

great political parties can claim immunity under the first, while it is easy to see how both may plead the restraints of a too merciful Providence for their continued existence!

IN another column we print a letter from a Michigan subscriber defending Ford from our slap at the eccentric Detroit manufacturer. It may be true, as our correspondent says, that Ford has attacked the evils in both parties in his state. That much is to his credit. But it is very little. For we know that such attacks have not been made on fundamental grounds, since Henry Ford was never fundamental. Condemnation of corruption in political life comes easy. Most people know it. What they do not know are the real causes of such corruption, the social and economic mainsprings from which it emanates. The late Tom L. Johnson carried on a campaign in the city of Cleveland and educated the people there in the knowledge that the political corruption that prevailed was due to the opportunities presented for gambling in public franchises, and in the second place, and to a much greater degree, to the whole unnatural system that gives to private individuals the enormous wealth in land values created by the collective growth and industry of the community. It is of course to be regretted that he did not lay greater and more continued emphasis on the second consideration, but at least he never evaded it, and cannot be charged with that sin

OUR quarrel with Mr. Ford, however, is not that he is not fundamental, but that at a time when the world needs friendship and conciliation—very sorely it needs them—he has chosen to fan the embers of a bitter race hatred, and that ridiculous as are some of his contentions, he has done this with the artfulness of a malice that knows no limits. For he does know, as much as he can be said to know anything, that people who hate the Jews, or hate the Japanese, or hate the Irish, or hate the English, or hate the Negro, do not weigh the reasonableness or unreasonableness of any charge that can be made. It is enough with these people whom race snobbery has afflicted, that some eminent person of position shall iterate the charges. They will not stop to ask themselves what kind of corious mentality is behind the maker of the Ford machines. Henry Ford is what Americans call a "big name"—that is, a well advertised name.

THAT a Single Taxer should defend Ford is only illustrative of the fact that a man may call himself a Single Taxer, and know little of the doctrine of love at the base of that philosophy of Freedom which Henry George and Leo Tolstoy taught, and in the acceptance of which we are to that degree their followers. If the Single Tax is nothing more than a fiscal proposition then there is room for hate, of course, but if it is the doctrine of the restoration to all men of their rights to the earth, the great humanizing philosophy of social redemption—then there is no room for hate, no room for silly racial animosities. For we are then face to face with the truth that men are not only

born free and equal, but that if they differ in defects and excellences the good in all predominates, and that Burke was eternally right when he said that against a whole people no true indictment can be found.

An Unforgotten Author

IT is with a great deal of surprise we read an article in *The Literary Review* of the *New York Evening Post* of February 12, entitled "A Forgotten Author," by Ernest G. Draper. The author referred to is Henry George and the work indicated is *Progress and Poverty*.

It seems incredible that Mr. Draper, who shows a genuine admiration for the literary qualities of that work, should nevertheless imagine that it could be listed among forgotten books. So far from this being true, it is today one of the most widely read books in the civilized world. It is the only work on Political Economy by an American author now being read in translation in Germany, Hungary, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Spain and South America. Even in China a translation has been made which is now being read by the leading publicists of that country. It is the only American book on economics that is being quoted in the debates in the British Parliament. It has had the largest circulation of any American book since Uncle Tom's Cabin.

All this might be true indeed, and yet its present-day popularity have declined. Let us see as to this.

Henry George's principal work is not among the "best sellers." Neither is *The Tale of Two Cities*, *Les Misérables*, or *The Cloister and The Hearth*. The last novel of Harold Bell Wright far outstrips their combined circulation. In the same way some recent volume on economics may displace *Progress and Poverty* for a period. Five or ten years are needed for any sort of comparison. It would be easy to relegate Adam Smith's *Wealth of Nations*, the only work on Political Economy which for sheer genius can be compared with *Progress and Poverty*, to the limbo of forgotten books when compared with some of the more recent books on the same subject, but every intelligent reader knows that it is far from forgotten. The popularity of all great books is not the popularity of the "best seller," or the work that catches the attention of the man who reads everything.

Let us see, however, just where *Progress and Poverty* stands at the minute, and how it circulates at the hands of those who minister directly to the reading public. Before doing so we pause to cite a recent letter from Doubleday, Page & Company, the publishers of Henry George's works, in which they say: "The sale of *Progress and Poverty* continues to be a healthy one year by year."

Public libraries, of which requests have been made for information on this point, report a very general application for *Progress and Poverty*. The conclusion to be drawn from the many letters received from librarians is that the

the chief work of Henry George maintains a sure, steady popularity among library patrons throughout the country. It should be remembered that the "open shelf" system, to which libraries of reference are tending, leaves us without statistics as to the frequency with which the work is consulted in this way, so that comparative figures are misleading. One of the most prominent libraries in one of our smaller cities writes that they have eight copies of *Progress and Poverty* in constant use, and these were taken out twenty-one times in 1920. In addition the work was consulted in the Reference Department, but of this no record is kept. The New York Public Library keeps no statistics. The same is true of the Crerar Library of Chicago, which is a reference library, but it reports a frequent use of *Progress and Poverty*. In Brooklyn, twenty-nine branches have copies of *Progress and Poverty*, and these are constantly circulated. The University of Pennsylvania has three copies of the work which they have been compelled to rebind, so worn have they become by constant use. The copies of the work in the Denver Public Library have in like manner become worn out from use, and their places supplied by new ones. The Library of Jersey City reports its three copies called for many times during 1920.

The Cleveland Public Library says *Progress and Poverty* was called for thirty-two times during 1920. Seven other works of Henry George were taken out eight times for each of the seven titles. The Portland Oregon Public Library, says that it keeps no record of how many times *Progress and Poverty* was called for, but concludes as follows: "The fact that we have seventeen copies of the work is more of an indication of its popularity than anything else."

Further statistics could be given, but they would be wearisome, and in the nature of repetition. It is necessary to remind the reader that no public library keeps two or more copies of a book which by any latitude of definition can be called "forgotten." *Progress and Poverty* in this respect takes its place with the standard novels of which libraries usually contain two or more. Single copies of books not generally asked for are all that public libraries feel called upon to place upon their shelves.

A Voice From Calcutta

WE acknowledge receipt of a pamphlet on the "Problem of Healthy Towns and a Healthy Industrial System," by Capt. J. W. Petavel, lecturer at the Calcutta University. These essays on a momentous problem are printed from the *Englishman* for the Calcutta University Poverty Problem Study Fund.

The author has a scheme of town planning. He seems to find some good in all plans of social regeneration. He seems to imagine that they can be kept moving side by side. Recognizing that the population as well as the activities of a great city are heaped together without regard to convenience, beauty or efficiency; that land values tend to

distribute themselves out of all proportion to the kind of communication that would secure the best results and the highest comforts of the citizen, he proposes a public control of the sites rent and a system of cheap transit. The details of this plan the Captain appears to have worked out with some care. We have not the space to go into them more fully.

Our chief reason for calling attention to the pamphlet is that the writer shows some knowledge of the land question. And he realizes, too, what all those who contemplate the building of the better city and a better civilization realize, that the land speculator stands in the way. He says:

"Making towns healthy is a matter of clearing up sites to erect more open spaces, or to improve communication and sometimes to relieve congestion. This is always rendered enormously costly now by the compensations that have to be paid to owners.

And again:

"With Bolshevism and physical deterioration staring us in the face it is evidently sheer madness to attempt to go on with the system of land ownership under which no improvements can be made in the towns without scattering bounties to lucky landlords—the owners of the silver turned into gold, copper into silver and new copper created; unhealthy towns being the result.

At the very beginning of the article Captain Petavel says:

"A Blue Book just issued on the results of the medical examination of recruits for military service during the war, has revealed the fact that our industrial system has produced an amount of physical deterioration which the official document describes as "appalling," and shows to be threatening, not only to render a large proportion of our manhood unfit to defend the Country, but to make them also too weak to be efficient workers. Now, what are we going to do, faced with such a situation as this? Never in the whole course of history has a nation been confronted with a graver problem.

It is not possible, of course, that Captain Petavel fails to see that the industrial system which has caused this alarming physical deterioration and the abnormal and unnatural growth of cities by which healthy progress is arrested, is due to the lion in the path, the toll gatherer of civilization, the lord of the land, the landlord.

The fine spirit of the author, and indeed the constructive value of much that he proposes, lead us to deplore the lack of temerity which prevents him from facing the full consequences of the solution for the evils which he so clearly sees. For on page 8 of this most interesting pamphlet he shows that he does see it:

"Very far thus from being necessarily a bad thing, industrial progress has rendered it possible to give the workers the conditions of life that have been proved to be the best of all. The fatal thing is not industrialism, but our having persevered in an industrial age with a land system that simply prevents matters from going their natural course, and evils remedying themselves in the natural ways.

On the fly leaf of this pamphlet appears a pregnant sen-