

service from others also; and not as a duty either, but as a happiness.

"That, as I understand it, is why you of the Commission are so urgent in your appeals for a large number of small contributions of a dollar or less. You want the contributors. From my heart, I approve that policy. It is human; it is democratic; it is good politics. If every man and every woman, if every giver of a dime would give himself or herself also; if each self-giver would then go out and get others; and having their dimes or dollars, would send them on to get yet others in the same spirit, we would soon have this country girdled with living chains of living people all devoted happily to a happy cause.

"I shall sail for England on April 28th. I am going there to work. While I am working there you will be working here to continue the movement started spontaneously by the contributors to "match their own dollars as Joseph Fels did." The results already achieved indicate that it may succeed. If it does, it will indeed be a monument to Joseph Fels, for that was his spirit.

"I shall be glad to be reduced to merely one of equal contributors and workers in our cause; equal, not in amounts of money but in the heart we all put in our work. In a word I would like to match you all, but especially the humble givers, not only dollar for dollar, but man for man, woman for woman."

In a letter sent out by the Commission they say:

"One of our contributors suggests that a request be made of each of our present subscribers and of all interested, that he constitute himself (or herself) a committee of one to collect all small subscriptions from a nickel up, the smaller contributor finding it troublesome and expensive to remit such amount."

The REVIEW will act as a collecting agency for any who wish to contribute their small change, and will forward such sums to the Commission.

THE Saskatchewan Province Municipal¹ Convention overwhelmingly endorsed the Single Tax.

MR. FILLEBROWN, HENRY GEORGE AND THE ECONOMISTS.

It is a real pleasure to read anything that Mr. Fillebrown writes, and in a little pamphlet, "Henry George and the Economists," we mark the same delightful grace of expression which informs all that is written by the distinguished Boston advocate.

There is a reiteration of Mr. Fillebrown's well known views on the private "ownership" of land and public right to land value — (all of it?) — a distinction which to discuss has always seemed to us a delightful but profitless exercise.

But in this pamphlet Mr. Fillebrown essays to do more than this. We pass over because it would entice us into too broad a field the question as to whether Mr. George was justified in his assault upon Herbert Spencer in the "Perplexed Philosopher." But Mr. Fillebrown's pamphlet is chiefly interesting because it is an apology for, or rather to the professors of political economy. Incidentally it makes a reflection upon Mr. George's attitude which ought not to be allowed to pass without inquiry as to its soundness. For example, Mr. Fillebrown speaks of his (George's) "sensitiveness to the indifference of the professors." Was Mr. George indeed so poor a student of history and human nature not to know that teachers in institutions endowed by privilege would not be anything else but indifferent when they were not actually hostile?

As a matter of fact, Mr. George had discovered what most of us have since found to be true, that professors of political economy are not teaching systematized knowledge, but the merest forms of involved fancy, speculation, artificial systems, charlatanisms and conceits, matched only, if they are matched anywhere in the written word, in the theological disquisitions of a century or more ago.

Why pretend any longer? Go into some great public library and examine the political economy shelves. Every generation has added its quota to this literary lumber from the pens of political economy professors high in educational institutions. Not even the theological shelves contain tomes quite so dead. They are dead be-

cause they were still-born. They contributed nothing to the knowledge of the time—and were not meant to. They are for the most part dreary defences of institutions as they existed, with all the evils sanctioned by custom and upheld by privilege. Smith and Mill are the exceptions, and it was the glory of these men that they disclosed the worthlessness of everything that had gone before and nearly all of what followed.

Mr. Fillebrown's apology to the professors for the rudeness of Single Taxers comes too late. What is needed is not grave and graceful courtesy, but some appropriate epitaph for a World of Dead Books.

THE BROTHERHOOD OF THE COMMONWEALTH.

At the last meeting of the Supreme Council of the Brotherhood of the Commonwealth, Mr. Carl A. Moor, 273 Eleventh St., Brooklyn, was elected General Secretary in place of Charles Frederic Adams, who has been secretary since the organization was formed, and which now numbers about 2,000 members.

The Brotherhood, as is known to most of our readers, has for one of its objects the providing of a pension fund, or increasing income for old age. It now has a fund of \$10,000, and it is hoped that from now on an increased interest will be taken in the organization. As the nucleus of this organization is composed of Single Taxers it ought to be a gratification to all the followers of Henry George to become members. The dues, one dollar a year, will keep no one out. Any further information can be obtained by writing to the secretary.

THE SUIT AGAINST THE FAIRHOPE CORPORATION.

In the suit filed in the chancery court of Mobile, Alabama, for the dissolution of the Fairhope Single Tax Corporation some of the newspapers have pretended to see a failure of the Single Tax to work. Whatever the result of this suit no one can honestly pretend that the Hen. v George theory

is discredited. If the corporation is dissolved it will be because its administration is adjudged in violation of existing State laws.

The REVIEW has never been partial to colony experiments as a means of popularizing the Single Tax, for reasons not necessary to present at this time, but the dissolution of the Colony will furnish enemies of our movement with ammunition, of which they are sorely in need at this time.

We shall let Mr. Gaston, Secretary of the Colony, speak for himself:

"The suit gives the Colony no uneasiness. It welcomes the opportunity to put to the test its legal right to administer its property on the basis of its voluntary and mutual contracts with its lessees.

"While the Colony does not approve of the principles or methods of taxation followed by the State, it has in no way attempted to interfere with the same or do otherwise than comply with them in good faith, as becomes all good citizens. It only seeks to illustrate what it believes to be a better system of securing public revenue, by using the land rents which, as a private land-owning corporation, it might legally divide as dividends among its members, to relieve its lessees of taxes upon their improvements, by paying such taxes to them.

"That our community has, under this policy grown more rapidly and enjoys a larger public fund, than any other community in its vicinity, enjoying the same natural advantages, is so patent as to make one who denies it ridiculous where the facts are known. And every land-using lessee can also be shown to be an individual beneficiary of the policy.

"The net result to the lessee of the Colony, of the success of the suit, would be to compel the members of the corporation to take for themselves the land values which they are now using for their lessee's benefit."

Of course this was to be expected: The *New York Times* speaks editorially of "The Failure of the Single Tax" in commenting upon the Fairhope suit. As it had only a few days before presented the facts in its news columns with some regard to accuracy of statement, the only verdict possible is that editorially the *Times* is just an ordinary liar.