

rear the tallest spires towards heaven, there is needed a standing army of policemen; as we build new schools, we build new prisons; where the heaviest contributions are raised to send missionaries to the ends of the earth to preach the glad tidings of peace and good-will, there may be seen squalor and vice that would affright a heathen.

Whence this dark shadow that thus attends that which we are used to call "material progress," that which our current philosophy teaches us to hope for and to work for? Here is the question of all questions for us. We must answer it or be destroyed, as preceeding civilizations have been destroyed.

Political economy alone can give the answer. And, if you trace out in the way I have tried to outline, the laws of the production and exchange of wealth, you will see the causes of social weakness and disease in enactments which selfishness has imposed on ignorance, and in maladjustments entirely within our own control.

And you will see the remedies. Not in wild dreams of red destruction nor weak projects for putting men in leading-strings to a brainless abstraction called the state, but in simple measures sanctioned by justice. You will see in right the great remedy, in freedom the great solvent. You will see that the true law of social life is the law of love, the law of liberty, the law of each for all and all for each; that the golden rule of morals is also the golden rule of the science of wealth; that the highest expressions of religious truths include the widest generalizations of political economy.

There will grow on you, as no moralising could teach, a deepening realization of the brotherhood of man; there will come to you a firmer and firmer conviction of the fatherhood of God. If you have ever thoughtlessly accepted that worse than atheistic theory that want and wretchedness and brutalizing toil are ordered by the Creator, or, revolting from this idea, if you have ever felt that the only thing apparent in the ordering of the world was a blind and merciless fate careless of man's aspirations and heedless of his sufferings, these thoughts will pass from you as you see how much of all that is bad and all that is perplexing in our social conditions grows simply from our ignorance of law—as you come to realize how much better and happier men might make the life of man.

Edwin Markham

On The Land Question

"IF I were dictator, I'd put title to all the land in this country in the Government forever. Land monopoly is at the base of most of the economic injustice. Most of our children are born disinherited. They haven't a foot of land they can call their own."—EDWIN MARKHAM, author of "The Man with the Hoe," in the *Boston Globe*.

It is idle to expect a scientific revenue system at Washington before we have one at the State capitals.

Well Said, Brother Gaston

WE regret very much to see that excellent publication with which we usually find ourselves in hearty agreement—*Tax Facts*, of Los Angeles, Cal., making this statement:

"Reason and the common experience of mankind have demonstrated to the satisfaction of all normal persons that private ownership of land and of the means of production, such as obtains in this country, is necessary to the highest development of society. A thousand communistic failures bear out this conclusion and the natural instincts of man confirm it."

Why should Stoughton Cooley, editor of *Tax Facts* and once editor of *The Public*, give this unnecessary offense to those who still hold with Henry George that "Private ownership of land is a bold, bare monstrous wrong?" Was it not sufficient to say, what we can all agree to, that exclusive private possession of land is necessary?

"A thousand communistic failures" wherein no private ownership of any sort of property was recognized, neither land nor the product of human efforts, prove nothing with regard to what is commonly understood by "ownership" of land. Nor are the "instincts of man" any safe guide. The "instincts of men," seem to have led men all down the course of human history, to take advantage of their fellow-men where they could. A common practice of early men was to enslave their enemies whom they conquered. The "instinct" of cannibals, impels them to devour their victims.

How can "private ownership of land, such as obtains in this country," be held to have been demonstrated as "necessary to the highest development of society" when our system results in a minority owning land, and a majority, ever increasing relatively, does not "own" any land, but occupies the position of tenant of the land-owning minority.—*Fairhope Courier*.

What About Single Tax?

WE must have an ample industrial foundation if our great office buildings, hotels, stores, theatres and other interests are to be sustained.—*Houston Post-Dispatch*.

Joe Pastoriza was a member of your city commission. He was a follower of Henry George. He induced your people to try the theory of Single Tax in part. But before a clear demonstration could be made, the courts were appealed to, and the experiment went by the board, the courts basing the opinion not on the right or the wrong of Single Tax as a principle, but that the Constitution nowhere authorized the experiment. Joe Pastoriza has passed to that bourne whence no traveler e'er returns. But men will go on asking why a city in particular should favor the vacant lot and fine the factory. Is Single Tax a thing to be shunned?—*Herald*, Waco, Texas.