

tudes is here embodied in language of undoubted eloquence.

The book should be labeled "Not to be read by clergymen who wish to make a comfortable living and who have families dependent upon them for support," for we doubt if the most complacent clerical supporter of the *status quo* can read it without some qualms of conscience.

The dramatic element in the book is marked and it is not quite easy to see if plays like "The Man of the Hour" have run through two seasons, why "The Broken Lance", which has an admirable *nom de theatre*, should not be put upon the boards and run with great success.

It has the religious element in it which makes so strong an appeal to the more serious-minded of the theatre-going public, and we have no doubt that if a sufficient number of orthodox clergymen could be found to denounce it to assure its success on the boards.

The figure of the militant Single Taxer is well conceived.

It is not our purpose to outline the story, because that is a form of petty larceny of which no good Single Taxer should be guilty. It can be summed up in a word as a book quivering with the impulse of to-day and no one will regret having learned the lesson which it has to teach, while its literary quality, on the word of several competent judges, is of a very high order.

JOHN J. MURPHY.

*A NEW BOOK ON LAND AND MONEY REFORM.

There have always been people to whom the Single Tax philosophy appealed, but who could not help but think that it ought to be amended. Most frequently it was the money question and a proposal of currency reform that was to be attached to the Single Tax. Unfortun-

Silvio Gesell, Die Verwirklichung des Rechts auf den vollen Arbeitertrag durch die Geld- und Bodenreform. Realization of the right to the full product of labor by means of money and land reform. Publisher: Bernard Herman, Leipzig, price, 3 Marks.

ately they could never agree upon any definite scheme of reform. The one denounces as pernicious what the other hails as the only way of salvation. No idea of value to the progress of economic science seems to have yet emerged from their controversies and I think we can take this as proof, that they are trying to solve a useless and self-imposed riddle, that they have fallen a victim to a pit-fall in the way of the human intellect, instead of working in the path of substantial progress.

I have for my part never been able to understand what the money question has to do with the land question, and after reading Mr. Gesell's book I still feel as unconvinced as ever. Yet if anybody could convince me it would be Mr. Gesell. His book is written in an extraordinarily lively and attractive style that with a little more polish and sound thinking would give the work a place among the classics of economic philosophy. Mr. Gesell can claim what nine tenths of economic writers cannot dream of—originality in thought as well as utterance. The main idea of his money reform is that the state shall issue paper money that shall diminish every day in value at the rate of 5 per cent. per annum. Of course coinage of gold and silver would have to cease. The purpose of this measure is to break the monopoly of the money-owner, to force the great financiers and the little ones to spend their money as soon as they get it. To-day money can be withheld from use without depreciating in value, therefore the money-owner is able to exact tribute from the lender in the form of interest. This would cease if the money owners were forced to lend their earnings to those who need them, and where to save would be to lose. In this way the money reform would abolish interest, land nationalisation would abolish rent, and the right to the full product of labor would be realized without the cumbersome and dangerous machinery of State socialism.

I have given my opinion beforehand and I shall not attempt to criticise these ideas. The future will show if Mr. Gesell is right. But I wish to say a few words

to those of our friends who think that they must have a complete scheme of reform for all questions of economic philosophy. No greater mistake can be made. To attach the Single Tax to any other idea, however sound and useful, will not strengthen, it will weaken our cause. Single Tax is so big a thing that it demands an undivided interest. Society cannot be treated as a machine gone out of order, to be reconstructed after a complete and infallible scheme of reform. Society is a living thing, and the questions which agitate society are not to be solved by statistics and theories, but by love and life. We do not know what will be the destiny of the human family. Therefore it is useless to think out a plan on which it shall work for ever. We need not care for everything. We only need to oppose those tendencies that lead to death and destruction, and to help these that lead to a higher and nobler life. All good things will help each other. But to confuse them is dangerous and can only result in weakness and inefficiency. It seems sometimes that this truth is overlooked by many of our friends.

GUSTAVE BÜSCHER.

HENRY GEORGE *BLADETSAMVIRKE*

The Henry George Journal Co-operation for Intellectual, Economical, and Political Freedom, Copenhagen, January 5, 1908, No. 1, Second Year.

The Single Taxers in Denmark have been remarkably active for a few years past. The agitation for a rational system of taxation carried on there has been pushed with great enthusiasm by the friends of the philosophy of Henry George; and it may safely be said that, in general, the truth is accepted there in a far greater measure by various classes of the community than is the case in the United States.

The little journal mentioned above is, in a measure, the organ of the Single Tax cause in Denmark. The issue under review contains some interesting matter, and indicates how closely our Danish friends follow the development of rational political

action all over the world. The leading article is not original with the editor; but it is none the less the best leading article, we may safely say, that could have been presented. It is entitled *Opgaven* (the Problem), and contains the latter part of the introduction to *Progress and Poverty*. It is accompanied by a half-tone portrait of Henry George.

An interesting article deals with the condition of farm laborers in Denmark, showing how the large estates are paying wages that hardly permit of even a bare subsistence. Another article dealing with the Land reform question in England is written with exceptionally clear insight into the matter treated. It is in particular pointed out that the Small Holdings Act, which has been before the present parliament, is by no means a Single Tax measure, nor have the land value taxation advocates in England been responsible in the least degree for the propositions of the Small Holdings Act. It is pointed out as well that it is of no great consequence under an equitable taxation system whether holdings be large or small, and that the Single Tax does not propose to limit holdings of land or natural resources by any arbitrary or artificial measure; but the Single Tax does propose to limit holdings by the action of natural law, and by applying the supreme test to the right of possession. This test is that of *use*.

The following statement in the same article is of great interest: "Henry George's platform is no infringement, neither of the right to own land nor of the right to occupy land. It is only an assertion of the true conservative idea that each pay a tax in proportion to the special privileges the community confers upon him—and these special privileges concentrate themselves and manifest themselves in land values—more especially so in large cities. And this taxation is * * * only a natural and legal limitation to the rights of property, without which, as a matter of fact, property rights could not exist."

An interesting little note in the journal refers to the fact that in certain Danish communities, where harbor improvements are required, petitions have been filed with the government by the property owners