

obliged to reply: "Well, I will admit that personal influence has a great deal to do with the matter, and unless a young man has a personal recommendation he stands small chances." While we cannot recommend Mr. Hanna as the best type of American, we most cordially commend his candor regarding the lessening of industrial possibilities. A few more such interviews would knock the Ladies' Home Journal recipes for getting on in the world into a cocked hat.

The city of Dayton, Ohio, boasts an editor who has been greatly stirred by the visit to Dayton of John S. Crosby, the famous single tax orator. So full are this editor's columns of weak anti-Crosby paragraphs, one might almost suspect Crosby of having subsidized him for advertising purposes. He thinks, for instance, that he has routed the single tax advocates, horse, foot and dragoons, with this question, supposed to contain a quotation from Mr. Crosby: "What is meant by 'taxing property (in cities), irrespective of improvements?'" But no intelligent friend or enemy of the single tax would suppose for a moment that Mr. Crosby, or any other advocate of the single tax ever proposed to tax "property" irrespective of improvements. The fact doubtless is that a reporter who heard Mr. Crosby propose to tax "land" according to its value, irrespective of its improvements, assumed "property" and "land" to be synonyms, and substituted the former for the latter; and that the editor, when he came to comment, failed to detect the reporter's error. Had this editor used the language that Crosby undoubtedly did use, his question would have read in this manner: "What is meant by taxing land according to its value, and irrespective of its improvements?"

If the editor could not have seen that the question in that form answered itself, any real estate agent might have helped him out. He would have known perfectly well that

the question contemplated the taxation of each site according to its value irrespective of the improvements upon it—just the same, that is to say, as if the site were unimproved but all neighboring sites were in the same state of improvement as at the time of taxation. Nobody has any difficulty in approximately determining the value of any given site irrespective of its improvements, in a neighborhood in which he is acquainted, except when he is called upon to do so for the purpose of understanding the single tax. Nor has he any trouble then, unless there is method in his stupidity.

In a mass of casuistical objections, of which the question quoted above is a specimen, this Dayton editor makes one and only one point that is worthy of serious notice. It is to the effect that the single tax advocates, if they believe in their doctrines, ought to start a colony somewhere, the same as Brigham Young did. This allusion to Brigham Young's experiment is unhappy for the purpose; for it will be remembered that as soon as Brigham's colony began to succeed, the gentile set about breaking into and governing it. That aside, however, an all sufficient reason why single tax men ought not to attempt organizing a colony, is that many extraordinarily large single tax colonies are already organized and in full operation. Several are in New Zealand; there are several more in Australia; South America has a number; so has the continent of Europe; while Canada and the United States contain them by the score. All these colonies are highly successful. Their annual wealth product counts up in the hundreds of millions. In every one of them, also, the value of land irrespective of its improvements is taxed with precision and regularity. The only defect about these colonies is that the tax so collected is appropriated by private individuals—by the so-called owners of the sites on which the colonies are located. This prevents all the colonists from enjoying the benefits of

the colonization. The colonial benefits of a pecuniary nature go to a comparatively few, some of whom do not even live in the colonies from which they draw rich incomes based upon the value of land irrespective of its improvements. But a movement has now set in in most of these colonies, and in some it has reached an advanced stage of success, for the abolition of the unjust privileges under which private individuals confiscate the profits of the colonization. With the success of that movement, the single tax colonies already established will be ideal.

The colonies alluded to above are the states and municipalities of the countries of the civilized world. No further single tax colonization is needed. What is needed, is such a reform in the existing colonies as will secure to all colonists their rights in the common benefits of their respective colonies, while leaving to each, untaxed, all the improvements and personal property that he individually earns.

Attention has been directed to a certain Dr. Woodbridge, of Youngstown, Ohio. It seems that Dr. Woodbridge has a notion as to how typhoid fever can be best treated, and is allowed a certain number of sick soldiers to experiment upon at Fort Meyer. But army surgeons generally hold to old theories and sneer at him. Now it so happens that Dr. Woodbridge's experiment has been highly successful. Out of 53 typhoid patients he has lost but 4. Yet other surgeons speak contemptuously of Dr. Woodbridge as being the only person who has found a "specific" for typhoid fever. To that we take exception. The treatment does not appear to be proposed as a "specific" at all, but as a simple compliance with natural laws. To the layman it appears to be nothing more than cleanliness. Dr. Woodbridge, according to the newspaper descriptions of his treatment, "cleans out the bowels of his patient first, and then