

be no encyclopaedic parade of definitions. All that will be attempted will be a passing mention of the most acceptable—if that is possible—connotations the word has for contemporary economists."

Professor Geiger notes the various definitions which economists for purposes of their own give to land. We are not supposed to talk of land without first describing the kind of land. It would seem that a working agreement might be arrived at which would establish a certain unity in the use of the word so that when land was referred to it would have some unmistakable characteristics shared everywhere by this natural factor. We may indicate that the Ricardian Law has demonstrated that unity since it applies to rural and urban land. The persistence with which this is overlooked argues something more than intellectual difference but rather deliberate avoidance.

The distinction between land and capital has never been more clearly stated. Note this from page 87:

The inferences that follow . . . should be clear and simple, but they need to be made articulate. If labor and capital cannot operate without land, i. e., without sites, rights of way, lots, farms, favorable geographical locations, and all else that comes under the heading of land, then, to that degree, land is the dominant factor in economic production. If capital and all the tools of production that man uses are essentially reproducible and replaceable, whereas land space and site value are just as essentially irreproducible, then land, under private control as it is, represents the final and limiting restriction in economic production. If land rent and land value are essentially unearned incomes, depending upon such private control of a given irreplaceable economic element, then the exploiter of that unearned increment occupies the keystone position in economic distribution."

Historical Aspects of the Land Question is the title of Chapter IV. There is one statement to which we must take exception. That is Prof. Geiger's dictum that it cannot be historically demonstrated that private property in land is the cause of the decay of nations. It may be true that a general history of the land question, which would reveal this, has not yet been written. But such a book may yet come from the press, and it was Oscar Geiger's hope that his gifted son might write it. If land has the important place assigned to it by both father and son the effect of systems of land tenure on the decay and deaths of civilizations should find its chronicler. What is needed perhaps for such a work is the faculty of imagination in which the son is not quite equal to the father, fine scholar and expositor as he is. But what remains in the minds of so many of us as a firm conviction, though not readily translatable into detailed exposition, will find its historian when the future gives a larger and more comprehensive elevation from which the problem may be surveyed, in the economic and social march of time. For this the days may not yet be ripe.

That portion of the work devoted to the historical aspects of the land question contains much evidence of the fine scholarship of the author and should be studied for its many implications. They include excursions into all lands. It needs to be studied rather than read.

In this part of the work, with its wealth of historic allusion, Professor Geiger does much to reinforce the conviction that one of the important factors in the decline of civilization, if not the most important, is the prevailing system of land ownership.

And it must be so. If the secret of social well being is "association in equality," which is axiomatic, it must be that a system which most directly and most effectively determines the state of equality or inequality, is a potent factor in the life of civilization. And more emphatically it may be said that there is no other cause which can so rapidly destroy the fibre of a civilization and so surely hasten its decay and death as the division of people into masters and slaves, a system infallibly produced by an order which denies the equal right to the use of the earth. And to this Professor Geiger assents in the concluding part of his work when he says that "the conjunction between social misery and the ownership of the earth" is perennial and ubiquitous."

We think Professor Geiger is in error when he says: "Although he (Henry George) and his followers are ordinarily classed as individual-

istic in their philosophy the very programme of the Single Tax must tremendously strengthen the power of the state by giving it amazing control of social life in the disposition of the huge revenues from ground rents. . . . This problem has never been adequately considered, it seems, by the individualistic adherents of land value taxation."

We were accustomed in the old days to deal with two forms of objections to the taking of economic rent for public purposes, one being that there would not be enough to meet current expenses of government, and a directly opposite contention that it would be so large as to corrupt the sources of government.

Mr. Geiger's dictum is without ground to support it. We do not know whether there would be huge revenues from this source or not.

Nor do we think that the advocates of the individualistic philosophy need to abandon their ground. The taking of economic rent in lieu of all taxes is the final expression of individualism. For the abolition of all taxes and the taking of ground rent mean an enormous simplification in government. For the first time in history its functions will be circumscribed and this is true whether the revenues from ground rents be large or small. The present administration has familiarized us with large federal expenditures, but because this is drawn from hundreds of sources the bureaucratic and overlapping functional structure has created a Frankenstein monster. This has enormously magnified government, so that its ramifications are countless. It is not so much the huge revenues that vitiate the character of governments, but the multifarious activities for which government must assume responsibility when everything conceivable is taxed over and over again, and where the activities it attempts to support are not the true functions of government at all.

But despite the points of difference between author and reviewer we must again assert our belief that this is a very valuable work, skillfully done, keen in its analysis, broad if cautious in its summarizing, and abounding in telling blows in behalf of the basic remedy for our economic ills.—J. D. M

A DEVOTED AND HEROIC LIFE

Macklin of Nanking, by Edith Eberle. 12mo., cloth, 173 pp. Bethany Press, St. Louis, Mo.

Here we have the life of Rev. W. E. Macklin, who carried to China a dual message of redemption, Christianity and the social gospel of Henry George. This story of a great life is attractively told. Not so much is given here as might appropriately have been devoted to the latter. We do not believe that the author of this biography completely recognizes its importance. But Dr. Macklin assuredly does. He knows, too, if his biographer does not, how intimately the two messages are related.

But with a life as busy as Dr. Macklin's has been it is difficult for a biographer brought newly to the task to properly appraise his varied activities. Dr. Macklin's career is fascinating—preaching, lecturing, writing through all the years. His influence permeated far. He brought not only the dual message of which we have spoken, but his own personality, his love for a people crushed under an economic despotism far deeper than any we know. And the Chinese, high and low, listened to him and learned to love him.

Dr. Macklin was born near London, Ontario, of Irish ancestry on his father's side. Miss Eberle tells the story of his youth. He was popular among the young men of his acquaintance but he would not drink with them. As doctor and missionary he did not depend for his strength upon artificial stimulants, and though never physically hardy he was able to pursue long and arduous labors, animated by enthusiastic impulse and a rare devotion. He was essentially a pioneer and found in his desire to blaze new paths the spiritual urge that drove him forward.

We learn much of China from Miss Eberle, and something of Sun Yat Sen. Dr. Macklin informs us that Sun was in favor of the Single Tax before he met him. Dr. Macklin says he was a fine looking man,

with a cordial expression. His endorsement of Henry George will be found in his "Principles for the People." He was elected president of the Chinese Republic in 1911.

In 1922 there came a second crisis in Nanking on which occasion Dr. Macklin rendered heroic service to the city. It is a matter of record that the Republican leaders of the new China profited by Dr. Macklin's advice and learned to respect his kindly wisdom. He saw an ancient civilization in process of transition and the transformation that swept the vast empire. In that transformation he helped, and it is doubtful if anywhere in China or elsewhere there is a man whose knowledge of this great transformation is so intimate and whose acquaintance with the conservative as well as the radical elements is so universal.

Dr. Macklin was married to the sister of Mrs. Garst, wife of a missionary to Japan, and well known Georgeist. Lieutenant DeLany cousin of Mrs. Macklin, was second officer on Admiral Dewey's flag ship, the Olympia, at the battle of Manila. We met DeLany on his visit to New York. He was a member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club. Dr. Macklin thinks he is still in New York.

Forty years spent in China is the record during which Dr. Macklin ministered to the ills of his patients, their spiritual and bodily ills. Fearlessly he went about, his life frequently in danger, and won for himself the title of "Hero of Nanking," which Miss Eberle calls him. And he turned the intense hatred of the natives against foreigners to love for himself, and this gradually mitigated the racial animosity of the Chinese toward the missionaries in general. His success was marked and his fame became widely known. He was showered with medals, this modest servant of the Master, self-forgetting, self-effacing.

Here is the isolated reference to his Single Tax work made by his biographer:

"All who know of Dr. Macklin know of his advocacy of the Single Tax. He always believed in it and then one day a book by Henry George, "Progress and Poverty," fell into his hands, and he was thenceforth completely swayed by the idea. The earth is the Lord's, he explains. Natural resources are God's gift to all people, the land and all that lies therein belong to all. That which is upon the land belongs to the people that built it. Man-made things are man's property and should be free of tax. Therefore let there be a Single Tax, a tax on land values only, a tax so heavy that no one can afford to hold land in speculation or in idleness. . . . "Why do you not talk about your work in China?" some one inquired, confused by his discussion of land and taxes, you have such interesting experiences to tell." "How can I talk to people about my work and the needs in China," he replied, with something of pathos in his voice, "unless I tell them also about the remedy for China's economic ills?"

Miss Eberle writes on page 159 of Dr. Macklin in the days of the sieges, quoting one of the missionaries as follows:

"I tell you it is no wonder that the people of Nanking love him as they do. . . . He took his life in his hands several times to save the city. He had a great opportunity and handled it as a great man. If you could see the thankfulness beaming out of the eyes of such men as the civil governor and other officials, you would realize how these people almost worship Macklin."

It is incredible that Dr. Macklin with all his infinite labors could have found time to translate into Chinese so many standard works. An incomplete list was furnished the biographer by Dr. Macklin and include "The Dutch Republic," "History of Switzerland," "Life of Jefferson," Schiller. "Life of Gustavus Adolphus," "Progress and Poverty," "Protection or Free Trade?" "Dove's Theory of Human Progression," "Spencer's Social Statics," "History of Ancient Religions," "Intoxicating Drinks and Drugs in all Lands and Times," "Caird's Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion," "History of Ancient Religions," "Excavations in Bible Lands," and many others. Surely an accomplishment.

Dr. and Mrs. Macklin live in San Gabriel, California. Here in picturesque surroundings is "The House that Love Built," as Mrs. Macklin delights to call it. And here we leave them in the rest they have so nobly earned.—J. D. M.

A WELCOME BOOK

The Sphere of Individualism, by Connor D. Ross. Cloth, 12mo., 130 pp. Price \$1.50. Meador Press, Boston, Mass.

Here is a work that merits all praise. It summarizes the doctrine of liberty without any reference to Henry George or the Single Tax. The author's definition and exposition leave little to be desired, and he enlists Blackstone in his support while insisting on his own conception of liberty, which is in harmony with the best that has been written.

He says: "If we believe in the principle that every man is entitled to live his own life in his own way, subject to the same right as his fellowmen, and the proposal is to affect that right, then the proposal becomes of the utmost importance." (Page 23.)

With this we shall find Henry George and Herbert Spencer in agreement.

An interesting point raised by the author is not commonly reflected upon. He asks us to consider that little of our legislation and none of our tax laws were passed avowedly for the benefit of the rich and well to do. On the contrary, all this legislation was passed in the supposed interests of the common man. He mentions the income tax as an example rather conspicuous. We can all recall the arguments used at the time the income tax was passed.

The programme of the Roosevelt administration, to which only passing allusion is made, the purpose of which is to benefit the "forgotten man," is an example of these misdirected attempts to improve the condition of the struggling poor, while increasing the burden of taxation, and making it harder for the poor to live. And here occurs a significant passage:

"We have not the cause of a Samson for the wrecking of vengeance for our blindness. But we have the power that was his—and more. Shall we use that power to pull down the social structure upon our own heads, or use it to restore the structure as it was originally designed?" (Page 41.)

Mr. Ross tells the interesting story of Gary, Indiana, under the chapter headed, "The Magic City." It would make a valuable Single Tax tract in itself. We should pause to mention the fact that Mr. Ross was formerly Assistant Attorney General of Indiana. He is therefore familiar with the laws. Better still he knows the natural laws of economics. And this short chapter demonstrates his familiarity with these laws. We are permitting ourselves the citation of certain striking passages which may convey an idea of Mr. Ross' literary quality. On page 61 he says:

"And after all, the discovery of truth is largely a question of one's wanting to know it. The possession of it is a question for us to decide. The truth does not barter with us nor sell. It does not lie nor can it be lied to. Man is not so cunning as to cheat or to defraud it. He can shun or battle, and thus prolong his own error, but truth knows no defeat—it has all the time there is."

May we not commend this to every student of the Henry George School? For the hundred or more current definitions of "capitalism," so called, the divergence of which has made the term unacceptable for general usage, we suggest to the dictionary makers Mr. Ross' definition, "The exercise of human energy by means of the tools of industry." It is simple enough and all inclusive.

From page 86 we quote:

"Is it any wonder that labor and capital—natural friends—feel the pinch of the shackles of governmental regulation? With these conditions confronting the producers of the country, why talk of the money question? Why fight the shadow and ignore the substance?"

From page 88 we cite the following:

"It is said old things have passed away. The Constitution and the horse and buggy are of a day that is dead. The thought of their day should be shunned—if for no other reason—there might be a historian, hoary with age, who would perhaps turn back the pages of history and seek guidance in the story of Joseph and his stricken brethren the land of Goshen."