

businesses is the basis of the remedies proposed." But the owners of privilege are reassured by the following from the *New Republic's* study of the Report: "All this looks in the direction not of preventing or breaking up monopoly but of substituting sound public regulation for the vanishing checks of competition." So land monopolists and monopolists of every other kind, most of which owe their existence to land monopoly, have nothing to fear.

THE Report also proposes that the government interfere with the free flow of capital into the most profitable channels, if we understand correctly. These new Liberals believe that the national savings, estimated at £500,000,000, should be used less for investment abroad and more for industries at home. Whether this is merely advisory, or whether forcible steps are to be taken to keep these savings in the country, does not appear, but the latter procedure is an easy step in translating this glaring economic fallacy into action. Surely there must be many of the old-school Liberals still alive in Great Britain who will read this Report with stupefied amazement, not un-mixed with a real sorrow in seeing a great political party forsake its most glorious traditions in a hodge-podge of ill-considered Socialistic recommendations. The only thing we miss is the Capital Levy, and we are grieved at the absence of an old friend.

INCOME and inheritance taxes are said in this Report to be the most scientific (sic) forms of taxation and should be made to bear a large portion of governmental burdens. We are still depending on second-hand information as to this Report, but have no reason to doubt the accuracy of the *New Republic's* statement of its contents. And again we cry, Shade of Gladstone! For Gladstone condemned the income tax as "overwhelmingly energetic in minutiae." Others of the great Liberal leaders would have relegated the income tax to periods of emergency. None would have advocated extensions of or substantial additions to it.

ONE proposal of this extraordinary Report which the *New Republic* calls "striking" is for the establishment of an "Economic General Staff working in close touch with the Prime Minister and Cabinet." No wonder this is called "striking." The mischief such a General Staff could do passes all imagination. The business of regulation and "snoop," after "the general statistics of all businesses" were in their hands, would give work to an uncounted clerical force, a great army of functionaries, and a department more extensive than anything in the Soviet government of Russia, and indeed in the history of any nation since time began. From mining operating companies and great department stores to peanut stands, the Economic General Staff would be kept pretty busy.

ONE thing this Report clearly shows. The economic thought of British politics has gone to seed; Liberalism is dead; the Liberal Party has no leaders. Everything advocated in this Report, which is the voice of the party's more influential spokesmen, the Labor Party will do better and more fully, and for those who like that sort of thing the Liberal Party cannot hope to compete. And another thing the Report shows: the confusion of thought is the child of the confusion that reigns in the economic, ordering of the country. Where the influence of land monopoly penetrates every nook and corner of the land, the disposition to evade this question of first importance leads to policies of makeshift of which this Report is the astounding culmination.

OWEN D. YOUNG, of the Dawes Reparations Commission, and widely recognized as a financial authority, has recently declared: "Here in America we have the standard of political equality. Shall we be able to add to that full equality of economic opportunity? No man is wholly free until he is both politically and economically free."

WE sometimes have to rub our eyes when reading statements from our leaders and politicians. Often they speak the dialect of Single Tax economics as if they had learned the language. How is it they manage to ignore the meaning? What is equality of economic opportunity for instance? What is economic opportunity itself? Is it not land, and is not every piece of land where people "most do congregate" an economic opportunity?

BUT let us give credit to Mr. Young for understanding just what he says. If so, he accepts what Henry George taught. If so, he is one of us. If so, he will feel impelled to do something for the truth he believes in. And there can be no more fitting conclusion to round off a useful life and the highly honorable career which has been his, than the doing of something fitting the action to the words we have quoted.

FOR today, and indeed in no time in recorded history, has there been such a thing as "economic equality." And for this reason what Mr. Young calls the "standard" of political equality, which he says we have, is a standard to which we find it impossible to conform. Your economic slave makes a poor political freeman. The individual who is pinched by poverty, or who lives in fear of want, or to whom his possessions are insecure, is the slave of his ward boss, or other boss, or of unseen influences to whose dictation he must bow. It is impossible to think of him as acting on his independent judgment in the exercise of the suffrage. Though even in cases where he may not be individually concerned he still has connections whose

material interests render them economically subservient, and whose welfare, for various reasons, influences his political conduct in their behalf.

WHEN he is not economically free, government possesses a power over the individual to influence his political conduct, and sometimes to crush him utterly in his material affairs. When the masses are poor they vote according to their economic herd instincts, and even when they are well-to-do must struggle for the possession or retention of economic privileges where opportunity is unequal. In such a state of society political opinions are colored to their economic needs; independence of judgment insensibly yields to the call for material advancement in a society of economic inequality. The standards of political and economic equality, however unflattering it may be to our prepossessions as "independent" American citizens, tend to exact uniformity in character, one declining as the other declines, rising as the other rises.

IN his Washington correspondence to the New York *Herald-Tribune* Mark Sullivan makes it clear that President Coolidge holds certain definite views with regard to the sharing of the cost of flood control and river projects that must be undertaken by government. His mind, according to Mr. Sullivan, is determinedly fixed in the opinion that "benefited property should pay." While undoubtedly the financial aspects of cost and benefit present some intricate problems, Mr. Sullivan says:

As one of many variations of the effect of flood control, there is some land and property that undoubtedly will be worth more after the improvements are made than it was ever worth before.

It thus seems clear to the President that the benefited land should pay.

WE congratulate our friends everywhere on the evidence this affords of the progress of the idea for which LAND AND FREEDOM stands. Once it has got clearly into the heads of our slow-thinking politicians that this is the principle that should govern us in the collection of revenue for public improvements, our cause is almost won. We congratulate also the President and his advisors. The principle once applied and generally accepted will send the Single Tax movement ahead with tremendous strides.

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND men in this city are without jobs, according to the New York *American*. Commissioner Hamilton says we would have to go back to 1921 "to find anything like the present unemployment situation."

WHEN truth is revealed, let custom give place; let no man prefer custom before reason and truth.

—St. Augustine.

Why People Leave Ireland

WILLIAM T. COSGRAVE, President of the Irish Free State, and Eamon De Valera, Republican leader, united in sending greetings to the American people on St. Patrick's Day.

President Cosgrave said:

We may well reflect on what might have been had circumstances enabled Ireland to retain the services of her far-scattered children.

Mr. Eamon De Valera, recounting that 300,000 of young adults left Ireland since 1921, said:

To provide employment so that it may no longer be necessary for our young people to emigrate is perhaps our most pressing problem in Ireland today.

The method of providing employment in the mind of Mr. De Valera is the old protectionist way, which has been tried and found wanting in so many lands. He says further on:

We must not only provide substantially all our own food but we must organize and equip factories to provide ourselves with boots, clothing, shelter, and a thousand other things we daily need and use—importing nothing we can produce ourselves.

This is the fundamental aim of the economic policy of the Irish Republicans.

It is to be observed that neither Mr. Cosgrave nor Mr. De Valera ask themselves why people leave Ireland—they merely deplore the fact without seeking the cause. Yet Fenton Lalor, Michael Davitt, Bishop Nulty and Henry George have told them why.

And with special reference to Mr. De Valera's remedy for unemployment we call attention to the following from Henry George written in the third quarter of the last century:

"Can manufacture be carried on without land any more than agriculture can be carried on without land? Is not competition for land measured by price, and if Ireland were a manufacturing country, would not the value of her land be greater than now? Had English clamor for "protecting home industry" not been suffered to secure the strangling of Irish industries in their infancy, Ireland might now be more of a manufacturing country with larger population and a greater aggregate production of wealth. But the tribute which the landowners would have taken would likewise have been greater. Put a Glasgow, a Manchester or a London in one of the agricultural counties of Ireland, and where the landlords now take pounds in rent they would be enabled to take hundreds and thousands of pounds. And it would necessarily come from the same source—the ultimate source of all incomes—the earnings of labor."

Ireland has no leader in these days to hearken back to those who sought to direct her steps in the right path. There is no Bishop Nulty nor Michael Davitt now; her cause