

real difference between parties and that consequently State elections have degenerated into annual scrambles for office and patronage by the politicians, who, to cover up the absence of real issues, encourage the voters to support in the State the party they favor nationally as recording their approval or disapproval of the national administration. Experience shows that this advice is generally followed and that the absence of real issues goes unnoticed.

The committee desires to state that it does not arrogate to itself any power or control over any State organization; that its individual members will enroll in their respective State organizations, support their duly elected officers and abide by the rules and regulations of such organization.

A. BASTIDA, Secretary,
For the Committee.

WHAT PROPHET WROTE THIS?

And it came to pass as the people increased in number the rulers and chief men grew fat and proud, for they walked not in the way of the Lord, but turned aside after lucre, and took bribes, and perverted judgment.

They gathered unto themselves the lands of the tribes and thus forced the people to labor and bring unto them the fruit thereof, so that the people hungered while yet they brought in corn and the increase of the herds.

Now the people knew not the manner in which they were despoiled but moaned in misery from day to day.

Then came there a prophet sent of God, who spake unto them saying,—

Hath not the Lord thy God given thee the land as an inheritance, with the command to subdue and replenish it?

Did not the Lord thy God, speaking through the mouth of His servant Isaiah, curse those who added house to house and field to field until there was no place for the people?

Arise therefore, gird up your loins and demand from the rulers the land which

thy God giveth thee,—that ye shall inherit it, one as well as another.

Now when the rulers saw the people assembled in rebellion their blood turned as water in their veins, for they said—who can withstand the multitude when it speaks as one man?

But the scribes and overseers counseled that emissaries be sent among the people to sow dissension and lead them astray.

These came unto the people with alms and doled out charity and urged them to ask that certain tithes be lifted, that wine be not drunk and that they save their pennies and put them out to usury; and from the people they raised up some to be overseers and judges and these also did urge the people in like manner.

Whereupon the people drew apart into rival camps and their hands were lifted against each other, and thus came the rebellion to an end.—AD-ITSAB, Chap. 1, verses 1 to 11.

DEBATE IN NEWARK BETWEEN EDMUND B. OSBORNE AND GEORGE H. GOEBEL.

On Sunday evening, March 7th, a debate on socialism occurred at the Strand Theatre, Newark, between Edmund Burke Osborne, the well known Single Taxer, and George H. Goebel, a prominent local Socialist. The question was whether it was to the interest of the working class to vote the Socialist ticket. Mr. Goebel contended that none of the old parties had anything to offer the working man, that they had failed in their pledges to carry out reforms in the interest of labor and that the best way for the working people to accomplish their ends was to stand solidly together and vote the straight Socialist ticket. He pointed to the labor legislation that had already been secured as due to the influence of the growing Socialist vote upon the old parties. Mr. Osborne, while in sympathy with the Socialist ideals, contended that it would be better for the working class if they united with one of the old parties on some practical measure of reform like public ownership of public

utilities or the taxation of land values and the exemption of labor products, measures which, if taken one at a time, could be realized by concentrated effort. The Socialists however, were determined to keep their eyes fixed on the remote ideal, unwilling to reach the goal step by step as history shows all human progress has been realized.

The principle of competition in industry he believed to be sound and necessary for the best development. He favored experiments in cooperation such as cooperative stores and as soon as feasible, cooperative factories to train the people in this method of satisfying their wants and gradually fit them for a wider application of the principle.

The spirit of the debate was most friendly and the audience sympathetic to both contestants.

Professor Byron C. Matthews acted as moderator and the audience was left to decide for itself whether they preferred the staunch idealism of Mr. Geobel as a means of political propaganda or the more practical program of Mr. Osborne.

HOW SLUMS SLAY.

Some new figures on this subject have just been prepared by Dr. Buchan, the Medical Officer of Health for Bradford, Eng. According to these, the death rate in one and two-roomed homes was about 25 per thousand last year, while the deaths in three-roomed houses were 20. On the other hand, the mortality rate in four-roomed houses was 12.4 and that in houses of more than four rooms 8.6 per thousand.

Thus the death rate where the people are crowded together is three times what it is in the other places.—*Toronto Health Bulletin.*

An effort is being made to organize the Single Taxers of Mississippi. In this work D. P. Dear, of Meridian and R. S. Phifer, of Jackson, are taking the lead. A recent debate in the State Agricultural College has awakened the hope that this State, never a very active center of the doctrine, may be able to perfect an organization.

CORRESPONDENCE.

UNDERSTANDS MR. BASTIDA.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I think I understand how Mr. Bastida feels. I don't believe in property in land any more than he does—I even go further, perhaps. The land doesn't belong to the people collectively any more than to any of them individually. It's the *use* of the land, not the land itself, to which everybody has an equal right. And in the use of the land it is the duty of each generation to remember that there will be others.

Property in land is the bane of all progress. The day is coming when those who uphold it, or even condone it, will be classed with those who upheld or condoned chattel slavery. This talk about recognizing the ownership of land itself but not of its rent, is like saying to a slaveholder, "You own the negro but not his wages; we are going to confiscate them."

Nevertheless, it proved impossible to found a successful political party upon the principle that property in human beings was wrong and should be abolished.

The beginning of the end of slavery was when its further extension was voted down. The argument that killed slavery was that *it didn't pay*. Hinton Rowan Helper failed to open the eyes of the South to that fact, but he did open the eyes of the North. The North had found out, long before Helper's time, that slavery in this latitude didn't pay; but the "Impending Crisis" showed that it wasn't paying in the South, either; that, consequently, it wasn't likely to pay anywhere in the country. It wasn't by talking about the wickedness of slavery that Ely Thayer got the money to colonize Kansas with anti-slavery settlers, but by reminding Northern business that Kansas as a free State would be a better customer than Kansas as a slave State.

We've got to open the eyes of business to what property in land is doing to business—hampering and throttling it at every step, preventing the possible production of wealth to an extent beyond present computation. We've got to show that collecting ground rent every year and