

never ceased, as occasion offered, to affirm or assume it, without any consideration of its own private interests or those of others. Our readers know quite well where we stand on the subject, and are, we assume, in the abstract at least, generally of the same mind. We can easily understand how journalists generally have had to be cautious about touching the subject, in view of the torrent of erudite and mystifying philosophy allusion to it was of old time sure to tap. It is now sixty years since Henry George challenged the world with this thesis. Probably, unless it were Karl Marx, there was no philosopher of the nineteenth—perhaps of any—century whose teaching took such a hold on mankind as that of this poor printer who observed in California in the crudest form the evils of landlordism. The currency of both these revolutionists was subterranean, little heeded on the learned surface of life, where the crazy Satanism of Nietzsche took such ready and blighting hold. It was no doubt, as our correspondent implies, willingly neglected by those whose interests could not welcome it.

An Eloquent Tribute to Henry George

AT the beginnings of the several divisions of "Progress and Poverty" Henry George put quotations from old poems that had evidently haunted his mind with a kind of compelling melody; there were some verses by Charles Mackay, and one as we recall by Gerald Massey. These lines from poets little known to most men, with their refrain of a slowly emerging beneficent end foreshadowed through the sad human pages of oppression and misery, of social justice that was to come long after the centuries of the wretched toiling Egyptians, of old Socrates trudging through his cell "cheerily to and fro"—it was manifestly some such inspiring theme as this that ran in the heart and mind of that great leader along with his developing thought of a better time coming for all mankind. It was this fundamental note of faith that made "Progress and Poverty" one of the most profoundly eloquent works that have ever come from the hand of man.

—MCCREADY SYKES in *Commerce and Finance*.

No Answer But One

WHEN the purchaser of the Senator Clark house and lot on Fifth Avenue, New York City, said that he would have paid more for the property had there been no house on it, he said more than words.

This house cost about seven million dollars twenty-five years ago. It is to be replaced by an apartment house that will pay dividends. Real estate rides along on other folks courage. A person who bought real estate in New York City 25 years ago and let it ride, gets millions out of nothing ventured.

People who own real estate are sometimes great objectors to the courage of others and profits arising from the successful ventures in what they call public equities. What greater public equity than in land monopoly? Is land with water-falling a public ownership and land with buildings on it private ownership? Is a wheat field essentially different from a water-power-field? These are questions that the Single Taxers will ask you. In cases like this, you have to think a whole lot before you can answer them, if you ever do answer them.

—*Evening Journal*, Lewiston, Me.

SEATTLE'S Chief of Police tells how a landlord recently visited him and complained that the cops would not let his tenants alone.

"I am paying \$18,000 a year taxes. How do you expect me to pay my taxes?" "Don't you know your tenants are operating brothels and blind pigs?"

"Yes," he replied. "But who else would rent the places (they are nothing but old shacks I am holding for speculation) and pay me enough to meet carrying charges."

This is a suggestion of one type of land speculation, and the indirect but efficient help it extends to vice.

THERE is a personal equation involved in the attitude of each and all of us toward the problems and tendencies of our time. Life is immeasurably freer, happier and fuller for us because other men and women of other times stood for justice and freedom when all the world seemed black and yet did not yield to the Devil's whisper, "What's the use?" At bottom we have that debt to pay and when we go over the Great Divide and meet the spirits of Milton and Franklin and Jefferson and Garrison and Lincoln and Emerson and Whitman and George and Hugo and Mazzini and above all, the Carpenter of Nazereth—we shall have less humiliation if we are able to give a positive answer to their question, "What did you do with that which I bequeathed you?"

—JUDSON KING.

“THE great criticism against rating is not merely that it lacks uniformity, and is unfair between the parties, but that it is unfair to the value of property that you tax and rate. This is the greatest grievance of all—that it taxes improvements. The more a landlord improves his property the higher he is rated; the more he neglects his property the less he is rated. . . . If he allows his cottages to fall into decay and become empty, his rates are less; but if he is a good sound landlord, who repairs ruinous cottages and builds new ones, up go his rates. The man who trusts to obsolete machinery in his business can keep his rates low; but the man who puts in new machinery and improves his buildings has to pay a higher contribution to the rates.”—MR. LLOYD GEORGE.