

master's interests by treachery to their fellow slaves, were "good niggers." In our day the struggle for economic freedom is different in many particulars, but not in general character, from that of slavery days; and there is a type of workingman now who answers to the characteristics of the "good nigger" then. An example of the modern "good nigger" organized, is the Brotherhood of Locomotive Engineers; and the Order of Railway Conductors appears to be a fair second. These organizations are prompt to denounce any movement to check the rapacity of railroad monopolies. They serve their masters not only in their regular work for wages, but as citizens in influencing legislative bodies and in influencing elections. They reject open and honest politics on principles calculated to serve labor interests in general; but their influence is at the service of their masters whenever the plundering power of railroads is menaced. Like the "good nigger" of slavery days, they expect to benefit themselves by a loyalty to their masters which involves treachery to their fellows. And for this despicable kind of faithfulness they are duly rewarded by their masters through the newspapers their masters control. They are praised and applauded, as the "good nigger" was praised and applauded for like fidelity fifty years ago. Labor organizations of this sort are the "good niggers" of the present stage of the irrepressible conflict.

Nelson's sociological study in St. Louis.

The Post-Dispatch was right in describing Mr. N. O. Nelson's recent experiments in St. Louis as "one of the most remarkable personal sociological studies ever undertaken in a big city;" and Mr. Nelson's comments and recommendations, given in the Post-Dispatch of August 13, are worthy of earnest attention, not only in St. Louis but in all cities. He writes with great clearness and directness. "The best

way," he said, "for anyone to study a subject is by experiment. Merely investigating or reading or studying reports gives a very inadequate understanding. . . . By living among the people on equal terms you learn how they live, learn that they are sound at heart, that they have as much sense, as much good will, as much affection as any other class. You learn that mankind is very much alike, that, after all, the political declaration of equality or the church declaration of brotherhood is not necessarily Pickwickian." He has demonstrated also that the destruction of the poor is their poverty. Speaking of the district which he has studied, and of which he has made a "poverty map," Mr. Nelson says: "Most of the livers in this district are industrious, independent, and some of them quite comfortable, but there are also many on the ragged edge of poverty. These are the casual laborers, the lowest paid factory workers, scrubwomen, washerwomen, peddlers, widows with children. The small income of these people is wasted by the high prices they pay for everything." And this includes rent, the largest item of family expenses; for Mr. Nelson has found that rents in the poor quarters are abnormally high.

PAUL THIEMAN AND "THE JOBLESS MAN."

Paul Thieman, an editorial contributor to the Denver Post, has had the not unusual editorial experience of falling into a single tax briar bush. Venturing in one of his signed editorials to write of the single tax, he inadvertently referred to land as wealth; and thereupon his mail began to swell with letters from vigilant single taxers, asking him if he didn't know any better than to confuse those entirely different things.

Mr. Thieman did know better, and he has frankly admitted his slip of the pen, at the same time reading his critics and others a lesson on the "cant of 'isms.'"

The lesson is a wholesome one. Yet his critics might ask in reply if it is cant to in-

sist upon the use of distinguishing terms for different ideas. For instance, we should not accuse a mathematician of cant if he insisted, in discussions of his "ism," upon discrimination in the use of mathematical signs. Without such cant, if it is cant, the worst confusion of thought inevitably results. The thinker confuses himself.

A notable example may be found in socialist economics. By making the term "capitalism" include private ownership of land (which is a natural object), along with wealth (which is an artificial object)—objects as different from each other economically as are fish swimming in the ocean from fish frying in a pan—the socialist so confuses his reasoning as to attribute to private ownership of wealth and land together, social conditions that clear analysis would trace to private ownership of land alone.

But what concerns us more than Mr. Thieman's use of terms is his misapprehension of the relation of the single tax philosophy to what he aptly calls "the jobless man," of whom he writes that in the city he—

is "jobless" because he hasn't found anybody to hire him. And he can't go to farming because he has no farm to farm. And, even if he could occupy any unoccupied land he chose, whereon to cultivate crops, he has no money to buy tools and horses and seed, or build a house to live in. Perhaps he doesn't know how to farm. And, even if he does, it may be winter time, and farm laborers not in demand. . . . The "jobless" man is not a theory but a fact. Pennilessness is not a theory but a fact. But the theorizing means that thousands and thousands of minds are bent on the problem, How shall every man have employment?

That question is really the crux of the whole economic problem; and the man who asks it honestly, as Mr. Thieman evidently does, and reflects upon it intelligently, as he shows both the ability and the disposition to do, will not be long in finding his answer.

How shall every man have employment? By making jobs continuously as plentiful as workers. So much is obvious.

But how shall this be done? It doesn't have to be done. It is already a fact.

Nature makes it so. She always has made jobs as plentiful as

workers; she does it now; she always will do it. This is only another form of the statement that the aggregate of human wants always at least equals the aggregate of labor power. Nature endows man with wants at least equal to his power to satisfy wants.

Why, then, are there "jobless men"? Because we tolerate obstacles between jobs and workers.

One of the greatest of these obstacles is the kind of taxation that makes trade unnecessarily difficult.

The more difficult trade is made, the less readily do specialized producers exchange what they make for what they want. The consequent reaction checks effective demand; and, as one man's demand is another man's job, any check upon effective demand obviously diminishes available jobs.

The abolition of obstructive taxes would enormously increase the accessible supply of jobs.

But the fundamental obstacle between jobs and workers, the obstacle which must be removed or the benefits of the removal of all others would soon be lost, is the monopoly of land.

This term is of course used comprehensively. It means not only farming land, but all other natural resources as well; and not resources in the fertility sense alone, but in every other sense. It includes, therefore, farming land of all kinds, mining land of all kinds, town and city building sites of all kinds; of course, also, the air and the water; and besides these, all other forms and forces outside of man himself and such temporary forms as men are able by their knowledge and skill to give to natural substances. For illustration, a marble quarry would fall within the category of land; but a statue from the quarry, and the energy and skill that carved it, would be in different categories—the statue in the category of wealth, and the artist's skill and energy in the category of labor.

So understood, land is obviously Nature's storehouse of jobs.

Nothing can be done without land. Not only can no one work at farming, but no one can build houses, construct machines, edit newspapers, practice law, teach school, or do anything else with-

out using land of some kind to some extent. And not alone for his own immediate use does he demand land; but for every little tool and every great machine, for every piece of material, every book, every sheet of paper, every drop of ink, and for the very clothing he wears at his work and the food he eats, does he make demands upon land, upon land of vast extent and of many kinds—farming, highway, and city lands—all of which must be resorted to by the workers who supply him with the tools, materials, machinery, etc., that he requires. Every act of any working-man necessitating the consumption of goods or the use of tools, operates as a demand upon other workmen to keep up the world's supply of such goods and tools; and this demand can be met only as men of all vocations have access to land of all kinds.

Absolute prevention of access to land, if that were possible, would put an end to all jobs; partial prevention restricts jobs; freedom of access would make jobs limitless. Access to the land of the world is the key to the economic problem of the world, for the land of the world controls the jobs of the world.

But Mr. Thieman sees for the "jobless" man no hope in the freeing of unused land, because the jobless man is without tools, horses, seed and other capital for utilizing this land even if it were open to him. Isn't this a superficial view? Can it survive intelligent and candid thought?

To free unused land to the "jobless" man means more, much more, than freeing a particular kind of unused land to an individual worker or a particular class of workers. It means the freeing of all kinds of unused land to all kinds of workers.

The "jobless" man not a farmer would neither have to go upon farming land without farming capital nor want to go there at all. The obstacles between the aggregate of jobs and the aggregate of workers being removed, all jobs would demand all men, and each man would take the job for which he was best adapted. If he had capital he would have the benefit that ownership of unmonopolized capital gives, and no more; if he had no capital, he would get, for

utilizing the capital of others, his full earnings as a civilized worker in a civilized industry of his own choice. And the obstacles between the aggregate of jobs and the aggregate of workers would in fact be removed, if trade were freed from taxation, and land, the one necessary condition of all industry, were freed from monopoly.

Mr. Thieman turns toward the true solution of the labor problem when he points to the "jobless" man as the cause of unwholesome economic conditions, and asks how to provide jobs for all. The Single Tax answers his question, but he fails to recognize the answer because he has neglected to consider it thoughtfully.

The Single Tax answers him by proposing to abolish obstructive taxes, thereby enabling workers to exchange their various products with the greatest ease of which they are capable. This would enable the workers in each trade to swap products freely for small tools and for interests in large ones, whereby they would in effect make their own tools and procure their own capital in the natural way—by producing it.

The Single Tax answers Mr. Thieman further, by proposing to take annually for common use the annual value of land of every kind that is so scarce as to be at a premium. Thereby it provides a public revenue which, while robbing no one and obstructing no jobs, would destroy all incentive to the appropriation of land except for immediate and full utilization.

With all appropriated land fully utilized, the aggregate of jobs for workers would be limited only by the aggregate of human wants; and with no obstructions to trade, every job would find the man it needs and every man the job he seeks.

Such is the ideal of the Single Tax. It would abolish the "jobless" man by abolishing the obstacles of industrial taxation and land monopoly which now separate workers from the jobs that, but for those obstacles, would abundantly exist.

"And is this man to come into this court with unblushing footsteps, with the cloak of hypocrisy in his mouth, and to draw 15 bullocks out of my client's pocket with impunity?" thundered an English barrister.—*Woman's Journal*.