

The Shoemaker To His Last

(Mr. Henry Ford's Solution of the Food Problem)

IN our food problems we have failed to realize that the solution lies in the increase of tool power on the land. . . . It remains for America to carry engine power to agriculture. . . .

"We shall get more food, not by bookkeeping and clerical regulation, but by the use of more and better machinery on the land."

HENRY FORD, in *American Machinist*, April 11, 1918.

Machines, Mr. Ford, will do a great many things, as you have already shown America; but they won't alter economic laws nor undo the effects of vicious fiscal legislation.

America already leads in agricultural machinery; and yet, of America's greatest city the head of the Bureau of Child Hygiene reported only a few weeks ago that over 80 per cent. of its school children are underfed. After a century of marvellous mechanical progress, and in the face of such an appalling social fact, are we still to put our hope of salvation in the machine?

The machine is efficient. That much may be conceded. But where do the products of its efficiency go?

The truth was told us more than thirty years ago by a great American economist:

"Without any increase in population, the progress of invention constantly tends to give a larger and larger proportion of the produce to the owners of land, and a smaller and smaller proportion to labor and capital."—"Progress and Poverty," Bk. IV, Chap. III.

Big Raid on Indian Reserves

ACCORDING to an announcement in the *New York Times* of May 9th, some enterprising landowners and Wall Street bankers have interested Secretary Lane in a scheme for utilizing in wheat growing some 200,000 acres of land in western Indian Reserves. It is put forward, of course, as a patriotic contribution to the urgent war problems of production. But at the same time it is admitted that "with no interest or taxes on the land, the prospects of a satisfactory profit from the venture were excellent." Furthermore, "it is proposed to keep labor costs down to the minimum by using tractors and other power machinery on a scale that would not be possible on a smaller tract."

All of which is very fine—patriotism plus profit. But why must such a promising enterprise be limited to the land of the poor Indian? Any of our eastern States has much larger White Reserves, nearer the consuming markets and absolutely unexploited in production. The patriotism that is interested in the better use of Indian Reserves could surely turn the idle white man's acres to public service. With a suitable re-adjustment of interest and tax charges, it might even be made a very profitable transaction, legitimately attractive to the higher type of

Wall Street finance. Besides being better patriotism, it would be bigger business.

Only an adulterated patriotism, blended with that "economic illiteracy" denounced by Mr. Vanderlip as our national vice, could have devised this raid on the Indian Reserves.

A Land and Labor Issue in South Africa—Its Parallel In the United States

THE question of Rhodesia, as we see from the cable service of the *Christian Science Monitor*, is at last up for public discussion in London before the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. The issues involve the respective claims of the native population, the white settlers, the British South African Company and the Imperial government. It is to be hoped that a decision will be reached in accordance with equity and the best traditions of British Colonial policy and judicature.

In the meantime, as land ownership and its economic effects are principally concerned in the case, we may recall with profit the interesting argument presented, in the early stages of the dispute, by Lord Delamere in defense of the expropriation of the lands held in common by the natives. Lord Delamere, owner of 150,000 acres of land, and interested in obtaining a supply of cheap labor, argued as follows:

"If the policy was to be continued that every native was to be a landholder of a sufficient area on which to establish himself, then the question of obtaining a satisfactory labor supply would never be settled.

"He considered the soundest policy would be to curtail the reserves, and although it might take a few years before the effect on the labor supply was apparent, the results would be permanent. In other words, as long as the native has free access to land, he is under no obligation to work for another for wages, and cannot be compelled to do so. Deprive him of that access, and the result would be permanent."

The words of Lord Delamere are illuminating, and should be pondered by the leaders of white labor in our own country, where vast areas of land are withheld from production in the greedy and sterile grasp of speculators. Labor leaders must know that color of skin has no influence upon the working of economic laws. The "permanent conditions" Lord Delamere argued for in Africa are thoroughly established and acclimatized here. And the victim is White Labor.

To this economic compulsion, the inevitable result of our defective land and fiscal system, is now added the lash direct of Compulsory Work Laws. In his appeal for economic compulsion of the negro, Lord Delamere also employed the argument that work was for the negro's good. Our State Governors, in applying the Compulsory Work Laws, declare themselves with equal earnestness to