

obtain the ordinary rate of wages and interest—then that law of competition that tends to bring wages and interest to a common level will enable the owner of land of superior quality to claim the excess which the exertion of labor and capital will yield on that, over what they could obtain on the poorer land. And as the earnings of labor and capital must always be fixed by what they can obtain on the poorest land worked, while the growth and development of society tends to bring out higher and higher capabilities in particular lands, the portion of the results of production that land-owners can claim tends constantly to increase with the advance of civilization.

It is this part of the increment of wealth—the part called by John Stuart Mill the “unearned increment,” because it now goes to, non-producers—that we propose by the Single Tax to take for public needs in place of the taxes now levied on industry, enterprise, and thrift.

Is not this clearly the wise and just way of raising public revenues?

*(To be Continued)*

## Action!

**I**T seems unthinkable that any Henry-Georgian should object to organization and action. Suppose mistakes are made. They are inevitable, but in spite of our mistakes the right implement can only be found by trying and will be found at last, and the cause will triumph sooner than from a course in inactivity.

Are we to be raised to the seventh heaven every time we read a Georgist paper or book and then do nothing about it! It would seem that we have wasted enough steam in that way to have got somewhere long ago. But we are all playing the part of lone scouts with none of the enthusiasm of camaraderie. The exhilaration of belonging to a great national body would be of untold value to the cause.

The appeal from the Land League in your last issue came as a surprise to the writer who had not heard of its existence. The long name of American Association for Scientific Taxation seems unnecessary and misleading. Why not simply The American Land League!

The appeal contained two very valuable proposals—first that no dues or obligations except political cooperation be imposed and second that we depend on systematic petitioning of legislatures. A volume of petitions rolling up every year in every State would put our cause squarely before the American people.

LEWIS H. CLARK, Sodus, N. Y.

## A Funny World

**W**E worry about the morale of the workingman who has to go on relief, because we know that he himself worries. Any decent man prefers to earn the money he spends, and feels himself degraded if he has to take without giving something in exchange.

But nobody worries about the landowner who takes in a big income without earning it. Least of all does he himself worry, about his morale or anything else, even though he is taking without giving anything in exchange.

It's a funny world!—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

## The Keynote

### Convention Speech, 1940

By HON. B. A. PARTYMAN

## A Story of Tax Relief for Land and of New Deal Prosperity

By HARRY GUNNISON BROWN

Author of “The Economic Basis of Tax Reform”

Mr. Chairman; Fellow Delegates to this Great Convention:

**A**S we meet here to deliberate on the selection of a leader in the campaign which lies before us, and on the formulation of a programme to be carried out during the next four years, it is eminently fitting that we pause a little while and pass a backward glance at the accomplishments and progress of all the states and of the nation during the years, since 1932, that our party has guided the destinies of America. There is a unity in the legislation of the states and of the national government during this period, which can be explained only by the fact that the great party which we represent has guided and directed both.

It sometimes happens that fundamental principles of wide application, which only an insignificant fraction of the people have previously understood, seem to burst suddenly on the popular mind and come to their full flowering in policy during a comparatively few years. Then there ensues a period of material and cultural development which succeeding generations look back upon as a golden age of human progress.

The great twin principles, that high land values are the foundation of prosperity and that taxes on land should be reduced in order to make land values high, have long been understood by the intelligent and substantial few. But it was not until seven or eight years ago, when our great party was waging its successful struggle for control of the national and state governments and during the opening months of the new administration, that these two fundamental principles began really to permeate the understanding of the great multitude. During these critical and significant months, however, it became increasingly clear to an ever increasing proportion of the citizenry that tax relief for land was the one fundamental reform for which all really good citizens, and certainly all landowning citizens, ought to work. For, clearly, the more that was paid in rent to landowners by the remainder of the people for permission to live and to work on the earth in any locations having community-produced situation advantages, and the less of this rent that was taken in taxation by the public, the higher would be the sale value of the land. And if the land was worth more, then each community and the nation would be more prosperous.

There had been, many long years before, a strange

and rather obstreperous sect, sometimes called Single Taxers, who had treated these great principles with disdain and even with derision. The rents paid to landowners, one of these deriders had said, benefited the rest of the people the same way weasels in the henroost benefit the poultry farmer. Another of the Single Taxers had got the habit of annoying prominent and substantial citizens who had developed their communities through collecting rents, by making them listen to a story about a certain Mrs. D. Mentid whose cellar was infested with rats which, she said, were making her daily and hourly more prosperous. Mrs. Mentid would often speak rapturously of her rats. For, obviously, she would say, the more of her potatoes, turnips, carrots, cheeses and hams were consumed by the rats, the fatter and stronger and so the more valuable the rats would be. And if the rats were fatter and stronger—and therefore worth more—Mrs Mentid would be correspondingly more prosperous.

But, fortunately, the membership and the influence of this sect had latterly greatly declined, so much so that many of the literary intelligentsia of parlor pink proivities, who write for the high-brow magazines, such as the *New Republic* and the *Nation*, said the species was extinct, like the dinosaur and the pterodactyl and the like, and its philosophy out of date and not worth the attention of such intellectual leaders as themselves. It was very discreditable for an intellectual to harbor ideas which other intellectuals have found to be out of date. To a large part of the intelligentsia, as well as an overwhelming majority of the entire people, were fast coming to realize that taxes on land should by no means be increased, as the Single Taxers had urged, but should, on the contrary, be greatly lowered.

So now in all of the states the people began to demand earnestly and insisently and even clamorously that the taxes on land and sites should be reduced, in order to have more of the annual community-produced rent of land in the possession of the owners of land, and thereby make the land worth more and thereby make the states and the nation more prosperous.

Not only were landowners in general—the really leading and substantial citizens of the nation—favorable to the change; but especially were the owners of vacant lots in favor of it, for, as they said, they were deriving no income from these lots while holding them out of use and ought not to have to pay taxes on property which was yielding them nothing. Furthermore, a large number of the public school teachers, school superintendents and other public employees realized full well that the influential public opinion favored the reduction and even the abolition of taxation on the community-produced value of land, and that increased salaries could come only from other sources, so they were heartily in favor of other sources for taxation and of the reduction of taxation on land. Parent-teacher associations joined

in the crusade to relieve land of taxes, so that they could get more money for the schools and increase thereby the intelligence of the citizenry on such matters as taxation.

To secure the necessary revenues to run the various state and local governments, taxes were levied on the salaries and wages that the people earned by their work and on the capital they saved and constructed and the income from it, on such luxuries of the pampered and idle rich as moving picture entertainments, athletic contests, cigarettes, soft drinks, gasoline and, in many of the states, on all retail sales.

The result was a great tidal wave of prosperity, proving that the fears and predictions of opposition calamity-howlers had been groundless. For these calamity-howlers had overlooked the innate mulishness of the people and were therefore entirely unprepared for the really stimulating effects of the new taxes. The taxes on what people earned by their work goaded them to work harder and more cheerfully and to do much more work, so the country became a veritable hive of industry. The taxes on the capital they constructed and on the income from it instigated them to save and to construct more capital, so thrift became a national trait and the increased capital made industry much more productive. The fact that home owners had to pay more taxes when they improved their homes than when they did not, a time-honored American custom, incited them to do more improving and to buy more lumber and paint, more trees and shrubs, more grass seed and lawn mowers. The taxes on moving picture entertainments aroused among the poorer people a frantic eagerness to attend the movies and thus stimulated the building of theatres and the making of films. The taxes on soft drinks made it so expensive to live comfortably in the cities, and especially in the slums, during the heat of summer, that the poorer people were tempted to buy more second-hand cars and more gasoline and to take their families to the seashore and to the mountains and to various inland lakes for the summer months. But the gasoline tax prevented this. So they stayed in the cities and worked harder in order to be able to pay the taxes, and therefore became thirstier, and therefore consumed more soft drinks, as well as other drinks, and therefore stimulated the employment of soda-fountain clerks and the manufacture of beverages and of bottles and glasses. Finally, the taxes on all retail sales, by leaving, for industry and wages in all lines of production, a smaller per cent of the consumer's dollar, fired the working class with a new and driving ambition—a sort of holy zeal, or righteous rage—and thus made them more prosperous than they had been before the sales taxes were levied.

There was, indeed, one disrupting factor in this scene of joyful activity. The common people in each of the states were so enthusiastic about the substitution of the sales taxes and other taxes levied on them, for taxes on the community-produced situation value of land, that when-

ever a state senator or representative who had voted for the new taxes appeared on the street, all of the day laborers and mechanics and clerks and housewives burst quite spontaneously into cheers and rushed from their work in the sewers and factories and stores and kitchens and pressed about the statesman to congratulate him and themselves and to shake his hand. And the great statesmen in the state legislatures were so pleased at this that they appeared daily and even hourly in public places where the common people could see them. So the business activity resulting from the taxes was not so active as it might have been. But, after all, the disruption of business on these occasions brought diversion and excitement to the working classes, and aroused their patriotism and their pride in their state governments, and so protected and preserved them from the wiles of communists and other dangerous radicals. In fact, one of the very purposes of the new taxes on sales and the like was to make the working people more contented and stop the spread of communist propaganda among them.

But the really important cause of the increasing prosperity was the country-wide reduction of taxation on the community-produced situation value of land. This welcome tax relief for land enabled the owners of land to keep far more than before of the rent which non-owners paid them for permission to live and to work in those parts of the United States where community development made labor effective and life reasonably tolerable, and the fact that the owners could keep more of the rent made their land worth more and so greatly increased prosperity. Reducing the tax on land reduced the penalty of holding land out of use for speculation and made it easier for owners of unimproved land to keep it unimproved until they could get a reasonably high price from those who wanted to use it for industries and homes. The owners were no longer compelled to pay as high taxes as before on land which, since they were holding it vacant and idle, was yielding them nothing. So, in a little while, it came about that approximately half of the building lots in the principal cities and their suburbs, certainly more than before, and many of the mines and potential power sites, and more agricultural land, were being held out of use by speculators who confidently expected the land to rise in value. This increased the demand for the remaining land for industry and to build homes and thereby made land values throughout the nation higher and the people richer.

Although the indirect taxes on many working farmers and on the poorer home owners made their total tax burden heavier than if just the situation rent of their land had been taxed, yet they were richer because their land was worth more. Even if they could not enjoy so good a living, could seldom afford to attend the movies and could have hardly any of the real comforts and luxuries of life, still they were richer because their land would sell for more.

In the central business districts of the big cities, an increasing number of the well-located sites came to have values of several million dollars each, and all the more intelligent people, such as the owners of these sites recognized such values as an evidence of general prosperity.

Enthusiasm for the new policy was infectious and spread rapidly. Those whose great intellects had enabled them to foresee the adoption of the tax relief system—as well as to urge it—and who had therefore bought plenty of land while it was still cheap, were now rich, and they could afford the leisure to help the rest of the people understand the advantages of relieving land of taxation. Some of the rest of the people were not quite sure about these advantages and needed to have them explained.

There were, to be sure, a few dissentients of the chronic kicker type, who did not like the idea of having land expensive even though property values in the nation were thus increased by billions of dollars, and whom no one seemed able to convince. These dissentients objected that it was now harder for most people to buy homes than it had been, and harder for cities to buy land for playgrounds for the children and for parks, that mortgages were necessary to enable any but the well-to-do to buy land for homes or farms or business, that crowding in the slums was getting worse and that the speculative holding of land out of use was interfering with industry and production and raising the cost of living. What most of the kickers appeared to desire was that the community-produced rental value of land should be the first and principal source of public revenue. It is to be feared that they had been infected with the virus of Single Tax.

But such critics failed to realize the importance of high land values as a foundation of prosperity. Lacking the vision and the breadth of view of the substantial landowning class, they were unable to see beyond the immediate apparent pecuniary interest.

As a matter of fact, it was not alone the owners of land who benefited by the new policy. For it should not be forgotten that from their large and increasing rents the landlord rich were able to employ many a butler, gardeners, caddies, nurse maids, kitchen maid, interior decorators and companions, and to buy jewelry and steam yachts and silks and satins and expensive liquors. Even, therefore, if more did have to be paid by working people for permission to work and to live on the land, this money was spent by the landlords in demands for the services of the poor. So the poor, by enriching the landlords, indirectly enriched themselves.

Although some of the poorer and less educated people could not understand this, it was quite clear to those who were intellectually acute and who could reason out how a person becomes richer by having to pay more to others and by keeping less for himself, because then these others have more with which to demand his goods and services.

Of course it would not have made the landowners richer to tax their rents and give the proceeds to the poor, even though the poor could therewith buy more; but all of the landowners and, indeed, a good many of the poorer people, were able to see how it enriched the poor to pay more of the taxes and more rent to the owners of land. Some of the landowners sacrificed considerable leisure time which they might have enjoyed in playing golf or watching horse races or dog shows or examining and purchasing antiques or travelling in Europe or vacationing in Florida or Hawaii, in order to explain this important economic phenomenon to those of the common people who could be made to understand it.

There were, to be sure, a few of the common people who were too ignorant to get a clear understanding of the matter even with all this explaining. Strange as it may seem, some of these began to burglarize the stores and engage in hold-ups and pick the pockets of copper and steel and coal and oil and gas magnates and of other great landowners. When apprehended they would say that they were merely trying to increase the prosperity of those they appeared to be robbing, that the money they thus secured was spent in buying goods from the very stores they had burglarized and from the very magnates whose pockets they had picked and that so business was stimulated and everybody's prosperity was enhanced.

It was, in truth, most unfortunate that, despite the sacrificial efforts of the owners of natural resources and of valuable city sites to make the recipe of prosperity clear to the common people, such mistaken notions as this should gain currency. Obviously, the incidental disreputable and illegitimate and violent thievery did nothing to raise the value of land and could not, therefore, increase prosperity. Stern repressive measures had to be adopted, and the owners of land and natural resources had to sacrifice even more of their time and money to make the recipe of prosperity understood by the masses generally. But, gradually, even the most ignorant began to see the light, thereby justifying that abiding faith in the intelligence of the common people and in American institutions and in high land values, so eloquently and often professed by the leaders of our great party.

It ought to be noted at this point it was not just indirectly and through the general stimulus to business from high rents and land values that the common people hoped to gain from tax relief for land. A number of the poorer citizens reasonably expected to profit directly from an increase in the value of remote and swampy building lots which they had been able to buy on the installment plan.

\* \* \*

When the farmers and home owners and owners of business sites and the real estate boards and land speculators and teachers, and the people generally, saw what

prosperity was being brought about by the simple expedient of relieving land of taxation, when they realized how the leaving of nearly all of the community-produced rental value of land in the hands of private owners had raised the value of all the land in the country and, by encouraging speculative holding of vacant land, had still further raised this value; they began to wonder if they could not devise other policies to raise the value of land and to promote the prosperity of the nation still more.

It was quickly seen that any further measures, to be effective, must be national in scope, and all the people began to look hopefully to their newly elected President for leadership in this great adventure. The President, who had pledged himself to work in the interests of the forgotten man, saw clearly that this forgotten man was typically the landowner, whose land was worth too little even yet, despite the spread of the tax relief policy among the states, and he did not disappoint an expectant nation. After a careful and statesmanlike consideration of all the important facts, an administration bill was introduced into Congress, which provided that new and additional taxes, to be known as processing taxes, should be levied on various productive processes and that the proceeds should be turned over to agricultural landowners, the rich and prosperous as well as those heavily mortgaged, whose land was being used for production, on condition that they should at once withdraw a large fraction of this land from use. The administration should have the right, if circumstances seemed to warrant, to increase this fraction. Congress passed the new legislation with enthusiasm and alacrity and the new policy was put into effect at once.

The good results were almost immediately manifest. Owners of farms and plantations on which there had been numerous tenants and farm laborers, made haste to terminate their contracts with a large number of their tenants and discharged many of their laborers, their hearts overflowing with gratitude for the wise leadership and statesmanship of the President, who had not failed to remember the long forgotten men to whom God, in his infinite wisdom, had entrusted the land and natural resources of the country. In truth, the day of these forgotten men seemed to have dawned at last and the glory of the rising sun of their prosperity illumined all their thoughts and anticipations.

For the policy of paying owners of land to remove it from use, reduced the amount of land available for farm tenants and farm laborers to work on, and caused them to bid more desperately for the chance to work on the land still left in use, and so enabled owners to charge higher rents and to pay lower wages, and so raised the value of their land. This, of course, made the nation more prosperous, and, therefore, in the end, made wages higher.

A few unthinking critics said it would be better to tax

the rent yielded by the superior land and to pay some of the farm tenants and farm laborers not to work and thus to make farm labor scarce and raise the wages of farm workers, rather than to tax workers in their food and clothing purchases to pay landowners to withdraw their land. Other critics said that if the owners of farm lands were to receive benefit payments from the government, only the more needy ones should receive the payments and the money required should be raised by a tax on the billions of dollars of community-produced value of city land instead of on the necessities of the poor. But what all these critics persistently overlooked was the basic principle underlying the new policy, viz., that high land values are the foundation of prosperity. To pay laborers for not working would most certainly lower land values rather than raise them, and to tax city land might lower its value by even more than the benefits to agricultural landowners raised the value of agricultural land.

But it was important to restore a proper balance between industry and agriculture. New Deal statesmen said they intended to put agriculture on a par with industry. There was much discussion as to what this meant. Many city workers had been out of jobs and, at times, cold and hungry. There had been jobs about as usual in the country. Narrow-minded critics said the President and Congress must be trying to bring about an equal unemployment among cotton croppers and other farm tenants and farm laborers, so that these would be cold and hungry too, in order that agriculture and industry might be on a par with each other. But such critics had no vision whatever of how all the people could be benefitted by making land scarce and raising its value and did not sympathize with the President's policy of aiding the forgotten man.

An unidentified old man—possibly the last living Single Taxer—was heard to remark about this time, in a street crowd down in Mobile, that it must have been the cotton croppers and other farm tenants and laborers of Scottish extraction that the poet, Robert Burns, had in mind when he wrote of "Scots, wha hae wi' Wallace bled." But what idea the old man meant to convey by his remark, no one seemed to know, and he slipped away before anyone had a chance to ask.

It was feared, however, that a considerable number of landowners might be tempted by the high prices of products, induced by the scarcity of them, to use all their land rather than to withdraw part of it from production. To make certain that none would follow a policy so disruptive of the entire New Deal programme, Senator X. sponsored a supplementary act putting a prohibitive tax on the excess output of plantation owners who failed to withdraw a sufficient proportion of their previously productive land from use. This new act effectively prevented too many people from having jobs raising cotton or bailing or ginning it or transporting it. But it was most unfortunate that so much of the valuable

time of Senators had to be spent planning how to make people withdraw land from use. It would have been much better if there had been less good land in the country to begin with, if, for example, the Sahara desert had been located in the South of the United States instead of in Africa.

Because of some complaints that a large number of former tenants were no longer needed on the land and that they were being kicked off to find such living as they could on the relief rolls, Senator N. introduced a bill providing that the government should establish a Farm Home Corporation through which farm tenants and farm laborers who desired to buy farms might be enabled to pay for them in installments. The bonds of the corporation were to be guaranteed by the government. This pleased almost everybody in the Senator's state. A few of the tenants and laborers thought they might possibly be able to buy a little land and, even, eventually pay for it, despite the rising price of land resulting from New Deal policy, if they could pay off their mortgages by easy stages. Even if they were unable to produce enough on the land to pay off these mortgages, at any rate they might be able to live on it several months during which no owner could dispossess them. And, of course, all of the landowners saw clearly that, if such a Farm Home Corporation increased the demand for and the price of land, they could get even more for such land as they might want to sell than the other legislation just by itself would enable them to get. It was obviously proper and desirable to pass laws that would raise the value of land. But to tax land values rather than other things, in order to make land cheap for tenants and laborers to buy, would have been obviously improper as well as inconsistent with much of New Deal policy.

\* \* \*

But the policy of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use was not fully effective, since it applied only to agricultural land. The owners of city land and mines and power sites and oil and gas wells insisted that some of their land should be withdrawn, too, with adequate compensation for withdrawing it. So the President shortly began to consider to what kinds of land and how far his policy should be extended.

Realizing the importance of technically trained expert advice, the President had already put several of the better known young economists of quasi-socialistic sympathies into important official positions and he consulted them frequently. The most distinguished of these, Dr. Z., following somewhat the line of argument of Karl Marx and various other socialists, emphasized the fact that production had become too efficient. Labor-saving machinery and efficiency engineers had been developing rapidly. It should have been possible to see, a generation ago, he said, that the world could be overwhelmed with goods. If, therefore, there was unemployment and a difficulty of finding jobs for the unemployed, this

was not at all due to the speculation in land which had come from the low taxes on land, nor yet was it due to the prosperity-building policy of the President and of the Secretary of Agriculture, of paying landowners to withdraw their land from use. In short, it was neither the speculative holding out of use of land in anticipation of a rise of land prices, nor the formal withdrawal of land from production for the sake of benefit payments, that was decreasing the employment opportunities of wage earners, but what was decreasing these opportunities was the efficient production of goods.

So the policy of restricting output by withdrawing land from use was consistent with the best conclusions of economic analysis and research. Consequently, further steps in the same direction, such as paying city landowners to hold more sites out of use, and owners of oil and coal land and iron and copper mines to hold more of these resources out of use, should be helpful in making the nation even more prosperous through bringing about more competition to use land and making land values still higher, and reducing not only the wheat, corn, cotton and tobacco which could be produced, but also the automobiles, radios, structural steel, oil, coal, shoes, shirts and other goods.

Perhaps, indeed, the national prosperity would be even more effectively promoted and more men given employment, if nearly all of the land could be withdrawn from use and the output of goods reduced by several hundred per cent. But the number of books on economics and sociology, especially those written by socialistically-minded young professors who had become administrators and advisors, should be increased rather than decreased, in order that the common people might learn how desirable it was to withdraw land from use, stimulate a healthy competition among tenants to use land, prevent an excess of goods, and thereby promote the general prosperity.

New legislation was quickly formulated and passed, applying the brilliant New Deal policy to land which had been used for all kinds of production and not merely to agricultural land. Not only did this prevent too great an output of goods to all other sorts, as well as of food and raw materials, and raise all prices, but, by inducing the withdrawal of more land from use than had previously been withdrawn, it concentrated the demand for laborers and tenants and enterprise upon the remaining land and greatly raised the rent and, therefore, the sale value of land. This, of course, made the nation richer than ever and raised wages and increased employment.

*(To be Continued.)*

TO see land is to discover it, and according to the childish laws of men to discover it is to own it. Ownership gives the right to gather its riches, and to that end kill all who stand in the way, whether they be Indians or white men claiming they saw it first.

"The Tale of Chicago," by EDGAR LEE MASTERS.

## Fortieth Anniversary at Arden

THE regular annual celebration of the birth of Henry George and the Fortieth Anniversary of the Delaware Single Tax Campaign was held in the Field Theatre, Sunday, Sept. 1, under favorable conditions, with a very good attendance.

Henry W. Hetzel presided and gave an appropriate biographical sketch of the life and work of Henry George and a synopsis of the history of the work in Delaware in 1895 and 1896. Mr. Hetzel said that Henry George was a brilliant example of the self-made man and that the Single Tax had, in addition to being an appealing fiscal proposal, certain spiritual qualities not apparent in the name. That the only difference between burglary and landlordism is that the latter is legalized. That Mr. Hoover has said that "to abolish poverty we must increase production," but to do this would only increase the value of land and further enrich landlords. The publicity of the Delaware Campaign was highly beneficial to the general Single Tax movement.

Mrs. Anna George de Mille followed Mr. Hetzel and paid tribute to the devotion and golden eloquence of Frank Stephens, one of Arden's founders. Mrs. de Mille reported a very great increase in the interest of people everywhere in our movement. She spoke particularly about the Henry George School of Social Science, paying a well-deserved tribute to Oscar Geiger, its founder, and urging a class in Arden.

Grace Isabel Colbron quoted Henry George's, "Unless its foundations be laid in justice, the social structure cannot stand." She said that our present world situation was proof that the foundations of society were not sound. That there was poverty even when men were fully employed. That labor was poor long before the present depression. That we treat symptoms, not causes. In answer to those who complain that Single Taxers do not go far enough, she said that when men go either to the north or south pole they usually return and tell about it as they can go no farther. Strictly speaking, the only property is what people individually create by their own efforts; that the value of land is a communal product and therefore not property in the true sense. Miss Colbron also paid a fine tribute to the memory of Frank Stephens.

Henry George, 3rd, made a very forceful and convincing statement concerning the basis of the large fortunes of the Astors, the Carnegies and the Rockefellers, which were all derived from law-made privilege. That such natural inequalities in men did not exist but only seemed to be so because of these privileges and the ability to stifle competition. He quoted Thomas Jefferson as saying that crime in this country followed the monopolization of land.

Edwin Ross, Jr., dwelt on the question of compensating landlords. As the Single Tax did not propose to take away title to land, there was nothing for which to compensate; and that if anyone was to be compensated it should be those who have been impoverished by an unjust and stupid system of taxation.

An open forum for questions and answers with an interesting discussion followed the regular meeting.—E. S. Ross.

## A Violation of the Creative Spirit

MUSSOLINI not only apes the Imperial Schoolmarm abroad, he apes her senile idiocies at home. In order to diminish as far as possible unemployment among Italian laborers the Inter-Syndical Committee has decided that "no mechanical means whatsoever shall be used for the next harvest." Demented as such a proceeding self-evidently is, it is a perfect reflection of the conduct of our municipalities, which insist on the greatest possible amount of hard labor under their contracts. There can be little risk of peace as long as war is the saner. Production is an aspect of Creation, and the failure to utilize every advance towards supreme efficiency is a violation of the Creative Spirit.—*New English Weekly*.