

A SELF-REVEALING picture is the recent work of the Countess of Warwick, "Life's Ebb and Flow." It is a picture of a life of devotion to high ideals from the time she met Robert Blatchford and was converted to socialism. In the interests of that movement this most beautiful woman of her time subjected herself to the bitter condemnation of her class. All honor to her!

BUT *cui bono*? The socialism that goes no further than British socialism has yet gone, that does not propose to cure conditions by fundamental remedies can, we imagine, bring small comfort to Lady Warwick. For it must be clear to her that socialistic politicians have not removed those evils which aroused her generous spirit and induced her to brave so much.

"A sense of earnest will
To help the lowly living,"

whether by charity or socialistic make-shifts, is not enough. We wonder if she realizes the terrible truth, for terrible it must seem to many, that to permanently help the poor the Lady Warwicks and the Lady Astors, must cease to be, with all their titles and rent rolls and great estates.

WE say Socialism "as far as it has gone." We are referring to the party which in England calls itself "Labor" and which is called by others, and especially its enemies, "Socialist." And included in this are other parties which in continental Europe use the same designation. In this connection it is interesting to refer to an illuminating article in the *New York World* of Nov. 9 by Arno Dosch-Fleuret, in which he says:

"Socialist" is the most misused term in Europe. If American readers were to translate "Socialist" to "radical" every time it appears in the news they would come nearer to getting a correct meaning of current political developments on the Continent. Even then they would often be exaggerating, as the so-called Socialists in many European countries are about as radical as insurgent Republicans in the United States, and in some countries parties calling themselves "National Socialists" are not radical at all.

EVEN the so-called Radical Socialists of France are mostly liberals, this correspondent points out, and he indicates a more important development—that the only political groups who cling to the Marxian formulas are the communists, and even the communists are moderating their demands. In Germany and France these moderates have been expelled from the party and the tendency will be for these groups now on the outside to amalgamate with the Socialists and thus help to increase the numbers of those who voting as Socialists are to be more properly designated as "Liberals."

HENRY GEORGE men are neither Socialists nor Anarchists. That we are too much governed in our economic relations they will without argument admit.

But that there are a number of purely governmental functions not yet taken over by government, they will as readily concede. To that extent we are socialists, and will be so accused. Yet our philosophy remains the philosophy of individualism; and such socialism as we would welcome is for the preservation of this same philosophy of individualism.

NOR in view of the rapidly developing evolution of so-called Socialism in which the Marxian formulas are rapidly disappearing need we hesitate to work with the New Socialists. Granted that many of the things they propose to do will prove ineffectual; granted, too, that when the whole economic rent of land is taken many of their problems will be automatically solved—as we trust and believe and as indeed we are prepared to demonstrate—we can afford to let them work out these reforms to the end if they will not lose sight of the great principle that the economic rent of land is the first, or if you please the main thing to be socialized.

A POLITICAL partnership of the sort we are hinting at may or may not be feasible at this time. The Socialists—term as capable of various definitions as the word Christian—are many; Henry George men are not so many, though more than some of our sharp witted columnists seem to think. They are at least clear and capable thinkers; their convictions make them so, and they are wonder-working proselyters among groups whose beliefs are undergoing transformation. In view of such a political partnership what can we concede without compromising our own principles?

IT seems a small matter to let them have their state housing and old-age pension programme. Socialists may be made to see that these pensions can be paid for out of land values. As for their state housing proposals, if we are right in contending that these would prove entirely unnecessary as more and more of the land rent came into the treasury and more and more land into use, our attitude could be that of "watchful waiting" without unnecessary opposition or antagonism. If the new socialism will rally to the principle of taking the entire rent of land its adherents will have their hands full in preaching it and much of the older socialistic proposals will drop away, even as the Marxian dogmas are gradually undergoing slow disintegration.

IN the *New York World*, of November 10, Norman Thomas reiterates the platform on which he made his remarkable and inspiring run in the recent mayoralty campaign. "Honest and expert assessment based on the principle that land values belong to the community which create them." He says again, in his article in the *World*:

The Socialist Party will not, however, go along with a group that avoids or hedges on the core of New York's able—landlordism. The people must get the benefit of the land values which they create.

WE are not deciding anything for the future policy of the Single Tax movement. We would not do so even if it were in our power. We are merely throwing out for discussion and debate what our policy should be. The Socialist party now takes advanced ground on the land question. If the party does this, there is no danger that this question will not soon become the crucial issue. As far as the party is concerned and the great national debate on the question will be opened. Whether the arguments outweigh the possible gains, whether we can afford to charge that we have become socialists, whether instead of presenting this great principle of ours the new party might shift its emphasis to what we regard as minor commendations, are all to be considered. Certainly the Henry George men of the Argentine now find that the socialists of that country are helping to carry forward the principles, and our friends there do not find themselves merged. It is true of course that what has happened in the Argentine might not happen here, and all these things are to be considered. It is a question of great interest and correspondence is invited from the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM.

MR. THOMAS has expressed indifference as to what the new party may call itself. He is not enamoured either with the name Socialist or Labor. To the average man the name Labor would seem to connote a Labor Union party, and many forward looking men and women would hesitate to belong to a party in which Matthew Ball was a dominating figure. Socialist is preferable to that. We beg to suggest as a name for the New movement, The People's Party. Whatever prejudice may at the time have been excited by that name has passed away, since much of the legislation recommended has been enacted and the People's Party has long ceased to exist. Until some better name has been suggested this one might still be considered.

The Fundamental Reform

PRACTICALLY, then the greatest, the most fundamental of all reforms, the reform which will make all other reforms easier, and without which no other reform will fail, is to be reached by concentrating all taxation into a tax upon the value of land, and making that heavy enough to take as near as may be the whole ground-rent for common purposes.

—HENRY GEORGE ("Social Problems").

POVERTY! thou half sister of death, thou cousin-germane of hell; where shall I find force of execration equal to the amplitude of thy demerits.—BURNS.

Profits and the "Vice" of Saving

PART II.

ON the theoretical foundation established in my first article, I will now build up a practical structure to indicate the present effect of monopoly profits on the distribution of wealth and income in the United States, where the principal monopoly is that of land values, with lesser ones based on patents or a protective tariff and in recent years, on labor unionism.

Land, or natural resources, may be divided into five different classes: viz, agricultural, forest, townsite, mineral and public-utility franchise.

The large unearned fortunes from agricultural land accrued at first chiefly to the recipients of large territorial grants from the English, Dutch, French or Spanish governments, in colonial days. After the Revolution some of the unoccupied land was sold during the early XIX century to speculators for a song, with the idea of promoting a rapid colonization of the west, and many of these gentry thus became rich by the later increase in value of their holdings as settlers began to need them. During the same period many land bonuses were given to canal companies and this plan was greatly extended later for the benefit of railway promoters, until it culminated in the case of the Pacific lines in the bestowal of empires of territory which later formed the bulk of such great fortunes as those of the Stanford and Huntington families. Since 1900 many smaller unearned fortunes have also accrued to the owners of the richer agricultural lands, such as those of the Mississippi Valley system, by the great rise in land value since that date due to the exhaustion of accessible arable public land in the face of a constantly increasing population and consequent demand for agricultural produce.

Many unearned fortunes have also sprung from the ownership of land covered by wild forests which, unlike the cultivated forests of Europe, are due solely to nature.

While 75% of the nation's forests were publicly owned in 1870, by 1910 about 80% had become private property. The three chief methods of despoilment were: 1, enormous land grants by the Federation to promoters of canals, cart-roads and railways; 2, direct sales in unlimited quantities by the Federation, under land-settlement laws, at \$1.25 the acre; and 3, direct sales in 160-acre tracts by the Federation, under the "Timber and Stone Act," at \$2.50 an acre. Under the last method forests commercially worth 240 millions *at the date of sale* were ceded by the Federation to speculators' dummy "settlers" for 30 millions or one eighth of their value. At present an oppressive timberland monopoly exists as 1,802 owners recently owned 88,580,000 acres—an average of 77 sq. miles apiece—while the three largest owners, the Southern Pacific railway, the Northern Pacific railway and the Weyerhauser Lumber