

mine, the Sahara Desert and Labrador will not become fertile within the next generation. The habitable and wealth-producing areas of the world will steadily become more crowded."

Were not the printed page before me, I should find it incredible that any man with sufficient intelligence to hold a professorate in any university, even that headed by the noted reactionary, Nicholas Murray Butler, could be so ignorant or so audacious as to assert or imply that the only unused land of the world is inaccessible or barren, and that the barrier to natural opportunity has already been reached or must be reached in the near future. Does not Professor Sneed know that with the immense and matchless resources of our great land, the density of population is barely one-tenth that of Germany and about one-twentieth that of Belgium under pre-war conditions? Does he not realize that even on Manhattan Island, the most congested spot in America, 8 per cent. of the lots are still totally unimproved, with mere nominal and unimportant improvements on a much larger percentage? Has he never heard of the measureless tracts of the best land of the nation deliberately kept in idleness by the privileged few who are suffered to monopolize it? Is he so ignorant of elementary economics as to be unable to realize that society has the power to set free these countless acres by destroying the profit in land monopoly, and that the measure to be taken is of the simplest, consisting solely in the reclamation by society of the value which attaches to the land as the direct result of social service? And if this man was in very truth so amazingly ill-informed regarding that which it behooved him to know, what shall be said of his auditors, the cream of American sociologists, who sat calmly listening, and not one of whom in the subsequent criticism uttered a word of correction or protest?

To those to whom democracy is something more than a word to conjure with or a toy for idle moments, the fiasco at the meeting of the American Sociological Society forms a subject for painful reflection. If the intellectual leaders of the nation have so purblind a vision of what is most essential, what may be hoped for from the rank and file? If there is solace, it is only to be found in the fact that the academic mind, despite its superior pretensions, is not infrequently found to lag behind the more direct perception of common men and women, who have not entangled themselves in a maze of subtle analyses and distinctions. Our college sociologists have done valuable work in their special field; but in the application of their own principles they have failed to take their expected positions in the van. Like the man who could not see the forest on account of the trees, they cannot see society or its actual needs on account of social theories. The real battle for a progressive democracy must be fought with little help on their part, although they have furnished many of the weapons which others will wield with crushing effect.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

The Schoolmaster Abroad

THERE is a general agreement as to something being desperately wrong in our social system. This is clear to all thoughtful men. The single fact that notwithstanding continuous progress in wealth-producing power there is no corresponding increase in general comfort; that the actual result is the raising of some to unreasonable riches and the depression of others into ever deepening poverty, condemns the system.

But the Schoolmaster of the day is nonplused to account for this phenomenon and, as a consequence, utterly at a loss to suggest a remedy for it. The mournful conclusion of the political economic system seems to be that it is the result of a mysterious dispensation of divine Providence.

Malthus, who combined in himself the office of Political Economist and reverend clergyman, put forth the explanation that "population tends to outrun sustenance." This as the statement of a natural law, has been accepted and incorporated in the Science of Political Economy as taught since his day.

In Thomas Carlyle there arose a thinker who named such a science "dismal," as well he might. In his picturesque style he says, "Of all the quacks that ever quacked (boasting themselves to be somebody) in any age of the world, the political economists are, for their intrinsic size, the loudest. Mercy on us, what a quack-quacking, and their egg, even if not a wind one, is of value simply one half-penny." But Carlyle himself groped in the dark, though from time to time a momentary glimpse of the truth flashed on his mind. "A man with £200,000 a year," he writes, "eats the whole fruit of 6,666 men's labor through the year, for you can get a stout spadesman to work and maintain himself for the sum of £30. Thus we have private individuals whose wages are equal to the wages of seven or eight thousands of others individual. What do these highly beneficial individuals do for their wages? Kill partridges! Can this last? No, by the soul that is in man, it cannot and will not and shall not!" But all the same, good Thomas, it can and will and does, down to this much later moment. How is it that Carlyle remained so strangely blind to the fact before his eyes that it was the system of land monopoly itself that was the secret of the trouble, and not the circumstance that landlords personally were frivolous people who were fond of idle pleasures.

Then there was Froude, another of our modern schoolmasters. "The fact," says he, "that under our present social conditions every additional child is a curse rather than a blessing to poor parents, is one which still waits for elucidation." He, too, failed to see that the spoliation involved in the landlord system was the simple and sufficient elucidation. It also accounts for the fact that Canada is fast ceasing to be what it was not long ago—the haven of the poor emigrant. The conditions here are rapidly approaching those of Europe, because we have the same basic cause at work.

As with Carlyle and Froude, so with Ruskin, and all the other schoolmasters of our era—a clear recognition of the terrifying problem; a matchless eloquence in the depicting of the conditions, and utter helplessness when it comes to the suggesting of a remedy.

Henry George was the first of the modern schoolmasters to grasp firmly and set forth clearly the explanation of the great paradox of Poverty keeping pace with Progress; and what is still better, he was the first to present the simple, natural and practicable method whereby these evil conditions can be rectified; the proposal, namely, that land values shall no longer be allowed to remain the property of those who own the land, but shall be rendered up to the people as the just equivalent for the privilege that land-holders enjoy.

But it is not because this would involve a vast improvement in our system of taxation that the disciples of Henry George are filled with unquenchable enthusiasm. Their warmth and energy arise from their consciousness of being the custodians of a great truth, the triumph of which will make for the lasting well-being of the race. To them Political Economy is not a dry and dusty subject for college class-rooms, but the essential subject-matter of Religion. The old prophet summed the essence of all true religion in one phrase: "What doth the Lord require of thee but to do justly, to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God," a text which might, I think, be briefly expounded to human governments—as—abolish all law-made monopolies; prohibit all injurious and unmerciful institutions, and refrain from all national cant and jingoism.

I dissent from the prevalent theory that Religion and Business, or Religion and Government are separate and distinct things, and the conclusion to which it leads, that the State is less holy than the Church. I cannot believe in an all-wise God without believing that He has supplied guidance for statesmen as well as for prophets and preachers. I must accordingly believe that there exists a natural and therefore just law of revenue as earnestly as I believe there is a divine distinction between Right and Wrong.

J. W. BENGOUGH.

"Let Not Thy Wrath In Its Terrors Awaken"

IT very rarely happened that Leo Tolstoy used a simile which was inadequate, much less misleading, but I think one case was where he spoke of the efforts of organized and respectable society to hush up the teachings of Henry George as comparable with the efforts of certain bees to wax over the bodies of beings who intruded within the hive. Only true *so far*. But the message sent from God by His servant, Henry George, is not the spiritual equivalent of a dead body, and those who wax it over do so at their own utter peril. Obviously. The advice which would have been "given" to the Tsar of all the Russias we know was to introduce

the Single Tax system as taught by Henry George and then to resign power into the hands of the representatives of the people. Every effort was used to wax over Tolstoyism—Stolypin used his hangman's necktie to persuade the peasants to give up communal use of village lands and set up private ownerships. Thousands of millions were borrowed from France to fight with the long purse all agrarian and political reforms. Tariffs were adjusted on systems of graft to the Nth power for providing employment in secondary industries for all voluntarily or involuntarily deficient of their landed heritage. But the thing was alive. Incidentally, the Marxians turned from their creed of nationalizing "factories for cannon, ribbons and fancy soap" to shoot the Autocrat and all his advisers who could be caught; but their efforts also were doomed to failure when they turn to construction.

The Allies have given support without stint to anyone who would try to re-establish private property in land, or compensation for that utilized; and to that extent the Marxians have fully deserved their success, which was at least half due to the hatred by the released populations for our friends as soon as our policy was comprehended. For instance, it was generally reported that Denikin began his advance by burying to the neck round his camp such peasant elders as had taken part in the re-division of lands privately "owned;" though his last advance followed a cable notice that he had allowed retention of all land by the actual occupier, but no fresh "jumping" would be permitted.

This in spite of the Constituent Assembly elections having shown a 70 per cent. poll of sympathizers with the Single Tax and property rights in articles of human production!

The Marxians have now had to concede to the peasants the right to dispose of their grain, which stultification of their creed must be indeed a bitter pill. I cannot see how such a right can be denied to the grower of linseed, or hemp, or potatoes, under penalty of everyone growing corn, except the Labor serfs of the First Red Labor Army, who again will only act so under the lash, the gallows, or for uneconomic pay.

Woe be to the theorists who tamper with the development of Henry George's teaching, taking it for a corpse! "Capitalist" or "Marxian"—only if statesmen follow it no matter how cautiously and even timidly it offers them power, and to their countries wealth and happiness. Nigeria and Malaya are sufficient proof of this to those who see only racial progress in the results of a Georgist tendency in municipal legislation in the British autonomous Dominions. But of those who play up to the Georgist support and let every opportunity go by to realize expectations the downfall must be tragic. One does not know how the vengeance falls: what one sees in one chain of horror began when a police official, Alan Bell, threw Henry George, as a traveler in Ireland, into jail on suspicion of popular sympathies. The wheel swung full circle on March 26, 1920, when Alan Bell was removed from a Dublin tramcar and shot by a