

indicated in his *New Republic* articles is the new atmosphere that has been created in Russia as evidenced in its educational systems, the contrast afforded between much that prevailed under Czarist rule, and the determination of the people to work out their own salvation. Prof. Dewey has no sympathy with communism, but views the experiment with toleration that Mr. Matthew Woll might do well to cultivate in his official capacity.

THERE continues to be a chorus of approval for Mr. Hoover's suggestion to relieve unemployment by accumulating a reserve fund for public construction. There is nothing new in the idea—it has been proposed again and again and sometimes acted upon by the states. But this of itself would not be an objection against it. And indeed there is no reason to oppose it. We only wish to indicate that these ever recurring suggestions to transfer a portion of the wealth of the people to the pockets of others as a remedy for what Henry George called the riddle of the Sphinx—the problem of poverty—are futile attempts to answer the question which if not answered once and for all is to be destroyed.

AND of course the suggestion of Mr. Hoover is no answer. It is of a piece—this transfer of wealth from the pockets of one class to the pockets of another—with the clamor for an increase in the tariff as a remedy for depression in certain lines of industry from the very people who have been telling us how wildly and conspicuously prosperous we all are! For this fund to provide a reserve for public works to be used in times of unemployment must come from increased taxation—that is, (and it cannot be repeated too often) must be taken from the pockets of some of the people to be transferred to the pockets of others.

THIS is but another of the efforts to solve the unemployment question by ignoring the necessary passive factor in production—the land. It proceeds, too, on the mistaken assumption of the helplessness of labor as something that needs to be provided for, to be aided by artificially constructive processes. It ignores wholly one pillar of the industrial edifice—Land—forgetting the true relation, seeking to build out of the air a wholly fanciful adjustment between Labor and Government without regard to the main pillar of the edifice. We submit that this is not the way that engineers proceed, and Mr. Hoover has been highly praised for his engineering feats. We submit that not a single bridge, not a single edifice of the simplest sort, could be constructed in this way if the engineer misunderstood the factors and calmly ignored their relation.

THOSE who have read the little pamphlet written by the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, "Jones Itemized Rent Bill," have perhaps been amused by the inventory

of those many things that add to the value of land, and the objections that occur to the tenant that he ought not to be called upon to pay for some of these things twice—once to the city and again to the landlord. This aspect of the question is taken quite seriously (as indeed it should be) by the *Washington Post*, which features in a recent issue, museums, art galleries, police protection and traffic provisions as adding to the value of what it calls real estate. Only the *Post* might have indicated that these things add only to the value of that part of real estate which is land or site value.

ONE of the astonishing characteristics of the literary men of this and the preceding generation is the superficiality of their social outlook. It is doubtful if any one of them has made a single contribution to the better understanding of social phenomena. Certainly not Kipling, and just as surely not Wells or Shaw, who in intent at least have set out as adventurers on social discoveries—in both cases a barren quest. We have more to learn from the older generation of literary men, Guizot, in his way Sainte-Beuve (who in his critical dissertations surveyed the whole of life), Matthew Arnold, Ruskin, Macaulay, Dickens, Carlyle, and others. How petty and shallow in comparison seem the modern essayists with their infatuation for the frothy and frivolous, or, at best, the extraneous, the accidental, the panoramic—never the deeplying, fundamental and determining forces that are at work beneath the surface—the deus ex machina back of it all, and which to make no effort to understand is to unloose the fancy for every extravaganza of socialism, futile Utopianism, proletarian or strong-man dictatorships. Anything may be accepted where there is no anchor, no compass, and no sense of direction.

IT is interesting to know that the officers and crew of the notable Expedition to the South Pole, which is now in the Antarctic Region, under the direction of Commander Richard E. Byrd, will have the opportunity, during their long stay in the coldest and most lonely region of the world, to study the writings of Henry George.

To the carefully selected library which was assembled for the expedition, the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation of New York contributed a number of George's books conveyed with an appropriate letter by President Hennessy of the Foundation to Commander Byrd. Writing from Wellington, New Zealand, before his ship set sail for the Far South, Commander Byrd wrote thus:

"Dear Mr. Hennessy,

Thank you for the edition of Henry George's books which will be a valuable addition to our Antarctic library. I am grateful too for your kind expressions wishing the expedition success in the Antarctic."

Mr. Hennessy was prompted in sending the book to Commander Byrd's ships by a timely suggestion made to him by Mr. Morris Van Veen, this city.