

improvement and progress that bars the way to peace and contentment and until the iniquity is faithfully dealt with, unrest and chaos will continue to baffle all inquiry.

The next step forward, to quote Mr. Churchill when he was not with the "fools": "Is one that will secure the double advantage of free trade and free land together, a commercial system from which as far as possible all form of monopoly has been rigorously excluded." Protection is an issue to-day because of the failure of the professing followers of Cobden to be true to the principle in all its fullness. But the principle will not be denied. As Henry George prophesied, the Tariff Question has passed into the agitation of the Land Question, and the Taxation of Land Values emerges at every point in the debate to trouble the vision of its declared opponents and to inspire all who realise its potency and power for good.

J. P.

WILL OUR CIVILIZATION SURVIVE?

By Will Atkinson

Is our civilization so founded that we are safeguarding the happiness of our children's children? If not, how should it be changed?

Lowell wrote, in *THE PARTING OF THE WAYS* :—

"Through the streets of towns where chattering cold
Hewed wood for fires whose glow was owned and
fenced,

Where nakedness wove garments of warm wool
Not for itself; or through the fields it led,
Where hunger reaped the grain it might not eat,
Where idleness enforced, saw idle lands,
Leagues of unpeopled soil, the common earth,
Walled round with paper against God and man."

And in *THE LAW OF HUMAN PROGRESS* (originally printed as the tenth book of *PROGRESS AND POVERTY*) Henry George, with inexorable logic, and with an eloquence unequalled in all English literature, accounts for the growth and decay of all past civilizations and points out the only way we can escape a similar fate.

He proves that "association in equality" is "the law of human progress"; that it is the universal law; that it is unchanging and beneficent; that it is the moral law: "Just as social adjustments promote justice, just as they acknowledge the equality of right between man and man, just as they ensure to each the perfect liberty which is bounded only by the equal liberty of every other, must civilization advance. Just as they fail in this, must advancing civilization come to a halt and recede. Political economy and social science cannot teach any lessons that are not embraced in the simple truths that were taught to poor fishermen and Jewish peasants by One Who eighteen hundred years ago was crucified—the simple truths which, beneath the warpings of selfishness and the distortions of superstition, seem to underlie every religion that has ever striven to formulate the spiritual yearnings of man."

But Henry George does far more: he points out, clearly and unmistakably the path of security and freedom; the only method by which humanity may continue its upward course and every improvement in mechanics and arts, every new invention, every new discovery in science, shall benefit all, shall be a step toward greater freedom and equality, and by the adoption of which we may assure our children's children the blessings of plenty and peace.

COAL AND POWER

THE LIBERAL POLICY: IS IT PURCHASE OF MINING ROYALTIES AND MINERALS OR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES?

Sir Edgar Harper, F.S.I., in a letter to the *WESTMINSTER GAZETTE* of 10th June, discussed Mr. Frank Hodges' proposal in his address to the Warwickshire Miner's Association on 6th June that a scheme should be formulated: "A scheme for the erection of low temperature carbonization plants, for the utilization of waste gases, for the recovery of oil, and other valuable by-products, for the scientific burning of low grade fuels on the basis of the best modern pulverised fuel practice."

"The preparation of such a scheme," Sir Edgar wrote, "is a proposal likely to command universal support from power-users; but as the taxpayers are to be asked to advance several millions in order to put the mining industry in the way of prosperity, any such scheme will require most careful consideration from their point of view. . . . The receivers of Royalties who are the legal 'owners' of the coal, cannot be compelled—except by Act of Parliament—to contribute towards the cost of the enterprise; but is certain to increase the value of their property very considerably. As it is, they derive, in most cases, large incomes from royalties upon the coal gotten, though neither they nor their predecessors in title can have had any share in Nature's bountiful provision of this most useful mineral. But as the law stands they are entitled to continue in receipt of the present royalties.

"Should, however, the scheme now proposed come into force, it ought to be so framed as to secure that those who finance and carry it into effect—the State, the colliery companies, and the miners—should alone participate in the profits, no part of which should go to increase the income of the royalty owners, unless they contribute in due proportion towards the cost of the scheme."

To these pertinent questions put by Sir Edgar Harper the *WESTMINSTER GAZETTE* answered in its leading article as follows:—"The reply is simple, for the report of the Committee set up by Mr. Lloyd George (which published the book called 'COAL AND POWER') proposes the purchase of all minerals and royalties by the State, and to the Royalty Commissioners proposed to be appointed wide powers are given to insist on better housing conditions, better gardens, better town-planning, better sport and recreation, to make the new mining village a very different thing from the old one."

This Statement on the part of the *WESTMINSTER GAZETTE*, with its open advocacy of the purchase of mineral royalties, drew forth the following challenging letter from Mr. Charles Bevan, published in the same paper on 15th June:

"I have read with interest your leading article of Wednesday, the 10th, but would point out that the 'Coal and Power' proposals submitted by Mr. Lloyd George's Committee are a mixture of compensation and confiscation. There is no suggestion, as I gather from your statement, that "all the minerals' should be purchased by the State. The Committee divided minerals into three classes: (1) those being actually worked; (2) those not worked, but whose presence is known or presumed to exist; and (3) those which as yet are unsuspected. As to class (1) the Committee proposed outright purchase of the mineral royalties; as to class (1) there was a time limit of five years for compensation but owners had to put in a claim within that period stating that minerals existed on their estates, and they had to declare the value of such minerals; the State