

Now, as society becomes more complex all labor need not be applied directly to land to produce wealth. In fact, for the most efficient production of wealth, it becomes advisable to find new methods to make labor more productive. Inventions come into existence which render Labor a thousand times, yes ten thousand times more productive than otherwise would be the case. A machine is invented, for example, to drop seed into the ground enabling the farmer to plant one hundred acres where before he could plant only one acre.

First, the Wheelbarrow, then the Cart, then the Wagon, then the Railroad, then the Automobile, then the Aeroplane, were invented, enabling the man to carry himself and his products more speedily and more efficiently than before. Machines of all kinds are invented to enable the worker more efficiently to convert the raw cotton, silk and leather (Raw Material) into the finished products (Dresses, Suits, Shoes). The machine, in economics is termed "Capital."

In other words, Capital is that portion of wealth which, instead of being immediately consumed is set aside to assist in the production of more wealth. Capital is the creature of labor. It possesses certain characteristics. First: it can be produced in illimitable amounts. If we want more capital, all we have to do is to apply more labor to land.

Secondly: Like labor, capital must justify its existence. If the machine cannot help labor to produce more wealth than labor could produce without it, labor will dispense with the machine. Obviously, the farmer is not going to use a machine to plant seed if he can do it faster or better by hand. This is the same as saying that capital must find its reward in the increased wealth which it, in association with labor, has produced. To put it in other words, the wealth which labor assisted by capital has produced must now be divided between them, labor receiving wages and capital receiving interest.

The trouble is, that before these two factors can divide the wealth they have jointly produced, the landlord who has done nothing, comes along and takes his Economic Rent. The wealth, which labor and capital have produced must now be divided between three parties, although only two have had any part in its production. It must be clear that the bigger portion any one of the three, Labor, Capital or Land Lord takes, the less that there is left for the other two to divide between themselves.

Now, the land owner is constantly taking a bigger and bigger portion of wealth, due to the fact that Economic Rent is constantly rising as population increases.

Labor and Capital therefore having less to divide between themselves, take to fighting each other, (strikes and lockouts), instead of fighting their common enemy the Land Owner. As conclusive proof that the interests of labor and capital are not antagonistic as claimed by Shaw and Socialists generally, we find that wherever and whenever wages of labor are low the return of capital likewise is low.

True, capitalists are often land owners. That is, the same individual who owns a business of making silk dresses may own the land on which his factory stands, or other land, or shares of stock in a railroad or telephone corporation owning land or possessing an exclusive franchise.

To the extent that this individual is running a factory to manufacture silk dresses and hiring labor and buying machines, he is a Capitalist. To the extent that he owns the land on which the factory stands, or shares of stock in a corporation owning land or an exclusive franchise, he is a land owner. Only in his capacity as land owner is he reaping where he has not sown.

The same is true of labor. Very often, in the United States at least, the wage earner owns his little home and the lot on which it stands, or he holds one or two shares of stock in some public utility corporation, or is himself trying to speculate in a piece of vacant ground. So far as the ownership of the house is concerned he is also a capitalist; so far as the ownership of the lot on which the house stands is concerned he is a land owner.

Shaw's great mistake is in failing to distinguish between Capitalism and Land Lordism. In no other way can he be excused for such erroneous statements as the following:

"By Capitalism we mean the system by which the land of the country is in the hands, not of the Nation, but of private persons called Landlords, who can prevent anyone from living on it or using it except on their own terms." (Page 100).

"Capitalism therefore means the only duty of the Government is to maintain private property in Land and Capital." (Page 101).

Landowners "are quite justified in making the strongest laws to protect themselves against having their land intruded on and their crops taken by rascals who want to reap where they have not sown." (Page 125).

"Capitalists failed to find employment for not less than two million demobilized soldiers who had for four years been not only well fed and clothed but trained in the handling of weapons" (Page 147).

"By letting their (Capitalists) land and hiring out their spare money (Capital) to others." (Page 165).

"Similarly, when there is a difference between the business ability of one person and another, the price of that difference is rent." (Page 341).

"Privately appropriated rent, whether of land, capital or ability, makes bad blood." (Page 343).

If Shaw, as we contend, is in error in condemning Capital and Capitalism, instead of Monopoly and Landlordism and if the interests of capital and labor are not antagonistic, it ought to follow that when labor is receiving a low wage for its exertions, capital should be receiving a low return on its investment.

And such is indeed the case as I shall now show.

The biggest department store in New York City, R. H. Macy & Co., last year did a gross business of \$82,200,000. Its net profits were only \$5,800,000.

The total sales of the largest meat packers in the United States, Swift & Co., last year amounted to over \$925,000,000. The net earnings were \$12,200,000.

The American Telephone and Telegraph Company received revenues last year amounting to \$894,600,000. The net earnings were \$103,000,000 or at the rate of 6.4% of the amount invested in plant and other assets.

United States Steel Corporation did a business of \$1,310,000,000 and its net income was only \$105,000,000.

The Pennsylvania Railroad's operating revenues last year amounted to \$664,000,000, and the net income was \$68,000,000, and \$43,000,000 of this was dividends and interest from securities owned by the railroad. In other words, out of its own operating revenues the road earned only \$25,000,000.

Who will say that any of these corporations have not rendered services entitling them to the comparatively small reward they have received as above set forth.

Shaw has indeed labored, but he has not brought forth even a mouse.

—BENJAMIN W. BURGER.

THE MARRIAGE OF RELIGION AND ECONOMICS*

John Emery McLean, now a resident of the Single Tax colony of Fairhope, Alabama, and former editor of *Mind*, the famous *Arena*, and *The Metaphysical Magazine*, has given us a book in which he has endeavored to fuse the spirit of true religion with the precepts of the material science of economics. And of a truth they are intimately related. Until men realize how close is this relationship between the aspiration that strives for a real union with the beneficent ruling spirit of the universe and the laws governing mankind in relation to the earth they inhabit, civilization must fail to grasp the essential spirit of religion. Until we truly love our neighbor, and by reason of the impulse of that love build institutions for the securing of justice on earth, mankind must endeavor in vain to realize the perfect Kingdom that all religions prefigure.

*Spiritual Economics; A Plea for Christianity in Action. By John Emery McLean, 112 pages. Price, 75 cents, Post-paid. Henry George Foundation of America.

In clearer terms Mr. McLean says: "The dictum of God's Fatherhood cannot be disassociated from the brotherhood of man. And this concept of racial fraternalism cannot be realized while inequality of human rights is tolerated in any line of thought or action."

To bring this truth home to laymen and ministers of the gospel who deplore the decline of religious faith as well as all others who blindly grope for an answer to the contradictions presented by the doctrine of a divinely ordained universe of law on one hand and a social and economic system on the other in which everything is involved in cruelty, poverty and disorder, is the message of this work. The message is reinforced by abundant quotations from well known writers and publicists who see these contradictions and who seek, most of them in vain, for an explanation.

We shall not anticipate the pleasure awaiting the reader of this book by lengthy citations. We must content ourself with the following which is a summary, in a way, of the author's purpose in his appeal to religious teachers:

"I refuse to believe that the Church has abdicated its office as the center of moral authority, but I do contend that its power is waning by reason of its failure to cooperate with those reform elements of the community who have made a really scientific diagnosis of our social disease and who propose remedial measures that will bear analysis by even the clergy."

We think this work is bound to do much good and we bespeak for it a wide circulation. Its style is one of directness and simplicity. Mr. McLean is a practised writer and the clearness and lucidity of his English are the result of long experience in the art of putting his thoughts on paper. The reader will find no difficulty in following the arguments.

There is not much that is new to the man or woman who is conversant with our doctrines and their application, but it is not to this class of readers that the work is directed. It is intended for propaganda, and as such seems to us for those to whom it is addressed a singularly effective piece of literature.

The work appropriately concludes with a quotation from James R. Brown, president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club:

"Could any injustice be greater than the law that despoils one part of humanity of their rights to the face of the earth and the natural bounties stored under the earth. When society thus degrades and despoils industry, when it thus makes unemployment and brings want to the home, is it any wonder that men are driven to steal, and that women. . . ? So long as we continue this tremendous injustice we may rend heaven with our prayers, we may erect monumental cathedrals, we may spread our missions from Greenland's icy mountains to India's coral strand, but we cannot have the Kingdom of God."

—J. D. M.

LANDMARKS OF A LIFETIME

This is a belated review of a book which appeared many years ago, fourteen to be exact, but which has just been brought to our notice and which should have had more publicity at the time of its publication.

On June 23, 1827, just one hundred years ago, Dorcas Helen Hayden was born in Wyoming. She was later Mrs. Dorcas Helen Ingham, and mother of Lona Ingham Robinson.

Here are her collected poems, some written when she was eleven years of age and others when she was 85, a span of nearly seventy-five years! It is a volume of 276 pages, neatly bound, and printed by Luke North for Mrs. Lona Ingham Robinson in 1914.

We like these verses. They are instinct with a gentle philosophy, they are radical in their outlook upon life, and they are rhythmically well turned. Some are of suprising vigor of expression. There is a poem to Augustin Duganne, one of the poets of the middle century who saw the land question more clearly than it was seen by his more highly gifted contemporaries in poetry.

"And there was the cherished name
Of my girlhood's lyric poet."

she sings, and this poem to one who was among the world's rebels is

instinct with her love for Duganne and the themes that animated his song.

There are some fine verses to Tom L. Johnson which have lines of real distinction. There are verses to Tolstoy on his death which have a rhythmic swing and there is a poem to Henry George. From this last we quote one stanza as typical of the rest:

"For those who have followed his trend,
Have been to him brother and friend,
Who faithfully met at the end
The trust he had left to their keeping,
Not on one may his mantle fall,
But solemnly consecrate all;
As watchmen at midnight they call
To a land still sodden and sleeping."

There are poems on the Boer War and on our own little war in the Phillipines. Here are eight lines to Cronje when there was talk of exiling him to Saint Helena:

"There are those who deem it a shame
That loyal Cronje's humble name
Should stand by his whose olden fame
Rings through the world's arena.
Not till we try by truer test
Than surface thought has ever guessed
May we decide which honored best
The prison of Saint Helena."

In this book we move in an atmosphere of quiet culture and make the acquaintance of a fragrant and gentle personality. The poetry in the volume is not great poetry, but it is satisfying verse and will appeal by reason of its sanity, its simple faith in justice, its acceptance of the full gospel of freedom, and its music, which, though in a minor key, is grateful to the ear.

Mrs. Lona Ingham Robinson has a few copies of these poems of her mother which she will send for 75 cents, postpaid. Her address is 332 N. Maryland Avenue, Glendale, California.

—J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

GREAT STUFF!

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Let no man think that Los Angeles is not just as funny as any other city that is trying to stand on its head. Municipal life here is just one great big expensive joke after another. A few years ago we said: "Go to, now, let us build us a library." So the boosters boosted and the "owners" of the site shoved up the price until there was hardly enough to buy a few sticks of library furniture. A little later we said: "Again go to, let us build us a Hall of Justice," and the boosters boosted and the voters voted and the "owners" of the site shoved up the price and busted the budget. And a third time we said: "Go to now, let us build us a City Hall" and the boosters boosted and the voters and site "owners" all did their stuff (especially the site owners) inasmuch as our kids and their kids unto the third and fourth generation will pay taxes all their lives to the alleged owners for sites that their great-grand daddies owned already. Great stuff!

Los Angeles, Calif.

A. J. SAMMIS.

FARMERS AND LAND VALUATIONS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

It is true enough that wherever it is proposed to draw more fully by taxation upon the annual rental of lands farmers should be informed how changes may affect their interests, but they are entitled to more sensible, sound and practicable suggestions than those contained in the article "Let the Farmers Themselves Answer," printed in your May-June issue.

It is to me shocking that such an article was written by Professor Harry Gunnison Brown, a teacher of "economics" at a state university,