

as that of the people who are said to have been thrown into terrors of apprehension as to what would happen if the earth fell into the sun.

On page 52 Prof. Ross points out that "Throughout its history the American people have developed in the presence of abundant land." It is necessary to remind the Professor that we are still in the presence of abundant land. He says, "without wishing it, yet with nobody to blame, we have entered upon the era of limited natural resources." But limited by whom? Surely somebody is to blame. Our own ignorance regarding the matter is deserving of some censure.

Prof. Ross shows us how land values shot up as the crop-bearing area "slackened." The word "slackened" is a euphonious term for another fact not indicated at all—the appropriation and monopolization of unused natural opportunities.

And when he says, "Think of the aggregate value of farm land gaining 118 per cent. in value in a single decade," it is to be regretted that he did not touch upon the origin of such increase and the social consequences that follow from it.

There are many enlightened comments in parts of this work. But none truer than this from page 125:

"A quarter of a century ago social workers took to investigating seriously the headwaters of the endless flow of miserable people defiling before them. They have traced up the tributaries of this flood, and, instead of finding their sources to be *individual congenial defects*, they have found many of them to be adverse *social conditions*."

And he adds significantly that "some of these conditions can be removed without disturbing anybody much save the taxpayer."

We do not want to find fault with this work for not being what it does not pretend to be. It treats many of the superficialities and it does this often with a thoughtful and discriminating touch. It does not indicate what we regard as fundamental, but the author does say (page 180): "One way to divert the people from fundamentals is to get them hurraing for petty betterment." We have no desire to indicate that the author pays unconscious homage to this tendency in much of what he has written in the work before us.

On page 188 Prof. Ross says: "The tragedy in the situation of the wage earner in modern industry has been his *insecurity*."

And what is our author's remedy for this condition? It is a "dismissal wage"—that is, where workmen are discharged by reason of no fault of their own they shall receive a six month's wage. A local board is to decide the question of each worker's fitness to receive this "dismissal wage."

Our respect for Prof. Ross falls once more to zero. The intelligence that he brings to bear on some of the problems touched upon explodes into this monstrous bubble of a "dismissal wage." To elaborate upon it, to indicate that the form of compensation suggested is a violation of all the canons of property, would be a needless waste of words.

What is the matter with the professorial mind? Is it that in the scrupulous avoidance of fundamentals they grasp at these frantic proposals that set at naught both the claims of equity and common sense, and erect fantastic conceptions of the relations of labor and capital? Here is a denial of the right of the employer to cease his partnership relations on any ground that may seem to him reasonable without paying him for six months to come what is euphoniously called a "dismissal wage." Yet it is an inalienable right for any employer to sever such relations for any reason that may seem to him sufficient. What is the State that it should be the judge in such matters?

All of this confusion of thought arises from a failure to get clearly in one's mind the real relations of Labor and Capital.—J. D. M.

* SOCIALISM AND CHARACTER

* *Socialism and Character*. By Henry Sturt, M.A., Lecturer at the University of Wales. 12 mo. clo. 214 pp. E. P. Dutton & Co., New York City.

The writer of the work before us begins with this inquiry: "Can any one who is not utterly callous profess himself content with our present social system?" and then he pictures the places, Sheffield, Wolverhampton and the East End of London where the industrial evils of our civilization reveal themselves in their worst lights.

He then announces his belief that "the characteristic defects of our society are due to individualism." He is careful to add that by this he means "the way of distributing wealth whereby men scramble for it according to each individual's strength and cunning." He then quotes from Henry Maine the belief of that writer (Popular Government) that succeeding in business (which he calls a beneficent private war) is "the climbing of one individual upon the back of another."

The author thinks we must adopt some intelligent plan of distributing wealth. And this he calls Socialism. But he does not tell what this intelligent plan is going to be. He pictures, and we concede the evils of present conditions, and then he leaves with a word wholly vague and indefinite, that we hold like a rag doll in our laps while the sawdust runs out!

The very title of the work leaves us with other problems on our hands. The author tells us that the main purpose of the work is to show what improvements in personal character may be looked for as the results of forming a better social organization, and in particular of distributing wealth upon an equitable system. Granted again, but the assumption that socialism provides such a system is a non sequitur.

It may be said that perhaps the writer uses the word socialism in the loose sense in which it is sometimes used as defining a better state of society, which makes socialists of all those seeking social betterment. It appears not. This writer, who is lecturer at the National University of Wales, goes further than Marx. He expressly condemns the Marxian programme as "too narrow." There is demanded "a thoroughgoing social reorganization." Socialism is spoken of as "the regulation of the acquisitive and dominative minds." "If we are to undertake to reform the distribution of wealth on socialistic principles we must also reform the commonwealth in other respects, in the organization of industry, in government, in the family, and in the relations of the sexes, especially in their economic relation."

Prof. Sturt is nothing if not thorough. At a time when Socialism is showing a tendency to modify its demands, a tendency that has followed on a falling away of the voting strength of socialism everywhere, this writer comes with a programme that "out-Herods Herod" in its suggestions for regulation, government ownership and management, and a social and economic regimen that exceeds anything with which we are acquainted.

The author has an easy method of settling the question of the distribution of wealth in terms of equity. It is so easy that we wonder why we hadn't thought of it before:

"The true principle to be observed in the distribution of wealth is that of public service. It is neither possible nor desirable to do this with exactness. I doubt whether a socialistic system would make any great change in the economic position of our professional or salaried class. (The Professor is going to see to it that there will be no reduction of the salaries of professors.) Some of these at present are paid too much; which is because they have special skill, and bargain to get the highest terms they can for their services. (It would seem that possessing special skill they may not after all be too highly paid.) Others are paid too little; which is mainly because the professions are overcrowded, a trouble which could easily be remedied by public regulation." (Easy as rolling off a log!)

Elsewhere the author says: "The distribution of wealth should not be left to "natural" causes, in other words to *the result of a scramble*." The italics are ours. So small is the author's faith in natural laws. The author finds it impossible to conceive of a society in which the individual is left free to follow his own inclinations to produce, to seek the satisfaction of his desires in which play of forces the general satisfaction of all is secured. He does not seem to have heard of Henry George, and knows nothing at all apparently of the philosophy of individualism. He seems to think that the opposite of this teaching of extreme socialism is anarchism. He has never even heard of the theory that while making a place for the exercise of functions purely social or governmental leaves the individual free, that harmonizes the two theories of government and constitutes the true via media.

Yet he seems now and then to approach the problem only to run away from it. Note the phrase: "Let us consider some of the causes

through which inequality of wealth arises." Then he mentions some of them. But if the inequality arises from existing causes why not take steps to remove them? Why assume that the only way to remedy causes that may be removed is to establish a system of government from which every liberty loving individual will shrink as loading it with more than it can bear with safety to the continuance of civilization and the march of progress?

In the socialistic state of Prof. Sturt there is to be public allowances for children. But at the same time to avoid what the author calls a "frenzy of propagation" measures for the repression of population are to be adopted. There will be inspection of families; "if allowances are to be made for the maintenance of children we must be assured that the money is properly spent."

We believe that it is quite impossible to find a work in which so many naive propositions are advanced. It is impossible to conjecture where this writer has spent the time since he came to earth. The "intense inane" in which he wanders is a medium admirably calculated for speculations of this kind. But there seems to be times when he is a little distrustful. For he says:

"The citizens of a socialist state must have charity, probity, conscience, temperance and general modification of character. Without these qualities it will be *impossible to work so elaborate and delicate a system.*" Again the italics are ours. But is it not a deliciously innocent paragraph?

It must not be thought that a good word cannot be said for the work. On page 118 will be found some admirable reflections on slavery.

And on the whole the writer means well to the human race. He would do a lot to mankind in the effort to do something for them. And the hell to which he would direct us is paved with the best possible intentions.—J. D. M.

* POST INDUSTRIALISM

* Post Industrialism. By Arthur J. Penty 12 mo. clo. 157 pp. Macmillan Co. New York City.

This work, with a preface by Gilbert K. Chesterton, is a study of the relation of man to machines. It is Samuel Butler's Erewhon transplanted into the more serious department of the study of economics. Butler's work was of course an adventure into the field of humor, even if back of it lay the suggestion that the effect of machinery upon civilization was largely to ossify some of the more admirable qualities of mankind.

The viewpoint of Mr. Penty's Post Industrialism is frankly mediaeval, and a plea for a return to the Guild system. Mr. Chesterton calls the author "one of the three truly original minds of the century." Both Mr. Chesterton and Mr. Penty are absurdly mistaken, the first in his estimate of the author, the second in his call to the industrial world to scrap the results of industrial advance.

The mistake comes from an imperfect knowledge of the factors in economic knowledge and their relation. If Mr. Penty would read Progress and Poverty perhaps some of the problems that puzzle him would receive an answer. But he evidently knows nothing of the land question.

Mr. Penty's mistaken thesis arises naturally perhaps in the minds of men of artistic impulses and little economic knowledge save what they can obtain by considering certain economic factors wholly apart from others. Ruskin made the same error, and left a mass of speculative writing on economics characterized by beautiful English, a rare imaginative touch—and a dense ignorance.

Mr. Penty's book, however, will repay reading for the urge that animates it toward a better and simpler civilization—better because simpler. In this its spirit is beyond praise.—J. D. M.

SHADOW OR SUBSTANCE—SOCIALISM OR INDIVIDUALISM

A little work of more than usual significance and importance is this pamphlet of 76 pages by Dr. William Preston Hill, of St. Louis. It is an examination of the theory and practise of socialism, and is really a triumphant refutation. At a time when socialism is declining it

furnishes a summary of the economic and political reasons for such decline.

Its logic is pitiless, and it travels from point to point of the inquiry with a lucid analysis that reveals a thinker who is able to convey his thought to the reader, and who does not assume that he is in possession of a profundity of wisdom that cannot be told in simple and direct English.—J. D. M.

A WORK BY JACKSON RALSTON

Another book by a Single Taxer is "Democracy's International Law" by Jackson H. Ralston, of Washington, D. C., published by John Byrne and of that city, a book neatly bound in cloth and comprising 160 pages, and sold for \$1.50.

We refrain from reviewing the work at length since we believe every Single Taxer will want the book. They will want to know how the subject is discussed by a Single Taxer. They will find many novel points of view and a treatment of the question that is clear and illuminating. (See adv.)

AN ADMIRABLE PAMPHLET

The "New Political Economy," an excellent pamphlet of 31 pages, by John B. Sharpe, of Pittsburgh, is now in its third edition. Some of our readers will no doubt recall the earlier editions. Those who do not possess a copy are referred to the advertisement on page 192 of this issue.

A WORK ON SINGLE TAX COLONIES

We have received the second annual volume of the "Enclaves of the Single Tax." This is an account of the Single Tax colonies, Fairhope, Arden, Tahanto, Free Acres, Halidon, Sant Jordi and Shakerton. This book of 220 pages is bound in cloth with gilt top, and is published by Fiske Warren and written by Charles White Huntington. Those wishing to obtain copies should write to Fiske Warren, Harvard, Mass.

CORRESPONDENCE

DOESN'T SEE IT—QUITE

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Your "Land Tenure or Tax Reform" and "Land Restoration or Tax Reform" must stir the blood of every true Georgist. I also note what Purdy says from his own experience. I have had some experience myself in politics, tax reform, and land restoration. If "land restoration" is ever accomplished it must be done in the field of practical politics. To make it an issue in the field of practical politics it will have to be brought there mainly as tax reform.

In Texas the Democratic Party controls and political issues are fought out within that party. Local conditions must be considered here as I believe they must be in other States.
San Antonio, Texas.

WM. A. BLACK.

NOT A MERE FISCAL REFORM

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I think you are right in pointing out that the Single Tax is not a mere fiscal reform and that half-way measures will not succeed in rousing the attention of the people to the injustice of private ownership in land.
St. Louis, Mo.

REV. L. G. LANDENBERGER.

THE LAND QUESTION IN ANCIENT ROME

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Stimulated by the article in the last REVIEW "Land Reform in the Roman Empire," I have been making a study of the matter. And I am appalled that a condition that should have been obvious to all students of Roman history has remained hidden so long.