

## Jerome Joachim Writes—and We Quote— From the Beacon of Berwyn, Ill.

**M**OST advocates of a planned economy base their arguments on assumptions that often have no resemblance to fact.

The acceptance of statements such as the following, without thought or proof, often leads many well intending citizens to ridiculous conclusions. Several such assumptions, together with comments are here noted.

1. "Planning would, without any doubt, eliminate powerful legislative lobbies." Our Federal government has done more planning, since 1932, than ever before in our nation's history. Are there more or less lobbies in Washington than there were? Can any business man exist today without being a member of countless associations formed to bring pressure to bear in Washington? How many workmen are not members of some group organized for the purpose of maintaining a lobby? How many farmers, miners, sailors or air pilots do not belong to an organization formed primarily to maintain lobbies? If more governmental planning is done, will there need to be more or less lobbies? Even a casual thought would indicate the ridiculousness of the above statement. Only under a completely totalitarian rule, such as Russia has, could it be otherwise!

2. "Vested interests control the local, state and national government by way of powerful lobbies."

This statement probably was true, prior to 1932. Today, as mentioned above, every group has lobbies. Legislation since 1932 would indicate that almost everyone except these interests control our legislatures. And is there much difference, as far as increased productivity is concerned, whether John L. Lewis, the farm bloc, the A. F. of L., the C. I. O. or the National Manufacturers' Association lobby controls Congress? Don't they all have the silly notion that each can have more by restricting production?

3. "Already 2½ millions are unemployed. This is not the fault of labor unions."

How many additional opportunities for young men has the stereotypers' union created in Chicago during the past 15 years? How often has labor made an effort to create additional jobs by increasing production or lowering wages so that sales could be increased and jobs made more plentiful? Does each laborer realize that if his fellow workmen could buy his particular product for half-price, that workmen would have enough money left to buy something else which would create another job? Has labor's attitude toward these fundamental truths been more intelligent than management's attitude? Have not labor unions joined with management to restrict opportunity to create monopolies and to limit opportunity?

4. "National Health Insurance is not socialistic."

What then is socialism? Socialism can hardly be defined as anything other than a system in which *all* are forced to do what *some* believe should be done. Since *all* now have the right to buy health insurance if they wish, is not the National Health Insurance proposal a plan whereby millions will be *forced* to buy it whether they want to or not? If its proponents were sincere, why would they not try to provide better health facilities and then sell them to

the people . . . giving the people the right to decide whether they were worth what they cost . . . instead of making them buy them regardless of their value?

5. "Did labor benefit from its 15 month strike against Chicago publishers?"

Labor never benefits from the use of force, except as such force may have publicity or educational value. A better question, capable of at least some argument would be, "Did labor ever benefit by its present method of substituting *force* for *education* in the achievement of its objectives?" Most labor leaders usually say "No". They contend, at least once a year, that the use of *force* elsewhere has reduced real wages for their group.

When will labor realize that *force* is not the answer? When will they realize that planning, which is merely governmental *force*, is not the answer? When will they come to know that *freedom* and *education* is the answer?

Labor leaders who consistently declare that real wages have increased very little over the past 25 years, despite vast improvements in production methods, should eventually learn that the methods they have used to increase the income of workingmen are not effective. Many of them realize this—and think that socialism or communism is the only answer. Actual contacts with workmen in Great Britain and Russia should prove conclusively that these schemes tend to impoverish not only the workmen but everyone, killing even the pleasures that Americans get from dreaming of what might be.

Perhaps some day, labor will realize that it is not industrial leaders, investors and men who lead in fostering greater production in the nation who must be induced to divide what they get with laborers. What they must do to improve their lot is to see that those who do not aid in greater production should be denied any portion of what is produced. This would include the shift-

less worker in their own crew, the government worker who produces nothing of value, the foreign worker who is getting what we produce without returning something of value to us and the monopolist who increases his share of what is produced by decreasing production.

They must know that the John L. Lewis's, who decrease the amount of coal produced through a strike, are diminishing their real pay by exactly the amount which they prevent from being produced. The cartel maker, who restricts production so as to control price, is the work-

men's enemy and so is the protective tariff advocate who shuts out the cheap goods which we could get in from other lands in return for a relatively small amount of our labor. The construction worker, who refuses to use the best tools or the most efficient methods is the enemy of labor, for he makes it necessary for other workmen to devote hundreds of additional hours of labor to acquire a home.

When and if Americans realize that increasing the number of those who "get more for less" won't help them and discover that instead, they must eliminate all schemes which enable anyone to "get more for less"—then will they and everyone enjoy greater prosperity than the world has ever known.

Georgism to me is not the Single Tax, though this is one of the important applications of the general philosophy that George taught. My concept of George is that he showed us that merely saying "Society can't get something for nothing" wasn't sufficient. He showed us that these words, so obviously true to everyone, must be applied fully to all our economic activities. For us to merely say that we realize we can't get something for nothing and then continue the systems which make this possible for part of the people, is only to utter empty words.

The function of the school today is to show Americans all of the methods which society has adopted which still permit folks to get "something for nothing" and to point out that so long as these loopholes are tolerated, others will try also to get what they desire—not through greater production but by methods similar to those which have previously been used. As they succeed in establishing a beach-head, these schemes will little by little be accepted as having general approval and make it more necessary for others to adopt similar tactics in order to survive. Nature will frequently revolt and wipe out the claims against production that are thus created, but as long as the methods are tolerated, we will continue to have the depressions and explosions which inevitably result from unsound economic practices.

—JEROME JOACHIM