

distinguish that forward movement, "back to the land," for which "Progress and Poverty" maps out the way.

September, 1927

LOUIS F. POST.

Carl Marfels

A RECENT visitor to this country is Carl Marfels who lives in a suburb of Heidelberg and is noted in Germany first as a famous maker and collector of watches. A book recently published in Germany incidentally describes him as a man of letters and an ardent social reformer. He was for many years vice president of the German Land Reform League.

He brings with him what the *Frankfurter Zeitung* describes as "a fairy-like collection of precious watches; old specimens in odd shapes, some of them of highly decorative charm, enamelled watches of Louis III period, some of them of highly decorative charm."

Mr. Marfels' greatest treasure is a famous Gothic clock which was owned by Duke Philip the Good, of Burgundy, made in 1430, and perhaps the oldest clock in the world. The timepiece is said to be a glorious specimen of Gothic art. A whole literature has been written around it. It is rated by connoisseurs as second only to the so-called Golden Horse of Old Oetting in Bavaria, a work of the same period which was established before the War, to be worth more than a million dollars.

There lies before us a little pamphlet of 16 pages by Carl Marfels published in Germany, *Die wahre Ursache der Arbeitslosigkeit und der Wirtschaftskrisen*. The True Cause of Unemployment and the Business Crisis.

Here is a translation of parts of this pamphlet. Mr. Marfels begins:

In the manifold discussions, in the press and in industrial society meetings, anent the current industrial crisis, I constantly miss any references to the paradoxical condition, that we have millions of part workers and unemployed, i.e. millions of people who wish to produce goods (subsistence products and other values), but who find no opportunities for employment, although they themselves and many others suffer poverty and destitution, for the want of just these products of labor. This fact is the more incomprehensible because labor means directly the production of wealth. This is true not only of those whose labor directly produces goods (materials, wealth) but also of the tradesmen and their employes, etc.

* * * * *

I am also continually surprised by the argument that because stocks do not sell readily that the existing stagnation is due to overproduction. As if ever too much could be produced! Truly if all the necessities of life, clothing, underwear, shoes, watches and other objects of daily use could be produced by those who need them, there would be no overfilled stocks, but only empty shelves.

* * * * *

The primary question, pushing aside all other problems, is therefore this: Why is it that millions of people anxious to work, cannot find employment, therefore no opportunity to produce the necessities of subsistence,

although they themselves and other millions of people suffer for want of these products, and although this latter class do not want these necessities gratis, but are willing to exchange the products of their own labor for them. In other words, why cannot demand and supply meet each other? And why is it that labor, which produces these values—and although its yield through technical progress has grown enormously—must be satisfied with remuneration which, compared with wheat (cereals) and other food stuffs, is much less than in the 15th century, and hardly suffices to keep alive.

All answers to the problem of the cause of industrial crises, that do not take this fundamental condition into consideration, cannot be accepted as a solution of the great economic problem under which all civilized countries suffer; and if the problem is not solved these countries will be driven to bolshevism and to chaos.

I will endeavor to give an answer to the suggested questions:

If we assume, for example, that a hundred people through shipwreck are stranded on an uninhabited but fruitful island, we will not for a moment doubt that they, although they saved nothing but their bare lives, will find means to subsist. Why would these helpless people, deprived of all the convenience of modern civilization, succeed in providing for their material wants, while their fellowmen in the midst of civilization fail in the same endeavor and often perish from want and woe?

The answer of necessity must be: Because on their island they have access to the fountain of life, mother earth, but lack this in cultivated lands. And why? Because the land has all been apportioned, because everywhere there is an owner who demands more from the willing worker than the land can produce.

Returning to the assumed island, it will afford us in camera a true picture of the progress which mankind at large has covered. When the shipwrecked recognize the advantage of labor division, one will hunt, another fish, a third will till the soil, the fourth produce the nets for the fisherman, the fifth will make clothing, etc., and each of them will participate equally in the products of the island. If a hare is harder to catch than a fish, then perhaps in trade three fishes must be given for a hare; or if the making of a piece of clothing take as much time and effort as the slaying of five wild ducks, that would be the rate of exchange.

If after a time one of the colonists realizes that by joint work of a number of the workers more production results can be obtained, and offers them the opportunity he will be able to engage them only if the remuneration exceeds what each individually has earned before. This will prove clearly that the worker, under natural conditions, cannot be exploited.

We will now go a step further. An ingenious individual constructs a machine which employing ten men produces a hundred-fold what the ten could produce individually. Can anyone believe that any one of these ten men would yield his independence unless he was offered more for his machine work than he could earn by his own endeavor? This proves also, that the workman under natural conditions, with access to the land, cannot be exploited by machinery, but that the machine must benefit him also, so that increased remuneration on the one hand, and reduced cost of machine made products on the other, will make increased purchase power possible.

All this will change at once, however, if one or more of the colonists assume ownership of the island, and have the power to maintain themselves as owners. Then the worker will have to buy the right to work the land, just by yielding a part of his produce, and then this rental would soon increase through competition continuously and finally only a bare living would remain.

The ownership of the land would mean a complete upheaval of all logic and reason. Labor, which alone produces all value, and which should be crowned with a diadem, would sink to the level of a beggar; it would be obliged to sue with good words for employment, and to accept all conditions demanded by the owner.

* * * * *

We frequently have people, who finally realize the importance of the land question, ask "All very good and right, but how shall we change it. You cannot divide (re-apportion) the land." If the solution could be only thus, it would be hopeless. But fortunately there is a simpler solution: The accomplished wrong could be rectified without depriving any owner of his land, simply by abandoning all other taxes and tariffs, and exacting only a *ground rent*, based on the bare land value, for the benefit of the whole community.

The Late James H. Barry of San Francisco

ONE of the very few remaining friends of Henry George to cross the threshold of the year 1927 has passed over the line of earthly life. His name was James Henry Barry. To the country at large and even in his own city of San Francisco he was best known and most appreciated as the owner and editor of *The San Francisco Star*.

Barry was born at New York in the year 1856, about the time that Henry George was sailing the seas as "a common sailor." When the Barry boy was about three years old his family moved to San Francisco, where Henry George, then a young man of twenty, had already settled down as a printer, the identical trade that Barry was himself to learn, and of which he made a commercial business in 1879—the very year in which Henry George first published "Progress and Poverty." At about this time, when George was somewhat more than forty and Barry about twenty-five, the two progressive typesetters came into personal contact.

Barry's *Star* was one of the first periodicals to advocate public ownership and operation of public service franchises; also equal rights for women, the initiative and referendum, and Henry George's economic principles and policies. In its editorial policy the *Star* was always frank and courageous.

That policy often brought Barry into uncomfortable situations. On one occasion, after he had denounced a well-known local editor for blackmailing schemes, two henchmen of the newspaper met him in the street—probably by design—and one deliberately spat in his face, with the intention undoubtedly of making Barry invol-

untarily reach for his handkerchief—a gesture which could be wilfully misconstrued as reaching for a pistol, and be made an excuse for immediately shooting him down. But Barry, with lightning grasp of the situation and extraordinary self-control, walked calmly forward until beyond his assailant's reach.

Such hostility took another turn in 1890 when Barry's exposure in the *Star* of the corruption of a local judge subjected him to one-sided contempt proceedings. Barry was commanded to apologize. He refused on the ground that he could not conscientiously apologize for telling the truth, whereupon he was sentenced to a five-days' term in jail. He served the sentence, but on the night of his release the largest mass meeting ever held in San Francisco, and attended by all classes of people, demanded a radical amendment of the law regarding contempt of court, a demand which resulted in the adoption of "the Barry law" which deprives California judges of their old power to punish their critics without a jury trial.

Among other services incidental to Barry's journalistic and business activities was his leadership in introducing the eight-hour workday in the printing trade along the Pacific Coast.

In politics Barry was a democratic-Democrat. This was his reason for supporting Bryan for the Presidency, and Wilson as Bryan's choice. Under Wilson he served for eight years as Naval Officer at the Port of San Francisco, resigning in 1921. At about that time he withdrew from his printing establishment and terminated the career of the *San Francisco Star*, which for many years he had edited and for many years had financed out of the earnings of his printing establishment rather than swap its economic and political principles for deceptive advertising.

James H. Barry was a straight man from the ground up. He was devoted to the principles of natural and moral law and to policies in so far as they were hand-maidens of principle. He was a friend of Henry George to the heart's core and Henry George of him. They were Democrats of the same variety, Christians of the same type, and men of like mould.

—LOUIS F. POST.

Death of Dr. Mary D. Hussey

WE regret to learn of the death of Dr. Mary D. Hussey on October 26 at the age of 74. She had been ill for a long time.

Her work for woman suffrage made her nationally known and her labors in behalf of the Single Tax endeared her to the followers of Henry George everywhere. She was a generous contributor to all Single Tax activities and was a familiar figure at Single Tax gatherings.

For many years she had invited Single Taxers from far and wide to meet at her home, and to them she distributed iris bulbs. Here in her garden, brilliant in colors, she