first twenty years of his maturity were spent as a clothing cutter, and he was one of the prime movers in the unionization of that trade in Philadelphia. For ten years he was in the insurance business, and twelve years ago entered newspaper work. He has had experience in all sorts of editorial work, leaving this field only recently to go into publicity for a large financial house in Philadelphia. He secured a leave of absence from his employers for the duration of the campaign in order, as he expressed it to me, that he might "go out and see how decisively he could be beaten."

In spite of his jocose method of speaking, Mr. Macauley has made very considerable sacrifices for the Single Tax idea. He has preached it enthusiastically for many years, and for some time edited a magazine of his own in Philadelphia devoted to the doctrine of the "great adventure." He was national chairman of the Single Tax Party in 1919 and 1920, and in the last two campaigns he was the party's candidate for United States senator and for governor of Pennsylvania, respectively.

The Foundations of Our Enthusiasm

THE enthusiasm for humanity is, like all impulses' transient, though it may be summoned again and again. But the enthusiasm based upon a rational knowledge of the world's economic problem abides as a calm perpetual glow which lights the dark places with a lamp of abiding comfort. It is in the nature of a religious faith based upon the knowledge that in our economic relations, as in fact in all other relations, "the power not ourselves," to use Matthew Arnold's phrase, moves in a mysterious way its wonders to perform.

To know that man in his relation to his fellow man, and to the planet, is destined for a grander future; that progress is real; that harmony and not discord in these relations is the law of his being; that civilizations may come, grander, nobler and more glorious than any of which we dream, merely by the recognition of the natural order which is the law of society as much as it is the law of the heavenly bodies, supplying as it does a religious faith founded upon knowledge, reinforces what is best in every religious faith ever entertained by man.

So simple seems the remedy, yet so complex the results! To take the rent of land, thereby making men free from economic thraldom, seems so little a thing to herald in the dawn of a new era. Yet it is the nature of liberty to call for little. All it asks is the absence of these bonds; all it asks is to be free. Man has never been free since the dawn of history. Whatever liberties he has won have left him still in bondage to the earth-owner; have, in many cases, increased the degree of his economic serfdom, with such mitigations as have been introduced from time to time for the benefit of the more distressed groups.

The thought that stirs within us at the thought of man-

kind free at last supplies a faith in comparison with which the old religious faiths seem to pale to hard and ineffectual dogma.

Is There a Law Of Social Progress?

Is there a law of growth in society? Is there a law of social progress? So much has happened in the last four years that seems to cast a doubt upon it. Many faiths were shaken by the world war, and among them the notion of a continuing stream of human progress.

The defect of the idea appears to reside in the assumption of its continuity. This the course of history expressly disclaims. Perhaps the truth is that civilization may really progress while whole forms of organization, good and bad within it, undergo processes of growth, decay and death. Civilization may be apprehended as a method which experiments with forms of organization as they appear, develops them to the perfection of which they are inherently capable or surrounding conditions permit, puts them to such use as they may serve, and finally discards them for the systems that grow out of newer necessities, or newer moral aspirations.

But this course, orderly, inevitable and constantly creative, is not free of interruptions. It is not possessed of the same unvarying and invariable character as the movements of the material universe, because the material universe is motiveless in itself. Civilization deals with human nature endowed with a free will; the laws of the material universe, and those governing the movements of civilization, do not possess an exact analogy. The most we can assume is the presence of a law of social growth, and this we are far from comprehending at this stage of the world.

But maybe history can tell us something. Nothing is surer than that the decay of great nations began with a diseased condition from within. No great nation has ever been overwhelmed from without and this negatives the notion that all nations must grow, and sooner or later decay and die. There is no warrant in history for this belief, for this reason. The diseases that overtake nations and result in their death are not inevitable accompaniments of national evolution. In other words, we can see how they might have been avoided. There is no reason at all for assuming that a nation cannot grow from century to century, reaching higher and higher levels of achievement. France and England among the modern nations have lived many centuries and show no sign of decadence. Spain has lifted herself out of a long decline and is showing signs of a renewed and vigorous life. That nations must grow, decay and die is a thought welcome to mental indolence, saving us the search for causes that operate to forward or retard national progress. But there is absolutely no warrant in reason or history for the assumption.

What are the forces that sustain national life at a high level of efficiency? Henry George has indicated his belief