

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 jocosely 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 thralldom, 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

that the true source of social progress and national greatness is to be found in association in equality.

It seems demonstrably true that where there are classes divided by artificially determined differences of income and possession, contrasts will arise that will hasten a nation's decay. Even when these inequalities are not deeply rooted or strongly marked, the effect is to arrest progress and keep national development stationary. A high level of civilization can only be maintained where these artificial inequalities do not exist and where opportunity and individual consciousness of opportunity are generally shared.

Association in equality does not mean equal possessions. Differences of fortune will arise that are due to unlikeness in abilities, and in this way variations in income will and should persist. But based on equal opportunity these will not be so strongly marked as now, and will arouse no bitterness and no consciousness of injustice. The sympathetic and spiritual bonds would be strengthened by the absence of antagonisms of groups socially divided by inequalities of possession, and the field open for that wider co-operation which is the real strength of nations, as it is the real motive power of civilization itself.

Henry George was right. The law of progress—association in equality—which he laid down, is not the least of his pregnant contributions to social thought.

A Correction and Apology

WE are sorry to have fallen into a grave error in the statement made in our last issue that Prof. T. S. Adams, of Madison, Wisconsin, was an advocate of the Tax on Sales. We are glad to print this denial in as prominent a place in the REVIEW as that in which the error occurred:

Editor, Single Tax Review,
150 Nassau Street,
New York, N. Y.

My DEAR SIR:

My attention has been called to the statement in your July-August number that I am "an ardent advocate of the tax on sales." No statement could be more untrue. I am opposed to a tax on sales as would be evident to any intelligent reader who read my recent article dealing with the subject in the *New York Evening Post*.

Very truly yours,

T. S. ADAMS.

The source of our information was some exchange as ignorant as ourself. We are more sorry regarding this because Prof. Adams has been in the main more than fair in his attitude toward proposed reforms in taxation and reasonable and temperate in such opposition as conviction impelled him to express.

UNDER all forms of government the ultimate power lies with the masses. It is not kings nor aristocracies, nor land owners nor capitalists, that anywhere really enslave the people. It is their own ignorance.—HENRY GEORGE.

A Mendacious Newspaper

THE Los Angeles *Times* is horrified at the result that the Single Tax would bring about in California. It estimates that there are about \$1,500,000,000 of loans on real estate, and that in the event of the passage of the amendment mortgages based on real estate would become valueless. Real estate is land and houses, and it would be interesting to know just what proportion is land wholly or partially improved, and what proportion is vacant land. The Single Tax proposes to relieve of all taxation that part of real estate which consists of improvements. Just how vacant land can pay interest on mortgages the *Times* does not state.

The *Times* speaks of the insecurity of land tenure under the Single Tax. About 97 per cent. of the population of New York pay to the landlords rent for the privilege of living here. What proportion it is in Los Angeles we do not know. In New York the only security of tenure is that enjoyed by 3 per cent. of the population. Is it as much as 10 per cent. in Los Angeles? That is what is troubling about 90 per cent. of the people in all the cities—security of tenure. But what the *Times* will not see, or tries to fool its readers into not seeing, is that what Single Taxers propose is to tax what is being taken from those who by the exercise of their labor and capital produce all interest upon mortgages—the economic rent of land. This does not belong to the landlords, because they did not make it. To take it in taxation, and in lieu of all taxes, is not to destroy the incentive to build, for the landlord gets it now whether he builds or not. He gets it in the selling price of land when he sells and he gets it as the price of permission for letting other people build or work. If he builds a house and rents it he gets two returns, one for the house and one for the land occupied by the tenant. The price of the latter is determined largely by the number of lots held out of use. If the taxes are light on land values more lots will be held out of use, and the price of land will be higher.

The people of Los Angeles pay a few other people for the privilege of living there. However the *Times* may seek to frighten its readers with bogie tales, that system is doomed—if not at this election, then at some other election. The only hope is that in the destruction of that system other things, useful or desirable, will not be destroyed along with it by angry men in revolt.

This is what the Los Angeles *Times* deliberately challenges by its systematic misrepresentation of the sane and reasonable proposal now before the people of California—a good deal more moderate than some of us would like to see. This attitude is unfortunate, for the Single Taxer seeks to render inviolate all rights of property—even the manufacturing plants of lying newspapers.

ISN'T anyone a statesman if he deals with affairs of a State? Whether he's wise or foolish, selfish or noble?

—H. M. Holmes, in *Cleveland Citizen*.