoritative commands, the well-balanced band dwindled to a few spot-lights, vacant "first chairs" and other band-stand chairs as the handful of remaining artists blew their last, wheezy breaths into their instruments at the end of the 24-hour budget-week.

Economic planning, Regimentation! In the name of Democracy mumble them words. Page Thomas Jefferson.

### "IT IS CONSTITUTIONAL"

In perhaps the first judicial decision in this nation, the Social Security Act may be declared constitutional. It does not follow that a directly contrary decision, with an equal degree of rationality, may not be made by another mind.

To those who are familiar with the distinction between moral and legal right—particularly after reading the able and conclusive expositions written by Henry George—there comes the realization of an added obstacle to economic justice from judicial decisions. Unfortunately too many people believe that a favorable judgment at once places a mooted question into the realms of righteousness. It is illogically reasoned that when an unbiased court passes judgment upon the validity, or constitutionality, of a man-made law then righteousness no longer is in doubt. Even lawyers—apparently intelligent ones—too many of them—accept this illogical conclusion.

Many intelligent men become lawyers, but not as many lawyers become intelligent men, and there are a vast number of the law profession occupying strategic positions in public office. An even greater number hold the confidence of, and hence influence over, lay minds and their private lives and present and future acts.

To the Georgeists who appreciate the time and toil which must be spent to rectify erroneous thoughts, before society permanently can be established in economic truth, there comes an appalling realization of the colossal task which confronts them even without the almost-daily addition of judicial confirmations of economic error.

As we appreciate the picture it appears that in order to avoid the creation of infinite obstacles to social justice—particularly those which come from our highly respected judiciary and which carry the greatest weight and air of finality—it may be necessary to re-write our national

and state constitutions in such a manner as to forestall further judicial decisions which actually tend to a destruction of the very Constitution itself. Almost helplessly to witness the compiling of daily decisions which can lead to naught but eventual revolution—to visualize the task of re-writing State and national constitutions—presents, indeed, a well-nigh hopeless undertaking. Yet it appears that this task must be accomplished because—assuming that all members of the judicial branch finally learn economic truth—they must still follow the erroneous mandates of our highest law in civil life.

It is at this point that we come to a realization of the puny efforts of mere man to establish social justice. The egotistical, materialistic self-sufficiency becomes conspicuous by its very incompetency, in the emotionally-conceived cures for social ills.

We meekly now turn to the idea that none but God Almighty can rectify our predicament.

We have exercised the power to think and to act illogically—selfishly—enviously, but we seemingly lack the equal and opposite power to rationalize—to be generous—to approve the success of our fellowman. Perhaps we can reach the spirit of humility—the acknowledgement of Divine omnipotence—in no other manner. Perhaps example is superior to precept. Perhaps the Law of Consequence is supreme.

Henry George has acknowledged the superior accomplishments of the Duke of Argyll, notwithstanding the Duke's inferior reasoning in the matter of economics, and the Duke obviously was not without ability to reason in other matters. He says:—

"And here we come on a great subject—the function of Human Law as distinguished from Natural Law . . . the Will of Society (can) operate upon the conduct of its members in two ways—first, directly by authority; and secondly, indirectly by altering the conditions out of which the most powerful motives spring. . . .

The ancient lawgivers were always aiming at standards of Political Society, framed according to some abstract notions of their own as to how things ought to be, rather than upon any attempt to investigate the constitution of human nature as it actually is. It was a mistake in the Science of Politics analogous to that which Bacon complained of so bitterly in the science of Physics. Men were always trying to evolve out of their own minds knowledge which could only be acquired by patient inquiry into facts. . . .

Such are the humiliating results from abstract reasoning, pursued in ignorance of the great Law, that no purpose can be attained in Nature except by legitimate use of the means which Nature has supplied. For as in the material world, all her Forces must be acknowledged and obeyed before they can be made to serve, so in the Realm of Mind there can be no success in attaining the highest moral ends until due honor has been assigned to those motives which arise out of the universal instincts of our race. . . .

But all this comes of thinking that we can be wiser than Nature, and of failing to see that every natural