

There are chapters on Competition and the Price System, Money and the General Price Level, Depression, Prosperity and Prices, the Rent of Land and its Taxation, and a treatment of the subject of Interest. Theories in conflict with the principles defended are examined, and the chapters are written with a clarity that makes easy reading. We doubt if any one will complain that Prof. Brown has not made his meaning clear, so that "he who runs may read."

It would not be fair to attempt anything like a review of this book, which is by the way a second edition, in the space at our disposal, nor to indicate save in passing that here and there are statements with which we may be disposed to differ. We would not subscribe unreservedly, for example, to all that appears in the chapter on Monopoly. Prof. Brown expresses his belief that intelligent public policy would dictate the effective prohibition of combinations where such prohibitions would not seriously limit competition. He is considering only extreme cases of monopoly that may result from combinations able to dictate the terms under which they buy materials needed in manufacture. Whether even these exceptional cases would survive under economic freedom is extremely doubtful. But, on the whole, the author's treatment of the subject is satisfactory with the exception noted. We might also register our dissent from Prof. Brown's apparent agreement with Prof. Irving Fisher's money theory.

The second work, *The Taxation of Unearned Incomes*, is an examination of various theories of taxation and a strong plea for the Single Tax, the objections to which, as made by certain of the economists, are examined and subjected to rigid scrutiny. He bares their confusions, and what seems their intentional misrepresentations with perfect good nature, but his pen is trenchant and occasionally he permits his indignation to assert itself.

Prof. Brown is a herald of the new school of political economy. In his hands it becomes no longer the dismal science. Economic Science and the Common Welfare marks the arrival of the new concepts in scholastic economics which students and writers on the subject will find it more and more difficult to ignore.—J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

A ROCK-RIBBER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

William J. Blech, author of a recent article in your paper, seems to decry sectarianism. But he surely is a rock-ribber. He says, "The rent of the land should belong to the people." Why not let it go at that? If occupancy and use were the only condition of land tenure, the Commonwealth Land Party should be satisfied. Tax, single or double, is a misnomer. In the words of W. J. Wallace, "We hope to create a public sentiment in favor of the public appropriation of land rent."

Philadelphia, Pa.

W. E. JACKSON.

LAND SLAVERY IN CUBA AND PORTO RICO

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Recently there appeared in the *New York World* a report made by the Social Action Department of the Catholic Welfare Conference on the misery of the working population of certain West Indian Islands.

After a year's work the Social Action Department has been able to see but one reason for the wretched conditions of poverty of the peons of Cuba and Porto Rico and to a lesser degree of Haiti and the Dominican Republic. It blames the American business man who has gotten control of the fertile lands and combined them into immense plantations of sugar, fruit or tobacco. It lays all the blame at the feet of the corporations because they employ the laborers only at certain seasons and at such wages that they barely exist. Since no other opportunities for work are available the workers are idle and half starved for long periods. All of which is true but it is not all of the truth.

The Social Action Department seems to hint that if every farmer held his own land the poverty would disappear. A knowledge of the cost of raising, transporting, and marketing such products as sugar, pineapples, grapefruit and tobacco, of the land areas available for cultivation, of the distance to markets and the transportation facilities, together with the census of field workers, will show the absurdity of the idea that any but large scale farming will pay in Porto Rico, to consider this as an example.

The real trouble is to be found in the land question of course. Most corporations do not own their land but lease it at exorbitant figures from absentee landlords. Land is exceedingly high so that capital is robbed at the start and naturally tries to make it up out of labor. The taxes on improvements and businesses are high. Company stores are a means of robbing the worker, but the corporations do not share in this nor do they allow it if it is brought to their attention. The outside stores or *tiendas*, being obliged to pay a tax, make it up in increased prices. A tax which appropriated the economic rent would bring down the price of land to the corporations and they could afford to pay better wages since their earnings would be greater. It would also cause other industries to be developed so that laborers not needed on the plantations could find employment elsewhere. Unfortunately the Social Action Department did not see this. As it is, it has made no direct recommendation for relief but has contented itself with damning American enterprise.

The report serves a useful purpose in showing up conditions as they are in contrast to the usual glowing accounts of the prosperity that one finds in some of high-brow periodicals.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

—JOHN LUXTON.

A CORRECTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Just a note for the information of the writer of "At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle." On page 14, he makes a reference to "political pensions." Actually there are only 5 available for ex-cabinet ministers. To qualify, a minister must have held his office for at least two years, and must make a declaration of inadequate means, which declaration has to be repeated at intervals so long as he shall continue to draw the pension. No Labor ex-ministers are on pension roll, first because none has served the qualifying period, and second because the whole 5 are at present being drawn by Tories and these may be expected to hold on while life lasts. We have one instance, the late Lord Cross, a Tory lawyer-politician, who held on to his £2,000 a year for 35 years. There are 3 first class pensions of £2,000 and two second class ditto of £1,200.

London, Eng.

J. W. GRAHAM PEACE.

FIVE DOLLARS REWARD

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I made an offer of five dollars reward to any one who would answer the following question: No man can by any possibility produce an everlasting value. Crops must be repeated year after year, so must clothing and everything that labor produces. What justification, therefore, can there be for any man drawing an everlasting income, either by rents, interest or dividends, so that he can live year after year without producing?

So far I have received no reply.

Sometime ago at a public meeting of citizens, I offered any man in the audience a thousand dollars spot cash, if he would tell me of any rational employer of labor, who told his men that the better a man did for him, the worse he would do to that man; and the worse a man did for him the better he would do for that man, he would give him a chance to gain a fortune.

Any one who will accept that reward, stand up. I waited in vain.

At one of the meetings of the American Academy of Economic and Political Science in Philadelphia, the subject of unemployment was