

does not confront the administration with any policy that assures coalescence.

THE hopelessness of any rational "line up" is evidenced in the confusion which prevails in the Republican opposition. Mr. Frank Knox, proprietor of the *Chicago Daily News*, who is spoken of as a possible candidate against the administration, is an economically ill-informed gentleman who would supplant the AAA with prohibitive tariffs and export bounties! And with these discarded weapons—discarded by every well equipped student of economics—it is proposed to advance against the well-drilled forces of the administration armed, politically at least, with every advantage of position and securely entrenched in power. It looks like a hopeless struggle.

AND there is something else to be considered. Hungry men are not to be attracted by policies which, good or bad, do not touch them directly. Roosevelt has nearly all the promises, and a little turn in prosperity will do the trick for them. He said over the radio the other day: "We have turned the corner. This is not mere chance nor the ending of a cycle. We planned it." (We quote now from memory.) Already he is claiming it. If it even temporarily succeeds, Mr. Knox's plan for prohibitive tariffs and export bounties have small chance of attracting the voter. The cry will then be to let well enough alone.

THERE is as much economic ignorance in one party as in the other. You cannot fight ignorance with ignorance; you can only fight ignorance with knowledge. There is little to choose between Hoover and Roosevelt and less between Knox and Roosevelt. If this is to be the division the election of Roosevelt is assured. His bag of promises is still not exhausted and in the prevailing state of ignorance a slight turn in prosperity, though with the inevitable depression awaiting at the end, the cry of "We planned it" will be enough.

THE way to meet restrictions is not with further restriction. The appeal is to liberty. And the signs of reassurance as to the coming of liberty, though not visible in the political horizon, are gratifyingly plentiful among intellectuals everywhere. In the flood of books now taxing the time of those who read at all, Henry George is coming into his own. The times are ours. Slowly but surely we are breaking through. One of the keenest observers of the modern trend is Leslie Eichel, columnist for several hundred papers, who said recently: "As the New Deal staggers on, unsuccessful in its attempts to re-employ men, and as critics assault it with nothing to offer in its stead, the Henry George group of economists slowly push forward."

THERE is something vividly impressive in this march of a great idea, something that not only stirs a confidence in its early triumph, but a faith that is profound and deeper still. That is a faith in the orderly processes of the natural law in society. The cry of "God will it" heard in the old Anti Poverty days may be heard again. God has not forgotten his children. And if this movement set in motion by Henry George is now in its second stage it is none the less divinely ordered and in harmony with the law of justice which is the law of God. It will not be sensed by every one, even by many who accept the philosophy, but to others it will be clear that we are preparing the way for a civilization greater and more glorious than any of which we dream.

DO we claim too much for what appears to some as a mere change in taxation? If it were only that it would in truth be that we claim too much. But it is not that—not that alone surely. It was Goethe who said that the highest cannot be spoken in words. Truth is revealed in vision and to the eyes of the spirit. Imagine a world where there is no poverty, no wars, no national jealousies, only a world made free and intensively emulative. We may then be on the threshold of solution to other problems which we have little time to consider, too harassed to pause, too far removed from the experiences of the soul which are in the nature of divine intimations known but to the strangely gifted. The human race is not only the heir of all the ages, but is the inheritor of the future whose revelations, as the wise Goethe has told us, cannot be spoken in words, but are reserved only for a race made materially and spiritually free.

TO descend a moment but proceeding along what after all is the same line of thought, do we ever stop to think that the new world made possible by the far reaching change for which we contend will render obsolete much of the world's twisted morals, the eccentricities of many religious faiths, and also a great deal of the world's literature, some of its poetry, and great tomes of its philosophies?

SOME of the followers of Henry George will feel a keen sense of disappointment that our distinguished leader has failed of election to the Hall of Fame. This disappointment we cannot share. It took some time for Edgar Allan Poe, the most distinctive of American poets to crash the gates of the Hall of Fame, perhaps because he was fond of whiskey and needed very little to render him either inspired or helpless. We are reminded of Abraham Lincoln's answer to complaints that General Grant drank heavily. He said, as our readers will recall that he would like to know the brand of whiskey Grant favored that he might recommend it to others of his

generals. In the same way the kind of whiskey indulged by Poe might be recommended to some of the so-called poets who clutter the magazines with their almost incomprehensible verse.

THIS merely by way of digression. Sixty-one votes were required to elect. Henry George received twenty-six, or five less than needed. A short fifty years have elapsed since Henry George was denounced by the "savants of society" and the conservative element everywhere as an anarchist and a dangerous enemy of the Commonwealth. Much water has passed under the bridge since then. Fifty-six out of one hundred and one eminent educators, authors, scientists, and public men representing every State in the Union, have signified their desire that this once despised printer and "agitator" be enshrined among the immortals. This is a great advance the world moves. His defeat by so narrow a margin, a victory for human intelligence and five years from now there will be another election. In the meantime his name is secure and growing.

The Single Tax*

By HENRY GEORGE

(Concluded)

TO give an illustration, let us suppose that a man of great wealth and benevolence, wishing to help a number of poor people, erects a building of many apartments. He stores the cellars with coal; he secures a supply of water; and he so adapts the building that elevators may be put in, and heat, light and water, and power be conducted through it. He does not wish to become a special providence to these men, for that would be to make and keep them babies. He wishes them, by doing for themselves, to develop manly qualities and to learn to live together. So admitting a certain number to the building, and providing for the future coming of others, he leaves them at liberty to manage as they please.

The donor of the building asks no revenue; he has made a free gift. But the tenants will need a revenue, since some of them must be occupied in taking care of the house, making improvements from time to time, and in doing other things for the common benefit.

Now, the proper way of raising this revenue will be clear—so clear that it will be certain to whoever considers it that the donor could have intended no other. And this way will appear as soon as the tenants come to settle the occupancy among themselves. Though for a day or two after they enter into possession they may

treat the house as common, yet they will soon discover the necessity for definite location. The question of how the apartments shall be assigned among them will thus come up. If all the apartments were alike, and if the matter of location with respect to other tenants made no difference, equality might be assured by letting each take an apartment leaving the unoccupied ones for newcomers. But the apartments are not all alike, and location in respect to other occupants is a matter of importance, especially since the erection of elevators, the distribution of heat, power, electricity, etc., could not be made all at once, but would come first in the best-tenanted parts of the house. The most desirable apartments would therefore command premiums. To collect these premiums for the common expenses would be the obvious way both to put all the tenants on a level with regard to the bounty of their benefactor and to provide for common needs and improvements. Under this system there would be no levy on any individual. There would be only a single tax, collected from the occupants of the more desirable rooms. No one would be taxed for living in the building or for having an apartment, for every one would be free without the payment of any premium, to take any apartment that no one else wanted. It would be only the use of rooms of more than ordinary desirability that the payment of a premium would be a condition.

In this way as the new tenants came in, in accordance with the benefactor's will, they would, until the house was really full, find ample room on equal terms with those already there, and in this way all the common expenses and the costs of making improvements could be met. As the tenants increased in number and improvements were made, the relative desirability of the apartments might change. Some that at first were most desirable and paid the highest premiums might become of only ordinary desirability and cease to bring any premium while the upper stories, that at first no one cared to live in, might, when the elevators got running, seem most desirable and pay the highest premiums. But the aggregate premiums would increase with increase of numbers and the making of improvements, and a larger and larger common fund be available for common purposes.

Now this is the way of the Single Tax—the method which we Single Tax men would apply to that house of which we are all tenants.

But another way MIGHT be adopted. If such tenants were to do as we of the United States have done, they would let a few of their number claim the apartments as their private property, collect the premiums, and keep the greater part of them. They would let them claim whole blocks of as yet unoccupied apartments, and in the effort to get monopoly and speculative premiums hold them vacant long after those who ought to use them had arrived, compelling the new-comers to go farther upstairs or into the wings, or to sleep in passage-ways, and to wander around unable to find a place to work. They

*NOTE:—This article, written by Henry George, and published in *The Century*, July, 1890, in answer to the attack, written by Edward Dickinson, entitled "A Single Tax on Land" in the same issue of the magazine, is here reproduced and slightly abridged by Anna George Mille.