

be left to the hazards of this most desperate scramble? No man in his heart believes it and if he does not believe it how can this system of land tenure under which we live survive much longer than the time needed to draw men's intelligent attention to it? And in the light of such understanding how childish will seem Sir Alfred Mond's proposal (and other related ones) to pension everybody out of somebody else's pocket!

SIR PHILIP SNOWDEN and other leaders of the British Labor party who propose to buy out the landlords should cast their minds back to the time of Gladstone and Parnell, when the policy of buying them out was gradually giving place to the policy of taxing them out. Gladstone's proposal to appropriate £150,000,000 for the purchase of the land from the Irish landlords seemed at the time a very radical one. But some time later he opposed the comparatively small appropriation of £5,000,000. He explained at the time that he still stood for the principle of land purchase, but was opposed to this particular purchase. Even Gladstone was weakening on the purchase policy. Parnell, himself a landlord, who followed Gladstone in this debate, declared that English taxpayers would never consent to tax themselves to buy out the landlords, and Michael Davitt called the measure "a landlord's relief bill." It is true all this referred to the Irish land question, but the principle is the same. Snowden and his so-called radical followers are just about forty years behind the times.

IT is interesting to note what Labouchere had to say at about the same time, to which comment Sir Philip's attention is invited:

"But in regard to the landlords, we may take one of two courses—buy them or let them rot where they are. As a taxpayer I object to buying them out. My advice is to let them rot. I don't know what use they are and besides it is their turn. All Ireland has rotted under their sway. But, by the way, if they don't like rotting, there is one thing they might do—work for their living."

THAT everybody can speculate in land and that all can make money at it, is about on a par with the proposition that every member of a community can make money by taking in the other fellow's washing, or that swapping jack knives can increase the number of jack knives. Mr. J. H. Castle, of Detroit, in an interview with a reporter of the *Detroit Free Press*, believes it or says he does. He is reported as saying:

"There is hardly a person in the Greater Detroit district, who does not have personal knowledge of a number of instances, where people in modest circumstances have saved their money, invested it in Detroit real estate and after a very few years have found themselves on 'easy street.'"

And he adds the following: "And there are greater

opportunities right here in Detroit for every man than ever before."

EITHER Mr. Castle is simple minded or he is willing to indulge in deliberate fiction. How can everybody make money in land speculation? Land speculation has for its object the living off the other fellow, or rather off the rest of the community. The rent of land is a social product; it exists because of the presence of population and by reason of the advantages created by all the people for production and trade—these, plus the expenditure of government in multifarious public services. Not everybody can gamble in location values, and emphatically not everybody can win at it, no more than all players can win in a poker game. And it is somewhat worse, for the land speculator gains what all the others lose. He is the sole winner.

LAND speculation is a lottery, and like a lottery, most of those who play never draw a prize. This is sometimes forgotten. But it differs from a lottery in this. In a lottery the sucker invests but once, and there is no compulsion about it. The lucky land speculator compels the unfortunate rent payer to pay every year, and the latter can never get anything back. He preys on the people's necessities, and the dice with which he plays is loaded. No self-respecting gambler would sit in a game where the other fellow had no chance. Yet these respectable parasites on society would probably lecture others on the evils of betting on the races or gambling at cards. Yet these are clean in comparison. Lincoln would not speculate in land—he saw its evil consequences and felt its meanness.

YET the gamblers in natural resources tell us that everybody can win at the game—a self-evident absurdity. Mr. Castle, a capper for the game, tells us so. And the game is protected by law, the same law that outlaws lotteries and bookmaking on the races. Yet not only is land speculation unutterably mean, it is responsible for panics, industrial depressions, bankruptcies and business failures. Strange that the law protects the only gambling game whose victims are involuntary and whose devastations are felt in every household.

THE Community Chest is the name given to a city fund for the relief of "the deserving poor." The undeserving poor have to shift for themselves. Cleveland has such an institution and one prominent person has said that it would not be safe to live in that city were it not for its community fund, by which he meant that if help were not extended to the poor, the deserving and undeserving alike, we suppose, would go out and take what they needed, which is conceivable. The Red Cross in Cleveland since 1920 has spent \$817,000 to help unemployed ex-service men. Mr. Benjamin Ludlow, of Philadelphia, spoke