

material interests render them economically subservient, and whose welfare, for various reasons, influences his political conduct in their behalf.

WHEN he is not economically free, government possesses a power over the individual to influence his political conduct, and sometimes to crush him utterly in his material affairs. When the masses are poor they vote according to their economic herd instincts, and even when they are well-to-do must struggle for the possession or retention of economic privileges where opportunity is unequal. In such a state of society political opinions are colored to their economic needs; independence of judgment insensibly yields to the call for material advancement in a society of economic inequality. The standards of political and economic equality, however unflattering it may be to our prepossessions as "independent" American citizens, tend to exact uniformity in character, one declining as the other declines, rising as the other rises.

IN his Washington correspondence to the New York *Herald-Tribune* Mark Sullivan makes it clear that President Coolidge holds certain definite views with regard to the sharing of the cost of flood control and river projects that must be undertaken by government. His mind, according to Mr. Sullivan, is determinedly fixed in the opinion that "benefited property should pay." While undoubtedly the financial aspects of cost and benefit present some intricate problems, Mr. Sullivan says:

As one of many variations of the effect of flood control, there is some land and property that undoubtedly will be worth more after the improvements are made than it was ever worth before.

It thus seems clear to the President that the benefited land should pay.

WE congratulate our friends everywhere on the evidence this affords of the progress of the idea for which LAND AND FREEDOM stands. Once it has got clearly into the heads of our slow-thinking politicians that this is the principle that should govern us in the collection of revenue for public improvements, our cause is almost won. We congratulate also the President and his advisors. The principle once applied and generally accepted will send the Single Tax movement ahead with tremendous strides.

FIVE HUNDRED THOUSAND men in this city are without jobs, according to the New York *American*. Commissioner Hamilton says we would have to go back to 1921 "to find anything like the present unemployment situation."

WHEN truth is revealed, let custom give place; let no man prefer custom before reason and truth.

—St. Augustine.

Why People Leave Ireland

WILLIAM T. COSGRAVE, President of the Irish Free State, and Eamon De Valera, Republican leader, united in sending greetings to the American people on St. Patrick's Day.

President Cosgrave said:

We may well reflect on what might have been had circumstances enabled Ireland to retain the services of her far-scattered children.

Mr. Eamon De Valera, recounting that 300,000 of young adults left Ireland since 1921, said:

To provide employment so that it may no longer be necessary for our young people to emigrate is perhaps our most pressing problem in Ireland today.

The method of providing employment in the mind of Mr. De Valera is the old protectionist way, which has been tried and found wanting in so many lands. He says further on:

We must not only provide substantially all our own food but we must organize and equip factories to provide ourselves with boots, clothing, shelter, and a thousand other things we daily need and use—importing nothing we can produce ourselves.

This is the fundamental aim of the economic policy of the Irish Republicans.

It is to be observed that neither Mr. Cosgrave nor Mr. De Valera ask themselves why people leave Ireland—they merely deplore the fact without seeking the cause. Yet Fenton Lalor, Michael Davitt, Bishop Nulty and Henry George have told them why.

And with special reference to Mr. De Valera's remedy for unemployment we call attention to the following from Henry George written in the third quarter of the last century:

"Can manufacture be carried on without land any more than agriculture can be carried on without land? Is not competition for land measured by price, and if Ireland were a manufacturing country, would not the value of her land be greater than now? Had English clamor for "protecting home industry" not been suffered to secure the strangling of Irish industries in their infancy, Ireland might now be more of a manufacturing country with larger population and a greater aggregate production of wealth. But the tribute which the landowners would have taken would likewise have been greater. Put a Glasgow, a Manchester or a London in one of the agricultural counties of Ireland, and where the landlords now take pounds in rent they would be enabled to take hundreds and thousands of pounds. And it would necessarily come from the same source—the ultimate source of all incomes—the earnings of labor."

Ireland has no leader in these days to hearken back to those who sought to direct her steps in the right path. There is no Bishop Nulty nor Michael Davitt now; her cause

sleeps where the winds from the sea stir her long grasses and quiet rivers. With the political freedom won after centuries of oppression she fronts the future clinging to the old and poisonous policies which have spelt decay and death to so many peoples. And there is less excuse for her than for other lands, since she has the teachings of the Brehon Code written in the dawn of her history. She has the ennobling sentiments of many of her patriots who saw the truth and proclaimed it. That the land of Ireland belongs to the Irish people, and not to the Irish landlords, is a truth held by many a humble priest whose memory is long and who has read much.

The statesman who will appeal to this slumbering sentiment in the minds and hearts of Irishmen will light a flame that will light the world.

But not yet!

Acres of Diamonds

ABOUT two decades ago, one Russell H. Conwell devised a lecture bearing the title which heads this article and which he delivered more than five thousand times. In doing so he visited all parts of the United States and earned fees which he devoted in a large part to sending young men through college. The lecture was devoted almost entirely to inculcating the belief that the diamond fields of opportunity lay all about us and only needed intensive cultivation to bring success to every man who would apply the principles exemplified by the lecturer. The appeal was to the low ideal of commercial success, with only the saving grace that the surplus when won should be used for the same educational purpose to which the lecturer was devoting his own profits.

A dispatch recently tells us that the condition which Mr. Conwell saw only in his vision actually exists on government land in South Africa, where diamonds can be picked up with little effort. Indeed the statement was made that the Minister of Mines and Forests had within a few hours picked up nearly a thousand dollars worth of the stones. The first thought of the unreflecting citizen would normally be "Happy South Africa! where wealth can be had merely for the picking; as this limitless wealth exists on government land clearly the Union of South Africa can exist for the future without collecting taxes and one of the grave sources of human discontent will be allayed." But he is not allowed to remain long in the contemplation of this glorious vision. One of those gloomy persons known as political economists buttonholes him and says, "Do you know that this diamond discovery on public land may precipitate one of the greatest financial catastrophies of all the ages? Don't you know that for many years past the output of diamonds has been regulated by a benevolent monopoly, which only permitted as much of the crop to be marketed as would not depreciate the value of diamonds? Just how much of previous crops remains un-

marketed only those on the inside know. And this situation has come about not altogether because of the desire of the diamond monopolists to enhance their own profits, but also because an unregulated market might easily deprive the diamond of perhaps its most valuable quality, its reliability as an investment which can be turned into cash without loss should an emergency arise. Large numbers of citizens have come to realize that such precious stones minister to their sense of their own importance, to the vanity of their wives or other female relatives and at the same time furnish an unfailing resource in times of financial stress. What is going to happen if, in addition to the undistributed hoard of diamonds whose existence is suspected, this new source of diamonds exists in the hands of the government, which can with difficulty be controlled by the trust and which will be under pressure to sell the stones as fast as they are found to meet the demands for new revenue which, if they do not already exist, will certainly arise, when the existence of a new source of revenue has become generally known?"

Then if we go a step further and imagine the Union of South Africa to derive from its diamond fields a sufficient revenue to enable it to dispense with any tax levy whatever, how would the country fare?

All land holders would immediately assume an even more highly privileged position than they now enjoy. Paying no taxes they would be under no pressure to sell their land or to permit anyone to use it save under such conditions as were favorable enough to overcome the natural inertia which is one of the chief characteristics of highly privileged classes everywhere. The lot of the landless classes would be much more severe than it is now. Rents would rise to the highest points that the traffic would bear, and unless the disinherited classes lost all the instincts of self-preservation, revolution would be speedy and inevitable.

This aspect of the case indicates that taxation, if properly applied may be the salvation of the people, not their destruction, as so many have deemed it.

The So-Called Housing Problem

FOR nearly eight years New York has been struggling with a so-called housing problem which has attracted the attention of the civilized world. The diversion of capital and laborers into belligerent channels from 1914 to 1920 brought about its normal consequences, the total stoppage of building in a city which was growing in population at the rate of 100,000 per year. Naturally a point was reached where living accommodations became congested and houses and apartments ceased to be available at any figure which ordinary citizens could afford to pay.

For a couple of years the Legislature considered the problem without being able to discern that the only line of policy, whether sound economically or not, which would