

ng can be seen from a government compilation of the data concerning the area of the land distributed. According to his compilation, only 11,060 hectares were distributed in 1923, as contrasted with the corresponding figure for 1922, viz., 52,000 hectares. These conditions obtain despite the fact that the Polish regulations concerning the expropriation of the land are rather drastic. Generally, sixty hectares is exempt from expropriation in overwhelmingly industrial districts. The corresponding limit in purely agricultural districts is 160 hectares. Some members of the Polish Parliament charge that these low limits were fixed as a measure of political revenge against those landowners whose past or present political activities are not to the taste of the government.—*Current History Magazine*.

Defining The Unearned Increment

SIR WILLIAM JOYNSON-HICKS used to be plain Joynson but, like the late Prime Minister Campbell-Bannerman and the recent but still living Secretary of the Board of Trade, Sir Philip Lloyd-Graeme, he found it financially advantageous to hyphenate his name in return for a substantial legacy. He hyphenated it with Hicks.

* * *

Nobody minded at all, because this is, after all, in queer, unexpected ways, a very free country. But the new Joynson-Hicks made the fatal mistake of rushing into politics during the height of the Lloyd-George, Henry George, By George movement, which was all about the Single Tax. He might have rushed into politics and even rushed around without harm, but he made the fatal mistake of trying to stop Lloyd-George in a similar rush around; he defied Mr. Lloyd-George to define the word "unearned increment."

The Welsh wizard paused for that fraction of a second in which he does his thinking, and then, amidst national merriment, dismissed the new Joynson-Hicks from effective British politics for a season by remarking that "the unearned increment might be defined as that which had accrued to Mr. Joynson-Hicks from the hyphen."

N. Y. World, Correspondence.

Great Words From Max Hirsch

BUT though it seems as if the fight for human freedom were unending, though it has lasted from the very dawn of history to the present day, yet we know there must come a time when victory will be achieved. From age to age the area over which this battle has been fought has become more and more contracted. From century to century the secured area of human freedom has become enlarged. As it has been in the past, so it will be in the

future. Justice will prevail at last. But stone has to be laid upon stone with infinite toil; the mortar that holds them together has to be mixed with human sweat and suffering, in order that mankind shall at last possess a fit habitation for a perfect social state. To have been a faithful soldier in this fight, a faithful soldier in the army of freedom, to have laid one stone in this glorious building, to have done so little to bring the Kingdom of God upon earth, surely to have done this—nay, even to have attempted it with all one's might—is sufficient reward for all the work, the fret and toil and the sacrifices that are involved in it." —Extract from Max Hirsch's farewell Melbourne address.

Belgium

THE efforts made to establish a new revenue system based on collective ownership of the land have resulted in very satisfactory results in certain countries. Nevertheless, there are some countries which remain refractory and even hostile to the ideas so eloquently presented by their own authors as well as by foreign socialists among whom I will mention only your countryman Henry George and my compatriot the Belgian, de Colins.

In Belgium as in France, some years before the war, small groups of intellectuals, with the best intentions sought to interest the public in the land question and in the solution which it offered of the problems of revenue reform. Particularly in France, aided by the liberality of an enthusiastic American supporter, Georges Darien launched a vigorous campaign in behalf of the Single Tax and there was reason to hope that the public would finally wake up to the economic and moral importance of the policy proposed and that it would accept the solution offered by Darien at that time (1910-1914). Unfortunately the war intervened and as he no longer controlled the necessary financial resources, Darien remained inactive until his death in 1922. Since then the most complete silence on this subject has settled down on France.

As for Belgium, the followers of de Colins gave no sign of life and exercise no influence on the economic life of the country. In spite of this discouraging situation, and stimulated by activities in England and Germany, I have thought that it was our duty to make one more trial. For this reason the Tax Reform League has been started and it has been decided to publish a bulletin to be known as *The Land (La Terre)*. If our league had the disposal of adequate funds there seems no good reason why, in a small country like Belgium, we should not be able to overcome the ignorance and indifference of the masses, as has been done in Denmark. We have already pointed out in *Land and Liberty*, of London, that it was not astounding that no one here knew the theories of Henry George. The edition of the two works which were published in French were exhausted twenty-five years ago. Hence our League has undertaken to republish "Progress and Poverty" in

French. But that takes money. How shall it be found.

Please inform the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM of our difficult situation. We would be glad to receive subscriptions to a new French edition of "Progress and Poverty." Be good enough to make an appeal for this purpose. Americans are rich, they can easily help us if they will. —ALBERT CAUWEL.

The Vanishing Home

IN the city of Detroit there are 218,973 "homes."

Of these 133,253 are occupied by renters.

Only 82,679 are owned by those who live in them.

Of those 82,679 owned by their occupants, 49,509 are mortgaged.

There are but 31,506 occupants who own their own homes free of encumbrances—but 14.9 per cent. of the total.

The Advertising Weekly actually boasts about this! It says: "This shows a very high percentage of homes owned, almost twice the percentage of St. Louis."

Poor St. Louis!

It has come to a pretty pass when a business magazine can brag that 14.9 per cent. of the families of a city own their homes free of encumbrance.

If it could brag that the rest of the families live in co-operative homes, free from the grip of the landlord, it would be something to brag about—but the rest of the families are precisely in the grip of the landlord, except those who are in the grip of the mortgagee.

Owned homes are vanishing—and nothing the own-a-home crusade can do will stay the tendency toward the vanishing point—*Toledo Union Leader*.

Despoiling the Sanctuary

THE matter of vanishing rural beauty to make way for "suburban building sites" is not a matter of individual vandalism like the despoiling of roadsides and the Sanctuary. The fault there lies far deeper in the economic basis of our social structure as now constituted. As long as land values, that fruit of the earth which man obtains not by his own labor, but by the gradual growth of the community, therefore by the united labor of all the community, can be diverted as individual profits, into private hands—just so long will villages grow ugly as they grow bigger, and natural beauty be destroyed as the thing that stands between the individual and his profits. The history of every growing or coming community shows how, long before the growth of the community demanded it, natural beauty, fine trees and all the rest of it, have been sacrificed for the speculative values to come, values that belonged to all, but went to the few.

Anywhere we begin to study and love the processes of nature, the beautiful growing things, do we, if we be honest, find ourselves understanding these fundamental economic truths, for no economic reasoning is fundamental if it cannot be linked in some way with nature's laws.—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON in syndicated article, "Bird Notes."

The Farmer and the Tariff

I HEARD nothing of a radical nature from Senator La Follette or his followers during the late campaign. If I understood them aright, they proposed to antidote the evils wrought by one kind of class legislation, by other and futher class legislation.

Such proposals may be drastic and even vicious, but radical they certainly are not, more's the pity. To me they seemed worse than useless. The system of class legislation and special favors is too strongly entrenched in the affections of powerful interests to be upset by anything in the nature of a conflict on interests. Nothing short of a radical public conviction of the foolishness of all class legislation can bring about the desired end of fair play for all.

The last four years have been hard for the farmer and for all business depending on farm prosperity—and what business does not? During those years some two millions of people were forced out of farming and added to our town and city population, many of them losing their all in the shift. And the town and city industries lost just as many possible customers. Who profited? Even the "Money Power" suffered, as the hundreds of failed banks in the West testify.

I see no intelligible reason for this state of affairs other than that all classes are intently engaged in the meanest of pastimes—trying to get the better of one another.

FARMER A POOR SCHEMER

The farmer, though a worker and producer and therefore not fitted to be a schemer, has engaged in the scheming, and got much the worst of it, as might be expected. I doubt if any class really gets the better of it, for human society is so put together that an injury to one often results in injury to all.

It is nearing four years since the Emergency Tariff law was enacted, followed by the Fordney-McCumber law, both putting a tariff on wheat. Last winter the tariff on wheat was increased. All through these years and the ups and downs of the market wheat was heavy. It sagged and sagged. It proved beyond question that the tariff could not put up or keep up the price of an article of which we produce a surplus for export.

Why is a tariff? Wages were always higher in this country than in Europe, even in Colonial times when Britain tried to suppress manufacturing here and to maintain the colonies as a dumping ground for her own mer-