

firm as a salesman with only \$6 in his pocket." "His earnings after three days of hard work totalled \$93."

It is all very inviting. The Elworthy-Helwick people tell us in this adv. that they can provide opportunities this year for more men to double their earnings from \$5,000 to \$10,000 in the next nine months.

Evidently the business of selling space in Cleveland is at its height. The English of these advertisements is execrable, but the real estate business probably does not need men who have more than a bowing acquaintance with the Queen's English. They are able to make handsome salaries without any previous experience in selling, and probably they can get on with a few additional minor deficiencies, since selling space in a great city seems so simple a matter. We need not any longer complain of the high salaries of railroad brakemen, house-servants, or window-cleaners, since some previous experience is necessary in all these occupations.

It is a great life, my merry gentlemen! But we cannot go on making a living by taking in one another's washing. A country cannot exist by trading eternally in jack-knives. This business is worse than that. For the game is a ruinous one. A million "turn-overs" in real estate in Cleveland in a year would add not a single penny to the sum total of wealth in the community. What is drawn in salaries and commissions comes out of what labor must produce. It is worse than a game of draw-poker at which men may sit down for a sociable evening. If they lose, it is their money they part with. Here it is other people's money. These speculators in land are gamblers in the people's necessities—indeed, if we will but recognize it, in the people's *only* necessity, for with land in their possession the people can produce all they need.

But the Saturnalia is on. The land boom is coming, is indeed here. Thousands will become rich. For a time we will be "prosperous." Then following the debauch will come the "morning after," violent convulsions, and the prolonged industrial depression that follows such excesses.

Henry George Unknown In Philadelphia

THE following from a recent issue of the *Philadelphia Record* must be humiliating to us. Forty years after the first appearance of the doctrine for which Henry George stood, so little stir has it made in the city of his birth that to a certain section of the people his name is unknown. Progress has been made, it is true, and the pages of the REVIEW are full of significant indications of much progress. But there is another side, of which this article gives us a striking illustration.

"Two pilgrims in search of Henry George's birthplace in an Italian quarter near the corner of Queen Street and South Tenth. Diligent inquiry brought the puzzled "Ghorgh-e. Ghorgh-e! Nobody name laika dat lif 'bout here." The strangers were watched with curiosity and suspicion as they went from one shop to another, vainly repeating their inquiry. At last they addressed themselves

to a man whose profession implied education and a probable acquaintance with the works of him whose birthplace they sought. One of the pilgrims went into a brief sketch of Mr. George's life and influence. The words "Single Tax" fixed the listener's attention. "There's no tax-gatherer named Henry George in this neighborhood," he said.

By dint of much telephoning and an hour's wait the pilgrims at length learned that they might find the house they sought in South Tenth Street, near Pine. Here was a region of antique shops and equally antique gentility. At the shop on the corner the name Henry George set the proprietor thinking. For him it had some association. "Yes," he exclaimed, after searching his memory. "He lived in New York, and he was an orator, eh?" Those of the quest assented, and then the man of the shop gave them specific directions, for he knew the house.

A ring brought an intelligent and courteous colored woman to the door. Yes, a good many persons came to visit the house as the birthplace of a man named Henry George. She knew nothing of the man. Most persons came in Summer-time, and some took pictures of the house. She had occupied it six years, and for 10 years before it had been vacant.

"The pilgrims saw that an extra story, with mansard roof, had been put upon the little house, and that an ornamental bay window of iron had been thrown out in front. Upon entering they found it much as it must have been when Henry George left the place as a boy. Within and without it must have been in Henry George's childhood just such a house as thousands of families in moderate circumstances occupied all over the Philadelphia of something less than three generations since. Now the region is undergoing a transition."

From A Socialist Organ

CONCERNING the franchise tax and other taxes abolished by Single Tax, I assert that the franchise tax is a humbug. The Socialist worries because it is proposed to untax monopolies which he believes should be taxed to the hilt. They should consider the effect of taxing any corporation that produces, sells or transports anything the people need. The corporation merely adds the tax and a collection charge to the price and the people pay the tax—and pay the corporation for collecting it. Clever, is it not, worthy of Bourgeois intelligence, this corporation tax? The Railroad Commission not only includes but is required to include tax costs in fixing rates for the companies. Take a big building. Tax the building, and who pays it? The landlord passes it on to the tenant and he passes it on to his customers. Everything is passed on to the ultimate consumer, nine times out of ten, the workers. That which Single Tax taxes is a community-created value and therefore attaches to the land and cannot be effectively passed on. The community merely takes what the community creates, and landlordism will perish by starvation. ROLAND D. JOHNSON, in *The New Justice*, Los Angeles, Calif.

THE mathematician does not call for a pair of compasses to test a proved theorem with, nor does the man with healthy faith wait for more evidence after he hears what the moral law says. It is enough for him that a thing is RIGHT. He will never believe that the carrying out of what is right by right means, can be injurious. —HERBERT SPENCER.