

IF order reigns in the universe—and it seems obvious to us that it does—we may find it supreme in the realm of economics. Because disorder and not order reigns, we may look here for the secret of the failure of civilization, the one we live in as well as the innumerable civilizations of the past. It must be a law of the economic world that what a man produces shall be his; the result of depriving him of this must bring certain consequences, certain disorders in the place of order.

THOSE who deplore the wide-spread modern skepticism, the weakening faith in the natural order may find here the answer to the riddle that perplexes them. Asa Grey has said: "I confidently expect that in the future, even more than in the past, faith in an order, which is the basis of science, will not be dissevered from faith in an Ordainer, which is the basis of religion."

IT is because of this, among other reasons, that every earnest minded thinker and philosopher, should be interested in demonstrating the natural order, in discovering first what it is, and secondly in getting rid of conditions that interfere with its free operation. That there is such a natural order cannot be demonstrated by any single experiment, but it is not to be ignored in any rational system of social or economic philosophy.

AND this leads us to another thought. The aim of the movement begun by Henry George is not to give man more wealth, more things, nor even merely to make it more easy for him to earn a living, though that is a great deal. But it is to establish that order of progress in civilization which in conformity with the natural law will assure a beneficent future for mankind, and make of the food-grubbing, house-building animal a religious man on whom a new power will be conferred to raise the curtain revealing his immortal destiny. These are the supreme heights for his attainment, which Henry George, in completing the task he had set himself of outlining his great reform, has foreshadowed in immortal prose.

The Land and the Race Question in South Africa

IN a recent issue of the *Missionary Herald* Ray E. Phillips, of Johannesburg, South Africa, begins a series of articles on "The Social Gospel and Interracial Relationships."

Mr. Phillips says that "the two outstanding factors that must be spoken of in any discussion of interracial matters as between these two great racial groups (black and white) are (1) the land problem and (2) the industrial situation in the big cities."

The writer tells us that the early white settlers of South Africa were land hungry, and that the whole land was eventually appropriated by the newcomers.

"And much of this land is not producing. There is no tax on land, and hence no inducement either to improve it or sell it. So there it lies in big holdings; tied up and much of it useless. This explains the fact that there is a land famine. For the large native population there is no land available for expansion. Although the natives constitute four-fifths of the population of the country, they own only one-thirteenth of the land, and they are now overflowing the meager allotments of past years. Thousands of natives of the younger generation are now finding themselves without land and faced with the choice between becoming serfs on white farms, or going to the big cities to work."

Mr. Phillips tells us that there is this difference between the black and white landless city dwellers: "While white men have the vote and are recognized a factor in South African politics, the natives are largely voteless and practically impotent politically. This means that political parties must provide for the whites even at the expense of the natives."

We quote the following:

"Second, there is no land which can be freed without serious trouble. A recent investigation by a Government Commission found no considerable areas free for occupancy by the blacks. White farmers stand solidly against any appropriation of good land for native settlement. Some scheme whereby natives can buy land in so-called "neutral zones" where either black or white may buy, but with safeguards to protect native interest, may relieve the situation. This is urged by certain thinking white men.

The recently enacted Color Bar Bill, which we have just mentioned, and which legislated natives out of employment in certain lines, makes the natives suspicious of the good faith of the present South African Government. They feel, and many thinking whites admit, that the segregation policy of the Government is dictated by fear—fear of the economic competition of the natives. And the natives, in their turn, are afraid that even though land is made available, and the line drawn about it, this line will not keep the white man from coming into their black territory if there is something in their area that the white man wants. A story reports an old native chief as saying to General Hertzog, the present Prime Minister, "Do you think, Sir, that you are better than God?"

"Why, no, certainly not," said General Hertzog.

"Well," said the chief, "God put a whole sea between you white men and us black men, and yet you white men crossed the ocean because there was wealth in the land of the black man. Do you think you can keep your white men from coming and taking possession of the black man's land merely by drawing a line down the country? Do you think you are better than God?"

Of course these conditions of grave injustice must cause deep resentment among the blacks, and Mr. Phillips says:

"They see themselves legislated against because of their skin color; they are embittered over the land situation, the low rates of wages existing in spite of increase of living costs; they rebel against the slum housing conditions in the big cities. They are becoming anxious and uneasy. It is not to be wondered at that there is a rapid growth of nationalist feeling quite comparable with that found in India and China."

Mr. Phillips sees the problem but he may not see the solution. But he would approach the problem in the spirit that will furnish the solution when he says in conclusion:

"What seems to be needed is a warm, Christian conscience on the part of the governing peoples; a sense of responsibility to God, and a sympathetic understanding of the other man, and of the fact that he, too, is a child of the same Father."

The children of the same Father are of course equally entitled to the Father's bounty.

A Pennsylvania Editor Speaks Out

ONE of the fundamental principles of civilization is that what a man earns is his own, and another is that he has a right to dispose of it, at his death, as he chooses. Those rights should hold for rich and poor alike. The cure for swollen fortunes, huge unearned incomes, is not in taxation after they have been accumulated, but in laws preventing their accumulation.

Two wrongs do not make a right. *Tax laws unsound in principle cannot be made permanently just by removing always recurring "inequities," by robbing Peter to pay Paul even though Peter be inordinately rich.* One basic principle of law is that it shall apply to all alike. We would not think, for instance, of enacting a law against murder with the provision that it should apply only to persons with a certain income, or of a certain creed or race. Yet we make tax laws frankly applying to certain classes, frankly exempting certain others. That means that somebody must decide who shall be taxed, who exempted, and therein lies the fatal weakness of that sort of taxation.

Henry George's plan presupposes that what a man earns or builds or acquires is his own, not subject to taxation. Land is the gift of God to all men, not to be "owned" outright by any man but to be held by the government subject to use by all men. For that use men would pay rentals, which rentals would be used for the support of government just as are taxes now. For years the land tax plan has been opposed by wealthy men, simply because large land owners opposed it when first advanced. These same wealthy men who now find the income and inheritance and other taxes exorbitant might profit greatly by studying Henry George's plan. By that plan they might have attained a just taxation fair to all alike. As it is we are rapidly becoming mired in a morass of always changing tax laws, of eternal political dickering and lobbying and trickery, seeking justice and equity in laws that are themselves fundamentally unjust and inequitable.

—Editorial—Warren (Pa.) *Evening Times*.

THE September-October number of LAND AND FREEDOM will contain full reports of the Henry George Congress in Chicago, September 10, 11 and 12.

Professor Beard and Henry George

IN the second volume of his fascinating history, "The Rise of American Civilization," Charles A. Beard writes:

"In spite of all this concern about the course of events in America during the gilded age, there appeared no social philosopher competent to survey society from top to bottom, plot the trajectory of plutocratic ascendancy, or interpret the sweep of things in the large. Of course, the socialists were active in obscure corners offering the gospel of Karl Marx in pamphlets and brochures, but they produced no critique of the capitalist procession in America worthy of more than a passing glance. Disgruntled populists, deprived of planting leadership and finding no clergymen or college professors to write for farmers as they had once written for slave owners, did nothing but pepper Mæcenas with bird shot.

"Perhaps the first approach to a critical diagnosis that made a rift in American complacency was Henry George's "Progress and Poverty," published in 1879, a trenchant volume drawing the deadly parallel of riches and misery, sun and shadow; proposing to apply to the complexities of the capitalist order a physiocratic doctrine of the eighteenth century in the form of a Single Tax designed to absorb unearned increment in land values and strike at the root of gross inequalities of wealth. By his vivid description of the carking desolation spread under the high noon of American prosperity and the assurance he displayed in prescribing a remedy, George sounded a new note in American criticism. Within a decade, he became famous at home and across the seas; radicals and trade unionists in New York tried to elect him mayor; owners of factories patronized him—he offered no disturbance to their economic operations. In England and Ireland he was hailed as a conquering hero, and, owing to the acuteness of their land problem, made a profound impression on current economic opinion. Through countless channels, George's ideas filtered out in varied types of American thought, helping to make the country at least dimly aware of the social question; but the Single Tax creed bore little fruit in legislation and gave no serious qualms to the managers of politics."

COMMENTS

Henry George did more than draw "the deadly parallel of riches and misery." He recast the science of political economy by working out the natural laws of the distribution of wealth. He destroyed the current academic theory of wages and capital. He amplified and extended Ricardo's law of rent. He dug to the root of the wealth distribution problem by proving that—

"The reason why, in spite of the increase of productive power, wages constantly tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living, is that, with increase in productive power, rent tends to even greater increase, thus producing a constant tendency to the forcing down of wages."

This was an achievement that called for attention in a history like Prof. Beard's.