

**Books Recommended for the Student of
Economic and Political Science**

- PROGRESS AND POVERTY,
By Henry George (Unabridged)—cloth..... \$1.00
- PROTECTION OR FREE TRADE,
By Henry George (Unabridged)—cloth..... \$1.00
- SIGNIFICANT PARAGRAPHS FROM
"PROGRESS AND POVERTY",
By Henry George—cloth..... \$.50
- SPIRITUAL ECONOMICS,
By John Emery McLean—paper cover..... \$.75
- THEORY OF HUMAN PROGRESSION,
By Patrick Edward Dove (Abridged)—cloth \$1.00
Paper cover \$.50
- SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK,
By Joseph Dana Miller—cloth..... \$1.50
- WHAT IS THE SINGLE TAX,
By Louis F. Post—cloth..... \$.50
- BASIC FACTS OF ECONOMICS,
By Louis F. Post..... \$.50
- OUTLINE OF "PROGRESS and POVERTY" \$.10
- OUTLINE OF "THE LAND QUESTION"..... \$.10
- OUTLINE OF "PROTECTION AND
FREE TRADE" \$.10
- Order from Henry George Foundation Book De-
partment.

Free Pamphlet Literature Furnished upon Request.

ENROLL NOW AS A MEMBER

Contributing Membership, \$5.00; Affiliating Mem-
bership, \$1.00

HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

1309 Berger Building
Pittsburgh, Pa.

**A FREEMEN'S
CITIZENSHIP**

**Complete Democracy
to be Achieved**

* * *

BY

G. FRANK KELLY

* * *

*"Rent [ground rent] is a toll, not a payment for services. By it social values are transferred from social pools into private pockets, and it becomes the means of vast economic exploitation. * * * Rent is obviously a common resource. Differences in fertility and value of site must be equalised by rent, but it ought to go to common funds and be spent in the common interest."*

—Rt. Hon. J. Ramsay MacDonald,
British Prime Minister

G. Frank Kelly * * *

Published by the

**HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION
OF AMERICA**

1309 Berger Bldg.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

Price, 10 cents

10280

FOREWORD

A Freeman's Citizenship is an attempt to portray human society as it would develop under the salutary influence of the law of social progress—Association in Equality. Obviously there are those who will pronounce the vision of the author as extravagant, impractical. And it must be confessed that the institutions of the race as now developed inspire only despair. Nevertheless, when it is considered that practically every agency of education and information, whether press or pulpit or college or forum, is sounding the gospel of go-getting and sensual pleasure, there is great wonder that the mammon-worship of mankind is not more pronounced. The mere fact that there remains in the heart of man the upward look is an augury of the heights to which civilization would soar if social conditions were brought into harmony with right and justice. Mankind seems responsive to the call of truth. The elemental goodness of the race is ever in evidence. These are the attributes of mankind that fill the drooping heart with hope and banish the nightmare of despair that worries the world today.

The author's message contains both a hope and a promise: the hope of a deeper insight of the natural order for those who deplore the tendencies of the machine age; a promise that mass production of wealth will lighten the burden of toil—a reassurance that Socialized Rent will distribute the products of labor equitably, to each according to his deserts, and thus open the gateway to a commonwealth of freedom.

When this ideal democracy will be achieved is a question that rests entirely with the people. The purpose of this treatise is to stimulate thought concerning the great fundamental social and economic problems that confront us today and to point the simple way to their solution. When the people once understand the disastrous effects of permitting the earth, the natural inheritance of all mankind, to be monopolized by a few for private gain, and when they come to appreciate the great benefits that would flow from Socialized Rent (the socialization of land values), it will then be necessary only to use the ballot effectively to bring about such modification of the laws of the land as will establish true freedom, both political and economic.

HENRY GEORGE FOUNDATION OF AMERICA

O master, lords and rulers in all lands,
Is this the handiwork you give to God,
This monstrous thing distorted and soul-
quenched?
How will you ever straighten up this shape;
Touch it again with immortality;
Give back the upward looking and the light;
Rebuild in it the music and the dream;
Make right the immemorial infamies,
Perfidious wrong, immedicable woes?

—Edwin Markham

A Freeman's Citizenship

THE dream of the ages has been of peace—individual and social peace. The vision of the prophets of Israel was of a people dwelling "in a peaceable habitation, and in sure dwellings, and quiet resting places." The Messiah is known as the "Prince of Peace," at His coming the angels sang of "peace on earth," and as a parting message He said, "Peace I leave with you."

The purpose of the philosophers has been to discover the means of peace and happiness for mankind. Plato wrote the "Republic" and Sir Thomas More "Utopia," and many others have had similar visions. And what fun humanity has had at the expense of Utopian dreamers!

Four hundred years ago Machiavelli wrote "The Prince," wherein he lauded absolutism and absolved the ruler from any responsibility, save to strengthen and extend his sovereignty by every possible means, fair or foul. The sovereign could do no wrong. That was very practical and became the working formula of European governments. Meanwhile "Utopia," to the casual observer, was merely a book, "only a theory."

But was that all of Utopia? Despotism is now an anachronism, Machiavellianism is discredited and indulged in by governments only in secret, and the world has attained much of democracy and idealism. Practically every feature of modern social and political progress was foreshown in "Utopia."

With all their idealistic philosophy, neither Plato, nor More, nor any of the others offered any practical plan to attain their ideals. Their conception of Utopia was a sort of benevolent social relationship, a bearing and forbearing, all sacrificing their individual interests to society or to the state, even to the extent of communism. Such a consummation was generally regarded as contrary to nature and beyond the range of possibility, little progress was made in that direction. Utopianism has been viewed as purely visionary and Utopian dreamers have been ranked as fools.

In the latter half of the nineteenth century came Henry George, who in "Progress and Poverty" proposed a practical plan of realizing the dream of the poets, philosophers and prophets. Now, having tried war, hatred and slavery without profit, humanity is, as never before, dreaming of and looking for world peace. So, while "The Prince" has ruled the nations, his reign is almost finished through the permeating influence of

Utopianism which is coming instead, is even now at the threshold.

George will shatter old ideals. By his plan the necessity for communism or even alms will cease, and a man's greatest service to his fellows will be his individual development. The very pursuit of his highest selfish purposes will produce and conserve ideal social relations. He will serve best who profits (attains) most—economically, mentally and spiritually. Self-preservation is the first law of nature. When men learn that Utopia will best serve the purposes of the individual, they will be quick to adopt, cherish and perpetuate it, just as princes selfishly and avidly cling to Machiavellianism. Some one says: "The majority of men spoil their lives by an exaggerated altruism." When all men, humblest laborer, sweetest bard, noblest architect, profoundest scholar, are relieved of "the sordid necessity of living for others" and are free to the attainment individually of their highest purposes and possibilities, what contributions to the welfare of the race may not then be made?

Our Social Problems Economic

WITH economic freedom—with "Socialized Rent," which will establish economic freedom it will be easier for men than for birds to live, because they are more intelligent, and their willingness and capacity to work, mentally and physically, will then measure the extent to which they individually will satisfy their desires. Each will get that for which he works, and he that worketh not, neither shall he eat.

Some great souls attain freedom in spite of environment, and some, like Socrates and Bunyan, maintain it, though confined by prison walls or condemned to death. A slave with a love for religion or philosophy might dwell in greater freedom than the average devotee of modern business, be he employer or employee. It is through such men of vision, of spiritual power, so breaking through or rising above environment, and becoming beacon lights, that humanity is gradually guided into truth which makes men free. Such a man was Henry George, who in passionate love for humanity devoted his time in poverty—sometimes in hunger—to the accomplishment of his great work. Now one of the immortals, he and all the other great souls (many from humble stations) go marching on, with humanity slowly but surely following after, destined to reach the goal proclaimed by those gone before.

George saw that *our social ills are economic*. When a man's nose is on the grindstone, he has

but a narrow vision. But, by an equitable distribution of wealth, establish such economic conditions that for men to maintain a comfortable existence is easy, a mere incident, and man, whose desire for knowledge is insatiable and who is incurably religious, will follow after and attain to the higher things of life as never before.

George's plan for social redemption may be stated in five simple words, "TAKE GROUND-RENT FOR PUBLIC USE"—almost incredible because of its simplicity.

Socialized Rent

GROUND RENT, known to economists as economic rent, is what land is worth for use. So-called rent from buildings is not rent, but interest. Part of the ground rent, improperly called a tax, goes to the state, and the remainder goes to the owner as rent. Suppose a lot to be worth \$1,200 per annum. If the state takes \$200, the landlord retains \$1,000. If the state collects \$500, there remains but \$700 for the landlord; while if the state takes \$1,200 there is nothing left. And our proposal is that the state take this entire ground rent. The landlord cannot increase the rent to offset the charge by the state—the burden cannot be shifted. On this point all economists agree.

Land is a bounty of nature. Ground rent, that is, land value, is the creation of the community. *Note the distinction between land and land value, or rent.* Before the community arrives the land is valueless. Disperse the community and it again becomes valueless. Buildings and other improvements are the products of individual labor. The producer of anything is its rightful owner. To deprive the owner of anything by force is robbery. The community is the true owner of ground rent by right of production. Therefore, for individuals to take it, even though the statute law permits it, is robbery, to which government is a party.

Taxation Abolished

HENRY GEORGE proposed that all ground rent be taken for public use. He further proposed that this shall be the only source of public revenue. This is popularly known as "the Single Tax." In reality, it will not be a tax, but payment of rent to the community, its creator, for the use of the land, just as that rent is now divided between and paid to the state and landlords. The writer, therefore, prefers to use the term "*Socialized Rent*," meaning the appropriation of ground rent to social or public use. This term ac-

curately describes the objective. It must not, however, be confused with the movement known as Socialism.

Socialists include Socialized Rent as a factor in the social program. They, however, would establish "governmental control of economic activities" (Webster's Dictionary). The means and methods of production and distribution of wealth (business, labor and industry) would be regulated by law. George Bernard Shaw, as a socialist, says (though many socialists probably would not go so far): "You will be forcibly fed, clothed, lodged, taught and employed, whether you like it or not."

George teaches that Socialized Rent will establish "equality, or justice, or freedom—for these terms here mean the same thing, recognition of the moral law," and that *freedom, itself, will solve all social problems.*

Ground rent inevitably attaches to land whether it be occupied by owner or tenant. If the latter, paying \$1,000 a year ground rent in addition to the taxes, purchases the site for \$20,000, his rent is still \$1,000 a year (with money worth 5%), the interest on the purchase price, plus the amount of "tax" previously paid. The sale value of land is merely the capitalization of the annual rental income of the landlord. With Socialized Rent, land will be "owned" just as now, without disturbance of title or tenure—and without investment—by merely paying rent. *It is not proposed to socialize land but land values.* Ground rent, now paid to individuals, will go to the community. There will be no additional burden. Every man will own all the land he can profitably use; no one will want more, as there will be no speculation in land, no profit except from using it, and no incentive to hold it idle. There will be no unused land within the perimeter of population, while beyond that limitation land will be unowned and as free as air—a great public domain. Rural or remote areas will contribute little or nothing to the public revenue, while a million-dollar city lot will pay \$50,000 at say 5%, in addition to the "tax" now paid. Vacant land will be free to whomever wants it; but the owner must pay the ground rent or yield the land to him who will. He will have permanent title, subject to the right of eminent domain, just as at present.

As to the adequacy of ground rent to meet public needs, it is estimated that present annual ground rent values in the United States amount to \$12,000,000,000, exceeding all public expenditures—Federal, state and local—by at least 20%.

Some \$10,000,000,000 of ground rent now paid to individuals will go into the public treasury annually. Thus under the new order *there will be no taxes*. The only exceptions, if any, will be for restrictive purposes, as for example a tax on dogs or advertising signs to lessen their number. At present we tax homes and other desirable things, and thus actually lessen the number or quantity that may be produced; we confiscate wages by taking men's earnings for public use, and then allow individuals to appropriate the fund that should go into the public treasury. This accounts for the prevailing inequitable distribution of wealth and most of the current social and economic ills.

Scholars and Henry George

THE object of this dissertation is to forecast some social conditions that will prevail when Socialized Rent shall be the order of the day. Before proceeding further, however, let us see how eminent thinkers regard Henry George, the founder of the movement to socialize rent, and his philosophy. *Professor John Dewey* of Columbia University, recognized as the leading educator and social philosopher in America, if not in the world, in "An Appreciation of Henry George," says:

"His is one of the great names among the world's social philosophers. It would require less than the fingers of the two hands to enumerate those who from Plato down rank with him. No man, no graduate of a higher educational institution can consider himself an educated man in social thought unless he has some first-hand acquaintance with the theoretical contribution of this great American thinker."

Commerce and Finance, of New York, a high-class financial journal, some months ago said that Henry George's "Progress and Poverty" was the greatest book of the nineteenth century, and spoke of its greatness both as literature and as to its influence on current thought. Several million copies in English have been sold, and it has been translated into many foreign languages.

Tolstoy said:

"People do not argue with the teaching of Henry George; they simply do not understand it. Those who become acquainted with it cannot but agree. The teaching of George is irresistibly convincing in its simplicity and clearness."

Louis D. Brandeis, Associate Justice of the United States Supreme Court, says:

"I find it very difficult to disagree with the principles of Henry George. I believe in the taxation of land values only."

The "Federal Council Bulletin," official organ

of the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, recently said:

"No one unfamiliar with Henry George's views can claim to be abreast of social thinking."

Many heads of departments of sociology, economics, philosophy, history and kindred subjects (probably the majority) in our leading universities, many outstanding ministers, social workers and leaders in public life approve George's plan of Socialized Rent. Some, however, do not yet see that it will automatically abolish all taxes and make unnecessary the collection of public revenue from any other source, nor do all fully realize the great economic and social benefits that will flow from its adoption.

Justice Oliver Wendell Holmes is quoted as saying that he answered Henry George many years ago and thought that had settled the question, but that, with Professor Dewey approving, he would have to look into it again. With such endorsements, should not everybody, as the lawyers say, "be put on inquiry?" Investigate and you will agree with *Tolstoy* that the teaching of George is "irresistibly convincing," and with *Elbert Hubbard* that the "arguments are absolutely unanswerable."

Humanity Instinctively Decent

HENRY GEORGE'S thesis assumes that men's actions are principally the result of environment; that if you make people free, they will be virtuous, kind, generous, noble. Only by limitation of freedom, as under our present economic system, do they become immoral, cruel, avaricious, criminal. Moreover, public opinion, where freedom and equity prevail, will coerce men to accept the community code. Says he:

"Take a company of well-bred men and women dining together. There is no struggle for food, no attempt on the part of any one to get more than his neighbor; no attempt to gorge or carry off. On the contrary, each one is anxious to help his neighbor before he partakes himself—to offer to others the best rather than pick it out for himself; and should any one show the slightest disposition to prefer the gratification of his own appetite to that of the others, or in any way to act the pig or pilfer, the swift and heavy contempt and social ostracism would soon show how such conduct is reprobated by common opinion. * * * Yet it is no more natural that men should be greedy of food than that they should be greedy of wealth. They are greedy of food when they are not assured that there will be a fair and equal distribution which will give each enough. * * * An equitable distribution of wealth, that would exempt all from the fear of want, would destroy the greed of wealth, just as in polite society the greed of food has been destroyed."

We do not propose to change human nature but permit it, yea, compel it, to function at its

best, and not at its worst, as it does under our present system. Considering the universal inequitable distribution of wealth and the consequent pressure and suffering, the human race is much better and nobler than we would expect to find it, for even now millions of men lead lives of unselfish rectitude and self-sacrificing devotion to their ideals.

Imagine the condition of humanity with all pressure removed. With plenty for all there will be no incentive to greed, and he who manifests avarice will be ostracised as surely as one who now shows greed at the dinner table is ostracised from polite society. Social pressure (public opinion) will force men to be decent. I think, however, men *want* to be decent, and only need freedom to make them so.

Poverty Abolished

ALL the various and conflicting theories of philosophers and theologians about property have been based on the assumption that we always must have the rich and the poor, that poverty is in the natural order and inevitable and that the rich must succor the poor. Abolish poverty and these theories fall. Then the property owner (and all men will be owners of property) still will have his responsibilities, but these will be principally to cultivate and develop his personality. Then will a man know, what he instinctively feels, that what he produces is his—"What's mine's mine." There will be no alms to debase giver and receiver.

If the George thesis is correct, poverty will be abolished. Will Socialized Rent do this?

Did Robinson Crusoe suffer poverty? He was able to provide himself with food, shelter and clothing, and gradually was enabled to exist in comfort and somewhat in luxury. If some one else had "owned" the island, he could have compelled Crusoe to endure a mere existence by exacting from him as rent all his produce over and above that requirement, or he could have reduced him to slavery or starved him to death, just as Crusoe, owning the island, held Friday as a slave and could have starved him to death. Had a hundred Fridays come, there could have been no slavery if every man had asserted and maintained an equal right to the land, and no poverty so long as there was room on the island for each to earn a living in his own way.

Or suppose a newly-discovered placer mining area, of uniform richness and free to and with room for all workers. The average man produces,

say, \$10 a day; some more, some less, according to ability. A village arises. Every man's earnings and the job he takes are determined by what he can earn at mining or the desirability of some other job compared with that of mining. If he gets tired of running a store or driving a truck, or if his earnings are not satisfactory, he goes to mining. There is no poverty there except among the unfortunate or profligate. Even a widow and her children can wash a little gold, or the miners' clothes, for subsistence. Every man gets all he earns, and he that earns nothing gets nothing—an automatic equality, (equity) in the distribution of wealth, resulting from free access to land—the mine. If a landlord had controlled either Crusoe's island or the placer mines, and collected rent therefrom, the worker would have got but part of his earnings and the landlord what he did not earn—an inequitable distribution of wealth. This truth applies whether we consider one person or ten; the 120,000,000 inhabitants of the United States or the billion and a half in the world. Socialize rent wherever you will, and every man will be as free and independent as Robinson Crusoe on his lonely island, or a truck driver in the placer mining field. *Socialized Rent will abolish poverty by making land free, and thus making men free.* On the other hand, so long as ground rent is appropriated by individuals instead of society and men must buy land before they can "own" it, the mass of mankind is reduced to the lowest point at which it can exist and reproduce.

War—Its Cause and Remedy

WHAT will abolish war? Will or can the League of Nations, or any pacts or treaties that have been or may be made, or the preaching of brotherly love or religion, or even the practice of the Golden Rule, abolish war? If every man in the world were the most devout Christian or devotee of *any* form of religion, and adhered to his principles rigidly, war would not cease unless men knew what constituted equity and were sufficiently intelligent so to regulate affairs that men and nations should strive for and ultimately achieve equity. George Bernard Shaw rightly says: "Social problems cannot be solved by personal righteousness; and John Ruskin says: "For truly this healing is only by justice; no love, no faith, no hope will do it."

When we seek the cure of any ill we must first determine its cause. What is the actual cause of war? This in its last analysis can be answered in one short sentence: *The cause of war is the struggle for control of the natural resources of*

the earth—the same purpose for which individuals struggle. Thus war, poverty and almost all our misery, degradation and crime come from the same cause—the appropriation by individuals and nations of the exclusive use of those natural resources, all embodied in the word *land*, and the consequent taxing of the products of labor.

Wherever the things our Creator made are found, every man has an equal right of access to them, whether he live adjacent to them or at the antipodes. So long as Germans are deprived of equal rights to the mineral deposits of the Ruhr Valley, Alsace-Lorraine and Silesia, Germany will want to fight and eventually will fight. Russia will be ready to fight, so long as she is deprived of free access to the ocean, and the nations of the world will be jealous and resentful so long as Britain controls the seas, including the routes to the East, the Mediterranean, the Suez Canal and other routes of trade. America, too, will have her troubles if ever there be a question as to her ability to maintain by force her position in Panama. A newspaper quip recently said, "Nations aren't likely to beat their swords into plowshares while beating their rivals into oil fields." So it is throughout the world.

If, then, the primary cause of war is the struggle between nations for special privileges in land, may we not abolish war by the abolition of those privileges? *Socialized Rent will abolish war by destroying privilege and establishing equity.*

I have tried to glimpse the teachings of Henry George as to the cause of poverty and war and their cure and to show why those teachings are true. Beautiful as is his picture of conditions that will prevail when our great day shall come, I think he has not told half of the glorious truth.

Government

WHAT about government? Is it not true that government is responsible for most, if not all, of our economic and social ills?

No man was ever out of work, but that government made him so. If the unemployed landless man attempts to employ himself by tilling the soil, cutting timber, or mining minerals on vacant land, he is arrested, and all the power of government supports the landlord, though he is simply a dog in the manger. The vast and increasing army of unemployed is composed of victims from whom government has taken the opportunity of earning their bread in the sweat of their brows. Year by year, the ownership of land is concentrated in fewer hands, and owing to the

accelerating output of machinery, the number of men permitted to do the world's work is steadily decreasing. A remedy must be found.

If land were free the otherwise unemployed could at least exist on it; their earnings there would add to the demand for commodities, the production of which would turn the wheels of industry. Herein lies the cure for unemployment on the one hand and the maintenance of general and continuous prosperity on the other—putting some men to work gives employment to others, each to supply the needs of the others.

Free land is the natural order. We find it among all primitive peoples. Only by force and conquest is it monopolized. *All existing titles to land are merely a special privilege* established by force through government. Sir William Blackstone, whose "Commentaries" has been the principal text-book of law students in America and England for almost a hundred and fifty years, saw the wrong of the ownership of land in fee, and says, among other things, "There is no foundation in nature or natural law, why a set of words on parchment should convey the dominion of land." Henry George speaks of the "utter absurdity of the titles by which we permit to be gravely passed from John Doe to Richard Roe the right exclusively to possess the earth, giving absolute dominion as against all others." George strongly emphasizes the fact that "There is in nature no such thing as a fee simple in land; there is on earth no power which can rightfully make a grant of exclusive ownership in land." The Creator himself has given it to all people.

Genesis of the British Tax System

ORIGINALLY and for centuries there seems to have been no taxes in England. The tillers of the soil and laborers gave tribute (really paid ground rent) to the barons, the landlords, who in turn, for their rights to the land, contributed to the sovereign's need as required—again payment of ground rent. They paid as they went, and, notwithstanding a millennium of almost continuous warfare, there was no public debt until the seventeenth century. There should have been no barons. Every cultivator should have had his land direct from the crown (the community), and all the ground rent should have been devoted to public use under proper supervision. By this plan even the crown could not have profited by dominion over land, there would have been no incentive to conquest, and the centuries of war would have been avoided. There was a selfish and constant effort, however, on the part of the

barons to shift the burden to the producers, the tenants, and thus arose excise, customs and other burdensome taxes, for the relief of the landlords. The first customs duties were levied by James I. in the early part of the seventeenth century. By 1660 but 60% of the revenue came from the land; by 1775, 20%; by 1834, 2¼%; by 1886, less than one per cent., notwithstanding the constant increase in ground rent values, now all appropriated by the landlords—leaving them with almost no taxes to pay. In the United States, land pays about one-fifth to one-fourth of the public revenue, though it constitutes one-half of the "wealth" of the nation. It pays nothing to support the Federal government. The boasted progress toward British freedom has been largely a struggle on the part of the nobility for relief from the exactions of the crown, and each step in their relief has, as a rule, imposed heavier burdens on the common people. In the earlier days the man was attached to the manor legally; now with freedom to quit his employer, it is suicidal to do so. *The serfdom or slavery has but changed its form—then it was political; now it is economic.* From political slavery many were freed or escaped; from economic slavery there is no escape.

Origin of British Land Titles

NOT only were tax burdens thus laid on the people, but they were robbed of their rights in the land. Only within comparatively recent times have the people been deprived of the commons (land held in common) and the church lands, all having been acquired and "enclosed" by the aristocracy. About nine million acres, one-third of the arable area of England and Wales, were enclosed in the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

Speaking of the England of 500 years ago, a writer says: "These small tenants and laborers were serfs, subject to restrictions on their liberty, but all were landholders; they could not be dispossessed and the proportion of land on a manor which was allotted to the small tenants was constant. The manorial system had the effect of limiting competition among the workers and the idea of joint tenure of crown, lord and cultivator, each with definite duties and claims, had not given place to the modern conception of unconditional ownership of land."

Professor Thorold Rogers estimates that in the fifteenth and early half of the sixteenth century a peasant could provision his family for a year with fifteen weeks' work and an artisan

with ten. Conditions favorable to the workers were emphasized at this time as a result of the "black plague" which had swept away half the population of Britain, including whole baronial families. This gave natural law a chance to function. Freedom of the workers was increased and enlarged privileges to land resulted. Control of the serfs was largely lost—many for the time became practically freemen—a condition that was overcome only by the enforcement by the government of rigid restrictive laws. Here is a fine example of the beneficent effect of naturally free access to land, while subsequent British history shows the baneful effects of governmental interference with natural law by forcing the re-establishment of the lands in the hands of the privileged class and the return of the workers to serfdom. Those were called "the golden days," the days of "merie England," with plenty reigning and little or no poverty. Now the various sections of England report from five to forty-five per cent. of the population unemployed; millions are under-fed, under-clothed, under-housed; a million are kept alive by public doles, and men, women and children starve, while millions of acres are fenced in for pleasure purposes, virtually untaxed and kept unavailable for food production. So Britain, with enough land to feed herself, would starve within a few weeks if her outside food supply were cut off. *Would Englishmen starve if they had access to land? Would land be held idle if one hundred per cent. ground rent were taken by the public? Only such land as was used would be "owned" and it would be utilized to one hundred per cent. of its capacity.*

We have learned that *our land titles in fee simple are not sacred on account of their antiquity, nor are they respectable in their lineage.* They have resulted from constant oppression and robbery of the common people, from the time beyond which the memory of man runneth not to the contrary. The situation in England was accentuated, however, about the time of the discovery of America. A new and ambitious aristocracy, created from the tradesmen and lawyers, supplanted the old baronetcy in influence and power. These gradually deprived the masses of practically all their remaining rights in the land. Britain, however, owes her persistent and successful record to having been partly right at the beginning. Centuries of gradually increasing wrong have been required to overcome the comparatively good start.

America's Ominous Future

AMERICAN land titles are an inheritance from modern Britain. Today, in Britain or America, a man who "owns" no land has (notwithstanding the millions of idle acres—more than a billion in the United States alone) nowhere to lay his head, nor even to stand. He has a right on the highways, but only to keep moving. Thus we in America started with an unjust land system, acquired by the aristocracy of England only after centuries of strife with and oppression of the common people. *We started with "unconditional ownership of land."* It is certain that, had Britain had her present land system from the beginning, her greatness could not have been attained and she would long since have ceased to exist as a nation. She is now engaged in a life and death struggle, and her end is in sight unless she changes her land system. *Unless there comes a fundamental change in our land system, our national existence is threatened also.* We are now headed for the rocks on which both countries are sure to wreck, if they persist in their present courses. In that sad event, America will have but her brief past and her briefer future with which to embellish history's pages. The secret of America's prosperity has been her unowned (public) land. We have reached the point where practically all the land is "owned" and we have no way to absorb surplus labor—men out of jobs on account of the introduction of machinery or other reasons have nowhere to go. We have reached a condition of permanent unemployment which will be accentuated by further increase of population and use of labor-saving devices. The great issue now in British politics is the resumption of the land by the people by means of "land value taxation" (Socialized Rent). It will soon be the issue here, for conditions are similar in both countries except that land ownership is more widely diffused here than there. This makes little difference economically. The crux of the matter is that men must buy land to "own" it, whereas it should be free to use by paying rent to the public treasury.

And so our land laws, the chief source of our social ills, are enforced by government contrary to the laws of nature. The same was true of the laws sustaining feudalism and slavery. Think of the iniquity of a government's making and enforcing the "fugitive slave" law! The criminal was not the fugitive, neither was it any one of the brave and noble men who assisted in his escape, though the government punished as criminals these aiders and abettors of ~~crime~~. The real criminals were the government and those

freedom

who by its authority deprived men of their freedom. Chattel slavery has been abolished, but our laws still enable the few to deprive the many of "the possession of themselves," to make the many the practical property of the few." (Dr. Holland in "Property," McMillan & Co.) Government must and will be reduced to a minimum and so function as to impose no injustice on any man.

Charm of the Simple Life

MY boyhood was spent in a rural village of five hundred people in Western Pennsylvania. In the 1870's, every family in the village owned an unmortgaged home. We were surrounded by a rich agricultural settlement in which almost every farm was tilled by its owner and clear of fiscal encumbrances. Land was cheap and building material at hand; so each farmer was able to establish his sons on farms at marriage, though many of the sons and even the parents went West and settled on still cheaper land—public land at \$2 an acre. Much the same condition prevailed throughout the country. None were rich; yet there was almost no poverty. The blacksmith, the farmer, the village merchant and the country doctor were quite on a par socially and politically, and there was no great difference financially. Their sons and daughters intermarried. They enjoyed the condition that Henry George designates as the law of human progress—association in equality. Today, however, over 50% of American farms are either occupied by tenants or bear mortgages and men are compelled to leave the farms. It will not do to say that this is due to change or decadence in men; the reasons are economic. (Read Herbert Quick, "The Real Trouble with the Farmers.")

In our simple community no one locked the doors of his house or barn at night. Once when a horse was stolen it was not a nine-day but a nine-year wonder. Crime and poverty were extremely rare, and frequently the county papers would announce a total lack of inmates in the county jail, while about the only inmates of the "poor-house" were a few unfortunates and profligates, though there were more than 60,000 people in the county. Former President Coolidge, writing of his boyhood home in Vermont, says: "The neighborhood around the Notch was made up of people of exemplary habits. Their speech was clean and their lives above reproach. They had no mortgages on their farms. If any debts were contracted they were promptly paid. Credit was good and there was money in the savings bank." Such communities had little need of gov-

ernment. Locally about all it meant to them was the collection and disbursement of taxes for schools and roads. Of course, they were interested in national affairs, for then questions of preservation of the Union and of political freedom were still being worked out. Those were real issues; everybody voted, and for a citizen not to vote was little better than treason. No such issues have existed for forty years, and men vote or not as suits their convenience. Why should they vote? Why vote when there is nothing at issue but the possession of the offices? Alas, it has not been realized that *political freedom does not necessarily imply economic freedom!* Fortunately, men are coming to see that our boasted political freedom is an illusion and that democracy can not truly function until social and economic freedom is achieved.

How Population Should Extend

TO ascertain what social and political conditions may be expected to prevail under Socialized Rent we should visualize how a new community, for example Pittsburgh and its vicinity, would normally grow and develop.

The historic Pittsburgh, however, was not allowed to develop normally. Many large estates were established and much other vacant land was taken up, all held idle for speculation, so later comers were compelled to establish themselves on remote sites beyond these privately-owned, vacant areas, or prematurely to establish secondary outlying communities. Thus there were many times as much idle as used land within the perimeter of population and people lived remote from one another, to their great inconvenience and economic cost. In the rural areas much land was taken up and left idle in the same way, and the farms were widely scattered and far removed from the centers of population.

Assume Western Pennsylvania to be again a wilderness and try to visualize the growth of Pittsburgh under normal conditions maintained by a Socialized Rent regime. Our first arrivals settle contiguously, near the confluence of the rivers, each man taking as much land as he wants for use and paying rent for same to the community. Others arriving do the same, locating on the unoccupied free land adjacent to the first settlers. The settlement includes business, residence and farm areas. There is no desirable land idle within the perimeter of population. Later outlying villages, secondary centers, arise. Each community now grows concentrically and contiguously toward the others, each surrounded by

agricultural lands, and by unowned and unoccupied lands beyond the respective perimeters of population.

Growth continues; all intervening land is occupied; the municipalities become contiguous; the farmers are confined to areas surrounding the larger municipality; and again surrounding all will be areas of unused and unowned land extending to the perimeters of other communities. For example, between centers like Pittsburgh and Philadelphia, while there will be intervening minor centers, there will be vast areas of unowned vacant land. Beyond the perimeters of population in our ideal society, the land is free as air. In fact the last settler within the perimeter occupies his land without rent, and will pay rent only when the population extends beyond him and his land becomes more desirable as it ceases to be marginal. This is Ricardo's "law of rent," accepted by all economists—the least desirable piece of occupied land in any community has no rent value, but determines the rent value of every other piece. All other occupied land under the new system pays 100% ground rent to the community—the sole source of public revenue.

Economic Cost of Vacant Land

MEN naturally aim to live where it is to their social and economic advantage to live. But under present conditions land is held at speculative values (more than it is worth for present use) anticipating future increment. So the more desirable land lies idle and men are forced to content themselves with less desirable sites, both urban and rural, and we find in cities thousands of desirable sites unoccupied and the city boundaries extended at tremendous economic cost. There is said to be more usable vacant land than used land in any city in the United States. Farms are found in mountainous and other undesirable and remote areas, while millions of acres of the most fertile soil lies idle between the farmer and his market. Land, like eggs and all commodities, will not be used if held above its actual value. Economically, to try so to use it would be disastrous. It is evident, therefore, that the low production from inferior lands and remoteness from market are mighty factors in the cost of living. The "restless pioneer" will disappear, for he will always have at hand what has always been his goal, free land. He will settle at the perimeter of population. In Virginia, Lord Fairfax alone owned 5,000,000 acres, one-fifth the area of the State. There were many large estates, Washington having 53,000 acres, and so men like Daniel Boone and Thomas Marshall.

father of Chief Justice John Marshall, went into Kentucky searching for land also to build estates. If farm lands were contiguous, millions of dollars would be saved in road building and transportation. The same waste is experienced in our distended municipalities.

When Land Monopoly Is Abolished

UNDER Socialized Rent, production will be contiguous to consumption, and only the most productive and best located lands will be used. This principle applies not only to urban and agricultural lands, but to manufacturing and mining, and to sites for all other forms of production. Only the best sites will be chosen, and only the most desirable mineral deposits as to location and quality will be worked. No such thing as a "coal situation" or a "farm situation" can arise. All our mountain lands and other outlying and less desirable tracts will be a great public domain—mostly covered with forest; all a free resort for the hunter, fisherman, nature-lover and pleasure-seeker.

Rent being socialized, with the present population, it is safe to say that two-thirds or more of the land will be such a domain. In fact that proportion is now idle. The trouble is, the idle land now is privately owned and held for speculation, meanwhile being denuded, for private gain, of its forests, minerals and every valuable thing (the heritage of the race but taken by individuals) that can be moved. Scientific forestry will maintain and furnish an inexhaustible supply of timber, while coal and other natural resources will be handled in the same way, all probably by private enterprise under properly regulated leases with royalties (rentals) payable to the community instead of to individuals. Thus manufacturers and other consumers will not invest private capital in natural resources for future use. They will be available when needed at their actual value on a royalty basis. No one will be able to "hold them up." There will be no need for a bond issue for the purchase of forest lands, as is the case now in Pennsylvania. For that matter, with Socialized Rent there will be no public bond issues; nor any public debt: "pay as you go" will be the rule. No public improvement will be made that does not add an amount at least equivalent to its full cost to land values, and the owners of the benefited lands will pay the bill.

Perpetual Prosperity

THE total taxes in the United States, excluding "taxes" on land, may be estimated at \$70 per capita. Most of this is a direct charge against

the consumer, being added to the cost of commodities. Moreover, there is a tremendous additional cost to the consumer in the profit on the tax added by the producer and middleman. Thus \$300 to each family (\$8,000,000,000 total) is below the actual annual burden of taxation in America. Under Socialized Rent most of this will be available for commodity purchases and the saving on account of contiguity of producer to consumer, the expenditure of labor on only the most productive lands, the increased earnings arising from steady employment—all these will add other billions to America's purchasing power. With the savings and economies that will follow, it is safe to say that this increase of purchasing power will be fully 100%. What an impetus to business this will create! Under such conditions prosperity will be constant and limited only by men's capacity for and willingness to work. Each community will be self-supporting and self-contained, except as to articles to the production of which a community might not be adapted. There will be no conflict of interest between communities and there will, of course, be absolute freedom of trade. The function of government will be greatly curtailed. When there shall be perfect freedom and all shall have plenty and none shall know fear, man's better nature will assert itself and enlargement of souls instead of fortunes will be our chief objective.

Patrick Edward Dove, in "The Theory of Human Progression," defines a crime as "a breach of equity," and says: "Consequently, we maintain that whatever is not a breach of equity is not a crime and under no circumstances whatever ought to be prohibited or restricted by law. * * * Absolute freedom, then, to perform every function that is not a breach of equity constitutes the great final termination of political progress so far as liberty is concerned. * * * By a free country, we mean a country in which every man has a legal right to do everything that is not naturally a crime. * * * Such actions and such actions alone is the government of a country competent to prohibit and to class as crimes." The crime, Dove shows, may be on the part of the legislators, as when laws are passed creating and maintaining slavery, private ownership of land values (ground rent) or restrictions upon trade.

In our future community the objective will be freedom. There will be no laws to interfere with or restrict or regulate men's personal affairs or activities so long as they involve no breach of equity. There will be no laws to regulate trade, commerce or employment or what we

shall eat or what we shall drink or wherewithal we shall be clothed.

General education and the development of character will be the main cultural objectives. With every family possessed of ample income, no child's education will be neglected. The state having a minimum of authority and a condition having arisen wherein all will be properly prepared for life, the community probably will not feel any necessity or responsibility for public education. There will be no compulsory school laws and probably no public schools. On the other hand, the parents, being in position to provide for the education of their children, will be free to determine where and how they will educate them with a view to perpetuating their own ideals.

Human Versus Natural Law

IN the new order there will be few laws. The work of the courts will be negligible. All having plenty and the emphasis being on other things than wealth, few will desire to rob their neighbors and even fewer will face the contempt of their fellows by undertaking to do so. It is mainly the *fear of want* that impels men to such action now. Jesus knew psychology when he said, in effect, if any man wrong you and will not make restitution, "tell it unto the church, but if he neglect to hear the church let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican." Public opinion is the great motivating force that determines conduct. It is irresistible. It gets what it demands or tolerates. It will compel men to do right when right is done by them.

The trouble has been that, with an economic system basically immoral, the individual has met charges against him with the truthful response, "I am as good as the rest of you." To this there is no reply. He could as truthfully say, "I am as good as my government," for when government permits private appropriation of ground rent and takes by force a citizen's earnings for public purposes, it is no less guilty of crime than he who robs on the highway. With men thus wronged, the wonder is, not that there is so much crime, but that there is not more. If men are robbed by society they will retaliate. As they learn to understand the wrongs from which they suffer, crime will increase till equity is established.

In More's "Utopia" a citizen began to "diligently and earnestly praise that strait and rigorous justice, which at that time was then executed upon felons, who, he said were for the most part twenty hanged together on one gallows. And, see-

ing so few escaped punishment, he could not choose but wonder and marvel, that thieves nevertheless were in every place so rife and rank." To which Hythloday responded, "Simple theft is not so great an offense that it ought to be punished by death. Neither is there any punishment so horrible that it can keep men from stealing, which have no other craft whereby to get a living. Much rather provision should have been made that there were some means whereby they might get their living so that no man should be driven to this extreme necessity, first to steal and then to die."

Our system forces men to crime, as Jean Valjean was forced to steal bread for his starving family. Most so-called criminals would be respected citizens but for the pressure of economic injustice imposed on them by law. It is the application of "the third degree," and some succumb. Of course, it is through ignorance that society so acts, but the highwayman is only doing as he and all of us are being done by, by society. In the new order, every man having received justice, a righteous society will demand and receive from each justice in return. *The community will establish and enforce its codes, and woe to him who violates them.*

In the new order the slogan will be not the greatest good to the greatest number, but the greatest possible good to the individual through his own efforts; and thus will be attained the greatest good for all—a maximum of individualism. In Hamlet, Polonius says, "This above all: To thine own self be true, and it must follow as night the day, thou canst not then be false to any man." Socialized Rent will produce the relationships of peace and equity visioned by Marx, which neither Socialism nor any other system that proposes to control men by law can do.

Henrik Ibsen tells us that never will democracy be satisfactory until we "shall make every man a nobleman." Universally the distinguishing characteristic of the nobility is ownership of land. Make every man therefore a landowner by socializing rent, and politically Ibsen's ideal will be achieved and a practically universal moral and spiritual nobility will result.

Honesty in Public Affairs

HAVING seen that in the new order government will be reduced to its natural minimum, it behooves us to inquire what community functions there will be. Almost 100% of them will be the collection and disbursement of ground rent for public use. Government's only other

function will be the prevention and punishment of crime (breaches of equity), and these will be reduced almost to the vanishing point. Men will be as unconscious of government as they are of their normal physical organs.

Why is graft in the expenditure of public funds so prevalent? Why are the grafters, instead of being turned out by an indignant constituency, usually continued in positions of honor? Is it not because all are grafters or potential grafters? Men seek favors in assessments; they evade proper tax returns; they take every advantage in income-tax matters short of perjury, and many do not stop even at that. When funds are to be expended they pull every string to have them applied where it will be to their personal advantage; they vote for inferior men for selfish reasons, and use their influence for personal gain or preferment at public expense; bribery is rampant. When the other fellow "beats them to it" they merely think he is "in luck," shut their eyes and bide their time. Since all are alike, how can there be righteous indignation when a corrupt city administration is exposed? All this demoralization grows out of our inequitable and immoral economic system.

Establish equity, and community morale will be established and graft will disappear. The same conditions that will make men honest in business will produce honesty and efficiency in public affairs and decency in citizenship. Public revenue having been equitably provided, with no special favors possible, public sentiment will compel its proper expenditure. So with ground rent aggregating some billions more annually than the present current expenses of government, the saving of other billions by abolishing graft and establishing efficiency in administration, and with nothing spent for war or charity, there will be several times as much for the public welfare as there is now and not one cent of it will be a tax on any man's wages or a burden upon industry.

We will have bureaus galore, with laboratories and research organizations gathering and giving to the public every kind of information, but only for suggestion and helpfulness and unaccompanied by authority. Every community will have highways, hospitals, welfare institutions, museums, libraries, art galleries, community centers, parks, playgrounds and a hundred other things for the benefit and enjoyment of all. Our modern charity and welfare work will be unnecessary and unknown. There will be no community "drives" nor "chests" and no endowment of institutions by individuals; no subsidized uni-

versities or pulpits. Public funds derived from ground rent will take care of every community requirement. Perhaps for educational purposes we will build great structures in which kindred spirits, at their own or maybe at public expense (since funds will be ample), will maintain separate schools to perpetuate their respective ideals. No harm can come from allowing every man to have his own creed, as he will be merely an individual and can interfere with no one else. Race hatred and religious bigotry will disappear.

There will be no tariff laws and no restrictions on immigration. As every man will be assured of steady employment and his income will depend on his individual effort and productivity, he will have no reason to fear competition from his fellow-workmen. The only competition will be between employers (the shop) and the land, just as in the placer mining camp. Equal efforts will produce equal results wherever applied, except that (as men are influenced by their preference) more or less wages will be demanded according to the desirability of the work—again as in the placer mining camp. There will be a perfect fluidity or mobility of labor. Men in disagreeable or undesirable jobs will demand higher wages or, as in Bellamy's "Looking Backward," shorter hours. The employer's ideal of "running my business to suit myself" will be realized, and labor will work for him or not as it pleases. There will be no strikes. The idle poor and the idle rich, *nolens volens*, will go to work. There will be no underpaid labor. Employment will be available all the time for every man at maximum wages—all the individual earns. The true (economic) wage is a matter of equity, not of sentiment, benevolence or negotiation. Not the Golden Rule, but the iron rule of justice must be our guide. Most of the talk of the Golden Rule in business is "bunk." First, be just and then you may be generous. Under Socialized Rent, the true wage of every individual will be automatically determined and paid.

In short, we will reinstate the simple life of our fathers (association in equality), with all the advantages of modern invention and material progress. Instead of contributing to enrich only those who own the land, the benefits of labor-saving machinery will be distributed equitably among all the people, to each according to his contribution to production. Every labor-saving invention will reduce the cost of commodities and increase the reward of labor. At present the opposite is true, due to the fact that every improvement but increases land values, and this unearned increment goes to land owners instead of the public, its rightful owner.

Wages

OFFICIAL reports place the total earnings in the United States for 1927 at \$90,000,000,000—\$750 for each man, woman and child, or over \$3,000 for every family. Under our new order this sum will be enormously increased and distribution will be equitable. Moreover, the cost of commodities, as we have seen, will be greatly lowered by the reduced cost of production and distribution. Probably no income (assuming, of course, reasonable industry) will be less than several thousand dollars per annum, with purchasing power perhaps doubled. Some men, with great executive ability and power to serve, may actually earn ten or one hundred times the average wage. Every man's wage will be the exact product of his physical and mental effort, just as the product of Crusoe's efforts on his lonely island were *his* wage. It will be determined by what he can earn at any other job—eventually what he can earn, self-employed, on land. Otherwise the worker will quit his job and find employment elsewhere. Every dollar thus earned will accrue to the earner, just as to Crusoe, and will be sacredly his. Not a dollar will be taken even for taxes.

If the employer, the entrepreneur, without special privilege or advantage, but with executive ability, shall so organize and direct a group of men that after paying each employee his true wage and deducting the earnings of capital, there shall remain a surplus, large or small, that surplus, usually called profit, will be his wage; his brain and brawn will have created what otherwise would not have been. Since both employee and capital will have received full pay, the equivalent of their respective shares in production, they are not entitled to more; and as no one else but the entrepreneur has been a factor in production, no one but he can lay claim to the surplus. It is his because he has earned it. He has made no "profit" at the expense of any man.

Under our system, probably no large fortune has been, will be, or can be acquired honestly. We make no attempt to discover a true wage. The man at the gate looking for a job determines the wage of every man inside, though the man at work may be producing a "profit" to his employer equal to or greater than the amount found in his pay envelope. This was illustrated during the war, when, notwithstanding unprecedentedly high wages, the daily profits of the entrepreneur were frequently greater than his entire payroll, plus reasonable compensation for

capital. We think no one will assert that that "profit" was an earned wage. Now, when "big business" is making unprecedented "profits," "wages" are declining because of competition between men thrown out of employment by the use of machinery. The true (economic) wage is what the worker produces.

Because of lack of free access to land, competition between laborers determines their "wage," which thus, as economists express it, tends to a minimum, to the margin of subsistence. Thus the worker gets but part of his wage. The honest employer is doubly prevented from paying honest wages—the true wage cannot be determined and he can afford to pay only what others pay. Political economists, until George, had never even suggested a theory by which this inequity (iniquity) might be overcome. Under Socialized Rent the true wage will be naturally determined and paid.

Neither is there any effort made, nor means available to determine the true earnings of capital. The mortality rate in business undertakings indicates that capital suffers alike with labor. All returns from industry go to wages, interest and rent. When rent is high, wages and interest are low, and vice versa. Under Socialized Rent capital and labor will fare alike—each will get its true economic return.

Orthodox economists attempt to distinguish between the wages and the "pure profits" of the entrepreneur. In the economy of the universe there is no such thing as profit. What is earned is wages and what is acquired otherwise is robbery, and under unjust laws government is a party to the robbery.

The Function of Capital

JUST a word about capital. Capital is that portion of wealth used to produce more wealth—such as tools, machinery, industrial and commercial establishments and stocks of merchandise. Capital is stored up wages. If I build a house, make a tool or machine or other product and allow another to use it, he takes my wages, just as though he took my pay envelope, and in equity must pay me for that use. If I save and lend my wage to another that he may produce by its use, the principle remains the same—interest is as natural and necessary as wages, and without it capital would not be available. Capital per se is always beneficent. No injustice can arise from its proper use. Any evil it may seem to have arises from our unnatural and baneful economic system—from our land laws.

Think of the comforts and luxuries available to every family from such increase of income and lowered cost of living as have been depicted! Every family may and, I think, will own its own home, with ample lawn and garden, piano, automobile, radio, electrical machinery and equipment, library, works of art and a hundred other contemporary devices for convenience, pleasure and culture, and have ample time to pursue and enjoy these things—and no tax collector. Think of the employment of laborers, artisans and artists to supply these needs!

Early marriages and fine families with ideal parenthood will prevail, careers for women will be few and careers of both men and women will be incidental to the leading of splendid lives. There will be neither military careers nor "heroes," and, therefore, no soldier's pensions, but ample funds for disability and old age pensions if needed. There will be no woman or child labor as we know it. We will live the simple life, in sweet domesticity. Men will vie with one another, not in striving for wealth and position, but in seeking culture and the enjoyment of their manifold advantages and blessings. Recreation will be a primary consideration, and all men will have their avocations as well as their vocations.

The practice of thrift and the necessity for life insurance will be negligible. Necessary for comfort as the accumulation of wealth now is, like our whole present system, it is unnatural; hence few achieve it. Of those who gain wealth, it is said, 90% lose it. Of 100 men at death, 82 leave no estate. One leaves wealth and two comfort. Fifteen leave indifferent amounts. If the end of man is to gain and leave wealth the race is a most abject failure. While there will be ample income for all men, there is not enough wealth in the world and enough cannot be produced for every man to accumulate and bequeath a fortune. If some acquire great wealth, others are prevented. The 10% of the people who possess 90% of the wealth of the United States make it impossible for the millions to have even a stake in the country. How does that affect citizenship?

We speak with pride of America as the land of opportunity, and so, in a sense, it is; but the success of the few is accompanied by the suffering of the many. To quote Ruskin again, "The power of becoming rich is the art of establishing the maximum of inequality in our own favor"—in other words, loading the dice. These strictures of course do not apply to wealth actually produced and conserved by its owner, but only to the unjust distribution of wealth, inevitable under our system.

It is proposed to establish an economic order where every sane and sound individual, old or young, always shall be in a position to earn an adequate income. Then hoarding will be foolishness.

In the new order, the modern "practical" man will be out of the picture, and most of Ben Franklin's maxims will be relegated to limbo. Men will have time to think and will not be called fools though they dream dreams and see visions.

Success in anything requires proper theories on which to proceed. In no place is this more true than in working out the social and economic problems of mankind. These are the most vital problems of the present day and should have the thoughtful attention of every individual.

Further Study Urged

THIS thesis is framed and expressed in the indicative mood, future tense—a prophecy, if you please. How do we know these things are to be? They are the logic of the centuries. Study the evolution of freedom from the time of the ancients, when war and conquest were the order of the day and to conquer a nation was to reduce it to slavery. Follow down through chattel slavery and feudalism to political freedom (equality before the law, equal rights to public office, universal suffrage). From this study you will see that the next and (it would seem) final stage in social evolution will be to step into economic freedom by socializing rent. As an aid to this study read Dove's "The Theory of Human Progression" and Oppenheimer's "The State." Dove leads into a condition of "non-interference," and Oppenheimer to "a freemen's citizenship," each author, by overwhelming logic, arriving at the same conclusion by different processes of reasoning. "In a freemen's citizenship," says Oppenheimer, "there will be no 'state' but only 'society'." That will be Utopia. Freedom will be man's ultimate social and political attainment. When we attain freedom indeed, then all that will remain will be to develop the individual life. Unhampered by carking care, to what may we not then attain? Above all, study Henry George. The mistake of the philosophers from Plato to Karl Marx has been the assumption that men need to be governed. It remained for George to discover that they need only to be free.

George Blazes the Trail

ORTHODOX political economy, "the dismal science," tells us of the niggardliness of nature, that population outruns subsistence, that

wages tend to the lowest point requisite to existence and racial reproduction; that poverty and all its resultant ills are inevitable; that a mere existence requires a constant struggle; that disease, pestilence, famine and war are natural means to maintain the economic balance—necessary to the ultimate persistence and development of the race. Philosophers and poets, accepting the theories of the economists, have attempted to reconcile the eternal laws of truth with results arising from unsound economic practices. They tell us that "man was made to mourn," that "whatever is right," even that evil is good, being the means by which mother nature or a beneficent God gradually works out the destiny of the race—the survival of the fittest. Thus men lose faith in God, or, in the consolation of religion, endure the things of this world, and "desire a better country, that is a heavenly" as the only hope of a surcease from suffering. Would not God be ashamed to be called our God if he were responsible for the mess man has been making of what, but for the violation of natural law, would be a social paradise on earth? Until Henry George it seems the philosophers failed to question those theories and to link together as in any way related the sufferings of humanity and the prevailing economic practices. George shows the untenable position of both philosophers and economists and that the relationships in question are those of cause and effect, that morals and economics are interdependent. Now science is telling us that existence is not a struggle (a survival of the fittest), but a beautiful harmony, that nature automatically controls the volume of life, including population. Soon the philosophers will overtake the scientists, at last catching up with George, who in "Progress and Poverty" exploded the Malthusian theory fifty years ago. Professor Dewey says, "It is through fusion of insight into actual facts and forces, with recognition of their bearing upon what makes human life worth living, that constitutes Henry George one of the world's great social philosophers."

George's disciples pray that social justice shall come peaceably through intelligence before men shall resort to violence, otherwise inevitable.

May Not Be the Final Step

WE have spoken of the freedom to result from Socialized Rent as the "final stage in man's social evolution." Whether or not it shall be final we know it will be the greatest social stride ever taken. When we shall have reached that eminence, who can tell what then may yet lie beyond? Oscar Wilde has beautifully said:

"The map of the world that does not include Utopia, is not worth glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which humanity is always landing. And when humanity lands there, it looks out, and seeing a better country, sets sail again. Progress is the realization of Utopias."

Our Utopia will be, not "Nowhere" as the word signifies, but here about us, with "peace on earth among men of good will." Based and projected on the eternal laws of justice and truth, the coming and persistence of the new Utopia are as sure as that man shall continue to inhabit the earth.