

land, but write off taxes owing to the State and even to refund those which have been paid."

And the reason for this change of policy, for the extraordinary reversal of the Prime Minister's declarations made in speeches which shook the pillars of British landed privilege, is given by Mr. Chancellor in the following words:

"Power is sweet. With his present colleagues its retention is only possible by betraying his principles. Therefore the valuation, the existing taxes and the principles themselves must go, that the Prime Minister may continue Prime Minister."

The Dawn of Civilization

A FAVORITE refuge for those who, seeing the irrefutable logic of the Single Tax position, wish to avoid conceding that it should be generally adopted, is the admission that had it been applied "in the beginning" all would have been well, but "it is impossible in the present advanced stage of civilization." Infant civilizations are always starting newly in various parts of the world, and observation of the circumstances under which they bud and flower are of great scientific interest. One of the latest civilizations to get under way is in British East Africa. The administrative centre seems to be Nairobi, which Theodore Roosevelt immortalized by using it as the starting point of his big game drives.

The British have recently started to bring this territory within the pale of civilization. The first step of course was to clear away the natives, so that the white settlers might be free to take up the white man's burden without ill-advised protests by the aborigines. The method adopted by ourselves of confining the ousted natives to "reservations" was followed. The new settlers came, took up the lands allotted them and then recognized that they had only one ingredient of the wealth which they had come to Africa to accumulate. They had the land—the raw material—but where was the labor to work it? For though it might be a white man's country in the sense of ownership, it was not a white man's country to work.

Of course the situation was highly exasperating. Here were reservations full of lazy, idle natives, leading care-free lives, quite oblivious of their duty to the Empire, and not a man of them willing to work for the white settlers. The aid of the Government was sought and a poll tax imposed—not a poll tax for revenue, but just for the purpose of making these idlers come off the reservations and work for people who could pay them real money wherewith to pay their taxes. But even this did not work, because the natives managed to raise enough on the reservations to sell and pay their poll taxes.

Now another appeal to the Government for help is made and we see the results in an official *White Paper* recently published, which is reprinted in the *Nation* (New York). It is a document calculated to make you break your heart

or split your sides according to the sort of temperament you have.

Of course slave or "forced" labor is not to be even thought of under the fostering folds of the Union Jack. The euphemism of "compulsory" labor was employed during the war to describe the conditions of employment, which necessity compelled. Now, that pretext having ceased to function, all the British officials and the headmen of the various tribes are enjoined by the High Commissioner to see that each community furnishes to the settlers such a quota of laborers, as its size may justify; and the employment of women and children under proper safeguards, of course, is strongly urged. Those who do not co-operate are warned that their names will be reported to the higher authorities. Young men of the tribes are to be compelled to pay their own poll taxes out of money earned by themselves.

Probably little would have been heard of the matter outside of Nairobi, were it not that three Bishops of the Church of Scotland Mission, perhaps fearing the effect of the compulsory labor plan on the spiritual enthusiasm of their converts, ventured upon a respectful remonstrance, pointing out that however carefully worded the High Commissioner's edict might be, it would inevitably be interpreted by the ignorant as a demand for forced labor. Especially were they concerned over the demand for woman and child labor, of the evil consequences of which they already had abundant demonstrations.

This remonstrance was too serious to be turned down by local administrations, so it was sent to Lord Milner for reply. That eminent satrap's answer was a model of diplomatic evasion. In ordinary language its meaning could be put in five sentences, somewhat as follows: "We wish those old Jossers would keep to their own affairs. We need that labor and we are going to have it. Of course, we would prefer that it should be voluntary and without any row, but we are going to have it, cost what it may. It is necessary for the development of the Empire!"

But he takes a couple of thousand words to say it, so that its essential ruthlessness is obscured. Doubtless he feels that it is only "human nature" for the settlers to want the natives to do their work. We could tell him how to proceed, without any question of slave labor being involved. Just take away the reservations as they have confiscated the rest of the land of the natives. Sell the land or give it away to new settlers, and then these benighted Africans will come around, and pray for the men who give them the chance to work. But we fear that as long as these heathen are permitted to retain their reservations there will be trouble and the beneficent designs of the civilizers of British East Africa will fail of fulfillment. With their land taken away, the natives will be in the same position as American labor, organized and unorganized, finds itself at the expiration of the war, with no weapon of self-protection but the strike. And with all its splendid dreams of sharing the Empire of Capitalism (to use the language of our Socialist brethren) going a-glimmering.

Considering the effect on the young men and women of the British leisure class of the present social order in Great Britain, it is quite amusing to read the following extracts from Lord Milner's addresses to "Governor Major-General Sir E. Northey, K.C.M.G., C.B., etc.;" (this is a person and not a procession, as people not familiar with the nomenclature of dignitaries might be led to suppose):

"As regards compulsory labor for private employment, there could of course be no question of entertaining any proposals which involve this principle . . . absolutely opposed to the traditional policy of His Majesty's Government, etc., etc. *On the other hand* from the point of view of the natives . . . in their own interests they should seek outside employment, when not engaged in work in their own reserves; it is desirable that the young able-bodied men should become wage-earners and should not remain idle in the reserves for a large part of the year. Again, "on the other hand" (we wonder how many hands Foxy Grandpa has) from the point of view of the settler, it is necessary that there should be an adequate supply of labor, if he is to develop his holdings, and in my opinion the Protectorate Government (O, Euphemism, how many crimes are committed with thy aid!) would be failing in its duty if it did not use all lawful and reasonable means to encourage the supply of labor for the settlers, who have embarked on enterprises calculated to assist not only the Protectorate itself, but also this country (Great Britain) and other parts of the Empire by the production of raw materials which are in demand." (Roll of Drums.)

It is such stuff as this that gives diplomacy its bad name by pretending to contradict what it affirms and to deny what it admits, until plain thinkers and speakers lose their way in a haze of verbiage. It would all be very much simplified if Milner would cable Northey: "Abolish the reservations!" Then rich men, poor men, beggars and thieves would fall into their due places in that sacred order which is the finest flower of civilization.

Concessions to Our Principle From Many Sources

FOLLOWING the interview with our nominee for the presidency, Robert C. Macauley, in the *New York Globe*, which appeared in our Sept.-Oct. issue, came a series of articles in the same paper from Charles Harris Whitaker, editor of the *Journal of the American Institute of Architects*, in which he says:

"The basic reason for the congestion of our cities is the high cost of land. As population increases, so do land values. The increased values of land which result solely from the fact that individuals are crowded together are of no benefit to those who create them. The land increment, in most cases, is wasted in speculation. If the city pays for a subway to distribute the population over a wider area the land along the subway immediately increases in value. It is charged as part of the cost of the house, either as rent or selling price."

Following this the *New Republic* in its issue of Sept.-1st,

said, commenting upon the proposition for city home-building:

"Besides, even if it were possible to put together all the holdings needed for an important improvement without encountering the blackmailing, or worse, the obstinate owner, the net effect of the improvement would be to raise ground values in all the adjoining territory and thus to put additional improvements out of reach."

Senator Boies Penrose, in the *Times* of Sept. 19th said:

"Perhaps the States and cities should exempt from taxation property erected to meet the emergency for a period of five years. Something of this sort must be done to induce private capital to take up building at a time in which it is so sorely needed."

Governor Smith, of New York, in his message to the legislature, said:

"The emergency is such at the present time that it might be well to consider the enactment of a law exempting from taxation, for a period of years, with proper restrictions, buildings used for dwelling purposes, whose construction is undertaken within such a period as will assure an immediate increase in housing accommodations. I believe this will aid in putting new construction on a fair competitive basis with buildings erected before the war and will assist in creating a market for new buildings."

Every one of these would doubtless deny that the suggestions were favorable concessions to the Single Tax principle. Yet they are all straws in the wind set in motion by the appearance of a notable book published in 1879, and known as "Progress and Poverty." This is recognized by the American Bankers' Association which has issued a statement opposing the bills submitted to the New York Legislature to relieve the housing situation. Referring to the proposal to exempt new buildings for a period of from five to ten years, it says:

"This is subject to all the iniquities and wrong principles involved in Henry George's so-called 'Single Tax.'"

The bankers are right. And as we increase our demands for the full return due from the owners of land to those who create the wealth now going into the hands of a few, the politicians, educators, and the men of "light and leading" who wait for public sentiment to grow before announcing their wise conclusions publicly, will ask for more and more. We will get an increasing part of the loaf by demanding the whole.

Signs of Progress

FOLLOWING are a few of the signs of progress being made in the direction of the Single Tax:

Australia raised over \$10,600,000 from a federal land tax; Germany's new constitution calls for various land law reforms; the convention of the Canadian Council of Women called for the release of industry from taxation and the raising of the necessary revenue from land values; in Denmark a bill was recently introduced replacing the local property taxes by a tax on land values. Another bill proposes a tax of 2 per cent. on land in towns, and 1.2 on rural