

Mr. Fred Skirrow keeps Yorkshire papers well supplied with matter. Two of his recent contributions are reprinted in our present issue. Among his "letters to the editor" and special articles we may mention those published in the YORKSHIRE OBSERVER and the BRADFORD TELEGRAPH on *Indirect Taxation*, on the *Purposes of Protection* and on the *Protection Danger*. Mr. Skirrow has gained the co-operation of the LEEDS WEEKLY CITIZEN in his very effective Press work, and has secured publication in that paper not only for his own writings, but also for other Single Tax contributions.

On 13th May the LEEDS WEEKLY CITIZEN printed an article by Mr. E. J. Brierley on *Labour and the Land Question* in which Labour leaders are urged to promote the Taxation of Land Values. In the same paper arrangements have been made to publish, in two instalments, an article by Mr. C. E. Crompton, on *Will the Single Tax on Land Values cure Unemployment?* based on and elaborating the "Notes" of his address on the Single Tax printed in our April issue.

Councillor Mervyn Stewart wrote to the CORNISH ECHO of 29th April on the *Cause of Industrial Unrest*; Dr. Percy McDougall wrote to the MANCHESTER GUARDIAN of 7th May on *Lenin's Dilemma* and the Russian land question, showing how Tolstoy's policy had been ignored; Mr. James Busby wrote to the GLASGOW TIMES of 10th May on the *Real Law of Wages*, and to the GLASGOW HERALD and the EVENING NEWS of 24th May on *Mining Royalties and Miners' Wages*.

Mr. Eustace A Davies contributed to the SOUTH WALES PRESS of 18th May an instructive article on the *National Pool*. In the same paper, on 11th May, Mr. D. R. Cartwright had a column article, entitled the *Wages Question*, dealing with land monopoly as the cause of industrial war.

Mr. Chapman Wright had letters in the BIRMINGHAM GAZETTE and BIRMINGHAM POST of 30th April on the *Exemption of New Houses from Taxation in New York*; and in the BIRMINGHAM NEWS of 14th May on the *Re-valuation of Birmingham*, and the opportunity it should have afforded to assess and rate land value, apart from improvements as in Sydney, Johannesburg and other cities in the Dominions.

Week by week Mr. J. O'D. Derrick, in his columns as Scottish correspondent of the IRISH WEEKLY AND ULSTER EXAMINER, devotes space to emphasizing the importance of the land question. On 23rd and 30th April he had two brilliant articles making it abundantly clear, with many telling examples, that landlordism was at the root of the trouble in the coal industry.

Mr. F. T. Comerford has had a number of letters on Rating, Housing, Land Settlement, etc., in succeeding issues of the HASTINGS AND ST. LEONARDS OBSERVER and the ST. LEONARDS CHRONICLE. Mr. Geo. Linsell had a letter in REYNOLDS' NEWSPAPER of 8th May on *Land and Unemployment*.

Letters explaining the Taxation of Land Values were contributed by Mr. J. Greenwood to the YORKSHIRE OBSERVER of 22nd April and by "Progress" to the SHIELDS GAZETTE of 28th May. "Single Taxer" had a column article on the same subject in the CLYDEBANK PRESS of 3rd May.

More and more of such Press work should be carried on. It is excellent propaganda. Every day there is some topic or other, or some item of news offering a good opening to show how fundamental the land question is.

We are aware that many of our co-workers are active in this way, and that we may record their activities correspondents and writers of articles are asked to make a point of sending Press clippings to us.

**A Free Copy of "Land & Liberty" is an Invitation to become a Subscriber. Monthly 3d.; by Post 4s. per Annum.**

## A "SQUARE DEAL" FOR ALL (By F. SKIRROW in the LEEDS WEEKLY CITIZEN, 6th May.)

It was with great interest that I read Jimmie Wilde's fine appeal for a "square deal" for the miners. On many occasions, and in many parts of the country, I have met these men at public meetings, at their Lodge meetings, and in their homes. In my opinion, they are as fine a set of men as this country can produce. As Jimmie Wilde says, "there is no happier person, no better sport." They are entitled to a "square deal" and I sincerely hope they will get it, but I have my doubts. The fact is, we are all entitled to a "square deal," and, until we all get it the miners will fall short of it.

During the winter of 1917-18, travelling down one of the Welsh valleys on my way to Cardiff, after addressing a miners' meeting, I had an experience which I will relate, as it throws some light on the miners' problem. When the train stopped at a small station, two big, fine-built intelligent young men entered the compartment, of which for many miles I had been the sole occupant. We struck up a conversation, and I soon learned that they were working in the mines. Knowing by their speech that they were not natives, I asked where they hailed from, and was informed that they came from Hampshire, where they had been agricultural labourers. "Well," I asked, "what on earth made you leave an agricultural county where you worked in the sunshine and pure air to come and bury yourselves for so many hours a day in these hillsides?" "Because there is no money in our county. We only had 14s. a week wages there," said one of the men. "Do you mean to tell me that there are no rich men where you come from?" I asked. "Oh! there are some rich men, but wages are low," said the men.

In the Eastern, Western and Swansea valleys I everywhere met just such men from the agricultural counties—men who for higher wages had left agriculture for mining work.

This is the explanation of why wages of miners are less than they ought to be in all our coalfields. Wages of agricultural labourers largely determine the wages of all other classes of workers.

About 1915 the Duke of Marlborough told us that agricultural labourers were worth £250 a year to their country. This suggests the question: "Why did agricultural labourers work for 13s. or 14s. a week when they were worth so much to their country?" The answer is that being unable to obtain land, they were wage slaves, and, like all slaves, must produce more than they are allowed to consume.

Karl Marx has made it perfectly clear that it is through land monopoly that the workers are exploited. But, strange to say, the men who claim to be the true exponents of Marxian doctrine practically ignore the land question, and, like Don Quixote, waste their time in tilting at windmills—at employers whose power is based on land monopoly. Could folly go further?

"In the society of to-day," says Marx, "the means of labour are monopolised by the landed proprietors. Monopoly of landed property is even the basis of the monopoly of capital and by the capitalist." That being so, one would think that those who are out for a "square deal" for the miners, and all other workers, would concentrate their efforts in an attack on the cause of the evil.

Why is it that the Labour leaders and Labour papers are so indifferent about this root cause of all the trouble?

The upper millstone alone cannot grind. That it may do so, the nether stone as well is needed. No amount of force will break an eggshell if exerted on one side alone. So capital could not squeeze labour as long as labour was free to natural opportunities, and in a world where these natural opportunities were as free to all as is the air to us, there could be no difficulty in finding employment, no willing hands conjoined with hungry stomachs, no tendency of wages toward the minimum on which the worker could barely live."—Henry George in "*Social Problems*."