

tion in the midst of plenty and "overproduction"—before you decide that idle men and idle land is a paradox which defies human reason—before you admit that the Pilgrims accomplished, with untold less facilities, what we cannot do (i. e., keep every last soul employed except he be lazy or infirm), read "Progress and Poverty" by Henry George.

Do not be prejudiced because he was not a dean or a professor. Never mind who he was. Read what he says. Read it with an open mind. It's all in simple English. You may rest assured that he leads away from, not into, Socialism, Communism, Collectivism, Dictatorism, Paternalism, Republicanism, Democratism, and every other emotionalism which deals in sophistries, aphorisms and platitudes.

You can obtain the book at any public library or you can buy it for the low price of one devalued dollar.

Go to it, and may the good Lord lubricate your mental mechanism.

#### HOW LOW IS HIGH?

The tax of which the Republican party is most proud is that which so long has been heralded throughout this nation as a "protective tariff." This tax, which is added to the foreign salesprice and paid by the American consumer of foreign goods—and which is accompanied by an equal increase in cost of domestic goods—is supposed to protect the self-same American consumer. That is, if you will permit us to tax you we will protect you insofar as you pay such taxes. This is the identical principle which motivates the racketeers' "unions." The racketeers, however, actually "protect" you from their molestations as long as you pay and pay. The tariff, on the other hand, does not give to you immediate and individual protection—you are left to find that haven of refuge in your work-a-day dealings with your fellowman. In other words, the tariff collects payment for something which is merely promised, whilst the racketeer actually delivers the "hands off" security.

In advocating a "high protective tariff" (i. e., a high tax) the Republican party frankly acknowledges that the tariff should not be too high. Just high enough for protection—"to protect domestic markets, workers and industries from cheap labor abroad and to provide revenue." With withering contempt they point out that the Democratic tariff seeks only to "provide revenue"; no protection—not an ounce—not even a hypodermic. To show, however, that they are not unmindful of the persuasive Democratic arguments that high tariffs kill foreign trade, our Republican kinsmen take great pains in showing that the Hawley-Smoot tariff act is much lower than some previous tariffs. It averages only 16 per cent as against 23 per cent under the McKinley law—20.9 per cent under the Wilson law—25.8 per cent under the Dingley law and 19.3 per cent under the Payne-Aldrich law.

We pause to wonder how the high protective tariff of the Hawley-Smoot Act (15 per cent), which is lower than the low tariff of the Wilson law (20.9 per cent), delivered high-class protection under a high tariff which is lower than a low tariff.

We have a selfish satisfaction, nevertheless, in listening to high protection at 16 per cent as against no protection at 20.9 per cent, because, you see, we save nearly 5 per cent and get the promise of protection in the bargain. Consequently, if we never find that protection, which we assume is lying around loose somewhere in this land of the free and home of the brave, we are still 5 per cent ahead with our jack in this pastime of high-low-jack-and-the-game. If we should stumble onto this promised protection—well that's so much velvet.

'Sneer as we kin make out—from what the Republican National Committee sez—the Republican tariffs (taxes to you) are always high enough to be high and never low enough to be low.

If you noticed that the Dingley Tariff was 25.8 per cent as against the Hawley-Smoot 16 per cent, you may wonder how high is high. On the other hand, when you read that the Democrats had a high low-tariff of 20.9 per cent as against the Republican low high-tariff of 16 per cent, it 'pears that its time we had a Supreme Court decision on where low ends and high begins.

With all due respect for our Congressional statesmen and their profound thought which confuses our understanding of high and low, all this stuff gives us an hysterical yearning for the common honesty and perceptions of Mr. Dooley, who, speaking of the tariff said, "They say the Foreigner pays the tax. He does after he passes Castle Garden."

SO far from the recognition of private property in land being necessary to the proper use of land, the contrary is the case. Treating land as private property stands in the way of its proper use. Were land treated as public property it would be used and improved as soon as there was need for its use or improvement, but being treated as private property, the individual owner is permitted to prevent others from using or improving what he cannot or will not use or improve himself.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY.

THE earth is an entailed estate—entailed upon all the generations of the children of men, by a deed written in the constitution of Nature, a deed that no human proceedings can bar, and no prescription determines.

THE LAND QUESTION.

FOR it is true, as was declared by the first National Assembly of France, that "ignorance, neglect, or contempt of human rights are the sole causes of public misfortunes and corruptions of government."

HENRY GEORGE, "Protection or Free Trade."