

be maintained with interest at zero. If more wealth were available and there were no need for it as capital, it would be necessary to pay a premium to someone to take it off their hands, else it would go to destruction with the inevitable tending of all things to decay.

Should the Single Tax be adopted suddenly, there would be a tremendous increase in the demand for capital. The number of parasites finding it necessary to go to work would make an increased demand for capital. This increased demand would be stimulated by the renewed energy with which all humanity would work, and for quite a time there might be a larger demand for capital which would disturb the present equilibrium of capital to production. But soon the increased production of wealth would meet the requirements of capital, and the equilibrium would again be established and interest would sink to zero.

There are two factors in the production of wealth—land and labor. Without these no wealth can be produced. Capital is not a factor in the production of wealth, it is a tool in the hands of one of the factors in the production of wealth. Consequently, the division of the wealth should go only to the factors which produce it, as rent of land and wages of labor.

ANTEDELUVIAN ECONOMICS.

(For the Review.)

By **W. A. DOUGLAS.**

Of all the impediments to the progress of religion, that which stands out as preeminently the worst, is our bad social conditions. In vain do we preach brotherhood so long as we keep alive the forces which inevitably split society into lords and serfs. In vain do we pray for the coming of the kingdom of righteousness or urge the injunction, Render to every man his due, or denounce covetousness as the very poison of the soul, so long as we maintain the conditions which make justice an impossibility and which inevitably arouse covetousness to the highest intensity.

It is a matter, therefore, of the first importance that the books dealing with the social application of Christianity and provided specially for the ministry, should make some approach to adequacy. In this respect the student has only to look through a number of these works to discover that many of them are very disappointing.

One of the latest publications of this character is a work of 230 pages by W. Cunningham, D.D., F.B.A., Archdeacon of Ely; Fellow of Trinity College, etc., etc.

With such a plethora of titles the reader has a right to look for a well arranged scientific treatise fully up to date and exhibiting the results of the

latest research. It is difficult to use respectful language at the disappointment. Elements the most essential and distinctions the most important to this inquiry are either conspicuous by their absence or vitiated by attempted minification.

One of the first and most important distinctions in social ethics is the difference between the gifts of the Creator and the products of industry. The right to the bounties of nature comes by birth. We are all equally the heirs of the All-Father and therefore all equally entitled to his gifts. As to the right to the products of industry, that depends on merit, on a man's industry, product or service. There should be equality of opportunity and equity of reward. This distinction, so all important in this discussion, receives scarcely any consideration, and certainly is not clearly enunciated.

There is no difficulty in seeing the men who put up a building, construct a railroad or raise a crop, and in this way produce values. But who ever saw a number of men go forth in the morning and work all day to produce land values? No one ever witnessed such a phenomenon. Land sells in London or New York as high as twenty million dollars per acre, because society has congregated there. Ask any man in the street, "Who made the center lots in the city worth millions of dollars per acre?" and it is much more than probable that he will say that this value is due, not to any one individual, but to the concentration of population. Here we have another distinction that is essential in the discussion of social questions. Is not the application of this distinction at once obvious? Is not the man who raises the crop entitled to the crop, and is not the community entitled to the value of the land? This distinction, all important in considering the subject of taxation, is treated by this author in a very gingerly way. After showing how the exactions of the land owner may press heavily on manufacturers, he says: "but the burden cannot be removed by any social rearrangement." After all that has been written on this subject and after the legislation that has been enacted in New Zealand and elsewhere to remove taxes from the products of industry, is it in any way improper to call this man an antedeluvian?

The Reverend Archdeacon mentions in a casual way that "Bastiat and other writers have been prepared to believe in a prearranged harmony by which the self seeking of each worked out for the benefit of all;" but he gives only the most meagre illustrations to show how the specialization of function brings this about. At the same time we look in vain for any indication by this writer of the existence of antagonism, in which the speculator grows rich as society becomes poorer in land, or forest or minerals.

This writer makes the fatal blunder of confounding a producer and an appropriator. He says: "The function of the land owner in the economy of the State has been that of making permanent improvements in the land of the country." Several years ago the Duke of Argyle in attacking Henry George wrote, "I have built upwards of fifty houses." He had not laid a brick. He had the power to take a large share of the crops raised by the labor of other men, and then with the proceeds pay for the building of those houses.

He did nothing towards the raising of the crops or the building of the houses. He had simply the power of appropriation. In the same manner this author states that, "the owners of capital have provided the mercantile marine." When the Duke takes part of his rents and buys shares in a marine company, he is not providing; he is simply appropriating. If instead of first taking his rent in the form of money, he had demanded payment in some industrial stock, we could see at once that he did not provide, he simply appropriated. When a farmer raises crops and from his savings buys stock, he is providing capital. This difference between appropriating and providing, this author has yet to recognize. He further asserts that the services rendered to the community by the owner of the land and the owner of capital are necessary services. Between the farmer that farms the farm and the farmer that farms the farmer there is a world of difference. Poor king William the Fourth, when dying, worried about the country. How would they get along when he was gone? This writer would make us wonder how the world would get along if the Westminsters and Astors were no more.

Instead of beginning with a consideration of the production of wealth, with the agencies that aid in multiplying that production, especially the overwhelming importance of the specialization of function and exchange of products, he begins by declaring his belief in the Malthusian doctrine of diminishing returns, that population tends to increase faster than the means of subsistence and states that "this gives a fundamental explanation of much of the misery and suffering in the world." But in the explanation of this doctrine he does not give the shadow of a hint that with increased population the owner of the land can demand a greater share of the products, thus crushing the producer to poverty and suffering. These supporters of the Malthusian creed never furnish any statistics to show that the crops have ever failed to such a degree with increased population, that any suffering has been due to this circumstance. When there is "revelry by night" in the mansions of an idle aristocracy, there must be want and suffering in the homes of the men who do the sowing and the reaping.

On the subject of taxation his remarks are singularly impotent. He says, "Questions of the incidence of taxation are very complicated." To a man who cannot distinguish between the production of wealth and the appropriation of wealth, the question of proper methods of taxation must be an insoluble problem, just as insoluble as a problem in fractions to the man who knows not the difference between multiplication and division. He fails utterly to see that the moment we allow one part of humanity to charge the other part for the occupation of the earth, we split society into two distinct parts and that thus we place the whole burden of supporting society, including all taxation, on one part, thus subjecting the industrious classes to a two-fold burden, one to support government, the other to support the owners of the valuable lands. Thus we have an everlasting creditor class and an everlasting debtor class, an iniquity which this author sadly fails to appreciate.

With almost wearisome iteration this writer teaches, either by implication

or direct assertion, that the goodness of society can be guaranteed only by the goodness of the individuals constituting that society. He makes the monstrous assumption that individual action can make justice with unjust laws, that the man who goes to the market can correct the sweat shop, or that he can counteract the villainy of land speculation. This man would make every one more than a Canute to sweep away the tide. Perhaps there is no more gross superstition today than this, that individual effort can change a social system. The individual is utterly impotent to change the market; we must collectively change the law that presses one man with a competition that forces him to accept a pittance of his just earnings, and allows another man to carry off yearly a fortune which he has never earned.

It is terribly discouraging thus to have to see the kind of education that is offered to those who are to take the lead in calling the attention of the public to the sublimest truths and to inspire them with the noblest aims. It is not much to be wondered at that the church is wielding such a meagre influence, where it should be well nigh omnipotent. There was no mistaking the character of Christ's teaching when he told the leaders in the church of his day, that they made long prayers; but, at the same time, they devoured widows' houses. And we still have the long prayers, and we still devour the widows' houses.

LIFE ON THE FARM AND THE BRITISH FARM LABORER.

(For the Review.)

By JOHN R. RAYNES.

Half a century ago the activity of Joseph Arch sent a thrill of hope through the lower strata of the agricultural world. At that time the farm laborers were overworked, underfed, and underpaid. Those conditions have not altered much since that time, and have not in fact altered much in the last five hundred years. Other conditions have altered for them considerably. They no longer go into the ripened crops with a sickle or scythe, nor do they any longer beat out the precious grain with the flail. Instead of the sound of the singing of birds in the field there is the rattle of machinery, and instead of the sweet smell of bruised straw at the threshing, there is the smell of smoke from great engines. These changes have been made for the employer's sake, and any such change is welcomed when it means more profit. The work of the laborer has changed somewhat in character, but not in its cash product. The single men are in many cases still housed in bedrooms and common mess rooms attached to granaries or stables. The married men still in almost every case carry home to the toiling wife a wage that is supposed to represent his value in the world. It may be fifteen shillings, aided by a cottage valued