

interest is in such values, but would benefit probably 98 per cent of the people—and business and capital whose customers and employees they largely are?

WHAT IS COMMUNISM? A question uncovering vast psychological weakness, or ignorance. It is the philosophy of Karl Marx; just as are also socialism, bolshevism and fascism. They all mean domination of the individual by the state, through regimentation and bureaucracy. The variations are only in detail, in spite of the fact that they do not recognize each other always, and therefore fight to the death.

THE ISSUE OF INDIVIDUALISM VS. COLLECTIVISM IS PERHAPS AS ALIVE IN RUSSIA AS IN THIS COUNTRY, though we are supposed to be exactly opposite to them. But we neglect to properly define and defend our individualism while they are in trouble over their collectivism because it goes against human nature and natural law. The Soviet is supposed to have collective farming, and has elaborate plants organized collectively. But the peasants, even working under the tyranny of the Tsars, don't like the tyranny of collectivism much better.

"WHAT IS THIS 'SIMPLE TRUTH' YOU CREDIT MR. SO AND SO WITH; but which he and his few friends are so slow in getting across?" "It is the answer to the riddle of the sphinx; why we have poverty when there is plenty." "And what is that simple answer?" "It is that about half of all we earn is taken from us by basic monopoly." "That is indeed simple! Is the proof also available?" "Yes, (1) this monopoly amounts to as much as all our wealth, \$200,000,000,000. (2) It is untaxed because we put all taxes on our wages, capital and wealth." "And the cure—is that also simple and obvious?" "Yes, to reverse the cause by just shifting all the taxes off industry and onto monopoly." "I give up," says the Heckler, "you have won your case of simplicity; but I am not so sure it fits into this world of barbed-wire entanglements."

Mr. Kellogg and Unemployment

(Reprinted from *The Churchman*)

To the Editor of *The Churchman*.

I READ in my copy of *The Churchman*, July number, that in his keynote address before the 5,000 social workers gathered in Buffalo for the National Conference of Social Work, Paul Kellogg, distinguished editor of the *Survey* and president of the conference, minced no words about relief. "Any one" (said Mr. Kellogg) "who thinks mere business recovery is going to get us out of the woods of public assistance is blind to what is afoot." "He begged the social workers who were his hearers to do everything possible to make clear that the advances of science and world changes were responsible for unemployment."

Well, there you have it: there you have solution of our social problem.

But let us do a little thinking in reverse under the aegis of factual logic. A satisfactory conclusion demands that we do this: If, then, there had been no scientific advances and no world-changes since the time of the root-grubbers and shell-grabbers, would there be no unemployment today? Certainly there would not be, any more than there is unemployment, or relief, or bread-lines among the animals, the birds of the air, or the fishes of the sea. Our world would have continued unto this present as delightfully static for the human race as for the tadpole and the mosquito. Very surely there would be no such thing as what we call civilization.

So, following out the logic of Mr. Kellogg's solution of the unemployment problem, our only recourse is to scrap all the scientific advances of the struggling centuries of human existence, and fall on our knees and try to persuade a guiding Omnipotence to decree forthwith a static, changeless world!

Fortunately, there is other logic than Mr. Kellogg's which it may be well to heed. This logic tells us that it is not "scientific advances," but human stupidity-plus-iniquity in not making proper use of scientific advances that is responsible for unemployment and destitution. If a relatively few super-elephantish elephants, or super-tigers, or lions, or leopards managed to corral the only available forage grounds that could provide sustenance for their fellow elephants, lions, tigers, leopards, demanding that these forage for them, their over-lords, as well as for themselves, how long before there would be gaunt and hungry elephants, lions, tigers, leopards, thousands, maybe, millions, of them begging for relief? The instinct of the lower creatures, it would seem, is wiser than man's boasted intellect; wherefore there is among them a common fatness, a common well-being; none millionaires in any animalish sort of way, none degraded to what we know as "the level of the brute"; nothing like unto London or New York slums, or Southern share-croppers. The four-legged animals have never been led by their God-given instinct to grab the choicest portions of the productive earth for themselves, demanding tribute of those who would apply to it their productive labor. They have never been dominated by a benevolent government which fulminated against monopolies in general, but was stubbornly, strangely blind to the giant monopoly confronting it on every side; the *land monopoly*; the monopoly of the ultimate *source of all wealth*; of all that feeds, clothes and shelters human bodies.

Give men access to land, make its productive capacity as available to all as to some, and Mr. Kellogg will not then need to worry about scientific advances; for they will but serve to make human labor more effective in procuring in greater abundance the things that minister to the welfare of their life.

New Orleans, La.

QUINCY EWING.

In Palestine

I HAVE been much interested in recent editorials on Palestine. I have been there twice in the past twelve years and naturally became interested in the situation.

I could not go to Damascus because there was fighting going on between the French and the Syrians. As I gathered from various observations there was a general feeling that the English mandate in Palestine was working much better than the French mandate in Syria.

My information was that the Arabs outnumbered the Jews in Palestine four or five to one, and that the Arabs resented the fact that their land might be passing from them. There seems no doubt that the present trouble in Palestine comes from the land question.

The word land reminds me of a personal incident which I may be permitted to relate. On a train going one day from Jerusalem to Joppa I happened to be in a compartment with an American engineer in the employment of the British Government. He was a graduate of Cornell University. During our conversation he suddenly asked me if I had known anything about Henry George or his plan for the taxation of land value. I told him that I had known Mr. George very well. He said that in America he had regarded the George movement very lightly, but that since he had been in Palestine he had come to the conclusion that this theory might be the solution of the trouble between the Jews and the Arabs.

To show how wide-spread are the problems of the land

question in Palestine, my friend on the train informed me that two-thirds of the Province of Galilee is subject to absentee landlordism. It is not easy to compare areas in the old country and the new. The drive from Haifa through Nazareth across Galilee to Tiberias is about like the drive across an average county in most of our states. Roughly speaking I think we may say that the size of Galilee is about two-thirds that of an average county in Virginia.

—J. H. DILLARD in *The Washington Post*.

New Zealand and the Recent Vote

OVERSEAS readers of *The Commonwealth* will be well advised not to jump to the conclusion that the people of New Zealand have gone over to Socialism, for that interpretation of the general election results would be far from the truth.

Our version of what happened is this:—The electors, for the most part, came to the conclusion that they had to choose one out of two evils—Socialist soothing syrup, or castor oil and concentration camps. In these circumstances they plumped for the soothing syrup, and in so doing they were keeping company with one of the clearest-headed of the older eminent English political economists, John Stuart Mill. Readers of his "Principles" may recall that Mill, in dealing with Communism, said that if it were a choice of Communism or the present state of affairs, where parasites reap the greatest rewards and the useful people the least, Communism would be infinitely preferable. Fascism is an attempt in the first place to stabilize the unjust conditions prevailing, though it later becomes solely the political tool of the political gangsters in office.

The writing is on the wall; if the people of means and education will not fight for the Justice the Cooperative Commonwealth League stands for, then the end will almost certainly be a triumph in New Zealand for Communism. Free cooperation is the only alternative to some form of collectivist slavery, such as Socialism, Communism, Fascism, and the like. Fight for the Cooperative Commonwealth!

Jan.-Feb. *Commonweal* of New Zealand.

HAVING accepted his appointment as Minister to France, Jefferson went to Paris before the revolution began there. He was well received from the start. The tall slender American was an impressive figure. "You replace Dr. Franklin, I hear," said the French minister of foreign affairs. "I succeed him," Jefferson replied, "nobody could replace him."

ON July 23 last, Benjamin W. Burger spoke over radio station WBIL on *The Elements of Democracy*. He advised his listeners to buy George's books.

The WPA Strikes

By STEPHEN BELL

It is hard to say which is the more absurd—the WPA strikes or the WPA programme itself. Here we have a great, rich country with unmatched natural resources which, intelligently handled, might be made a garden, a land of happy, prosperous homes, but which by mishandling and maltreatment has been made a land of *disemployed*, unhappy and miserable people.

We boast of being a land of the free, while ten to twelve millions of us are not free to make an honest living, for, with all our boasting, our thinking and planning are aimed at domination and control, the very opposite of freedom. Thus have we brought about a condition in which these matchless resources have been made the private property and possession of a comparatively few, who utilize and develop them only as it is profitable or suits their private purposes.

That the nation and the world is suffering the natural consequences of destructive taxation is no secret. There is scarcely a man or woman in the country who will not admit that vicious and mischievous taxation is in some way connected with this the greatest and most prolonged depression in our history. Yet what does our government do about it? Astounding as it may seem, it *increases* the amount and variety of the already multitudinous and multiform taxes which *caused* the depression, in order to raise funds to cure or alleviate it and bring about business recovery. It even "borrows from the future" to raise funds for this purpose and has thus added more than twenty thousand millions of dollars to the national debt.

It has created no new purchasing power by such means, at best it has only shifted purchasing power from the people to the government, and much of it has been lost in the process.

Of the public works projected and carried through to "make work" for the unemployed, such as those of the WPA, many of them have been economically useless, and I fear that most of this "work" has benefited only those who owned lands taken for, or adjacent to the improvements. Especially is this true of the great motor highways which have been and are being constructed.

That the whole system of relief, both direct and by way of "made work" is reeking with "graft" is a matter of general belief if not of general knowledge. Never yet have governments provided opportunities for "graft" without attracting an army of grafters to work it for all it is worth, and the opportunities for graft inhere in the system. Our recent labor legislation has provided further opportunities along this line, and some of our labor unions have taken full advantage of them. No doubt they are motivated by a desire to get "theirs" too. Our whole fabric of morals and honesty is being shot to pieces.

The crowning absurdity, it seems to me, is the action of certain of the "WPA" unions in invoking the "strike" to maintain and strengthen their grip on the system. Utterly failing to see that business has been crippled and paralyzed by taxes in order to maintain "made work" ideas, they wish to perpetuate the absurdity. In what are essentially charitable employment enterprises, they will not accept the "employment" except at "regular" rates!

Such a state of mind is the outcome of the so-called liberal view of things. But who and what are the "liberals" of whom we hear so much? They are a nondescript collection of people who think "liberal" means "generous," and are extremely generous—with other people's money.

It would be interesting to know in what direction these "liberals" have extended human liberty. Certainly they have not extended economic liberty, the liberty to earn an honest living and enjoy what one has earned. Nor will they while the masses regard as "liberals" those who use the name to wage new restrictions on economic liberty. They live on other people's earnings and strike for more.

Where will these folks be at the day of reckoning? It is evident they have no heed for the morrow, when retrenchment comes, as come it must.