

pointing office holders, the Filipinos will have no trouble at all about counting their money, and they ought to be happy. Then the Congressman told me of the good things the party is going to do for the people at the next session, which I will not reveal until I can borrow money enough to pay my rent, or pacify the landlord in some other way.

JACKSON BIGGLES.

THE SINGLE TAX.

Mr. Henry George published in 1879 his "Progress and Poverty." In this he sought to find the reason for the "persistence of poverty amidst advancing wealth." He said that had an eighteenth century man like Franklin or Priestley been able to pierce the future and foresee the mechanical triumphs of the nineteenth century he would have assumed that poverty must necessarily have disappeared like an evil dream. But it remains. The race is disappointed. They have assumed the failure to be temporary: to be due to monarchy, standing armies, defective money systems, tariffs and the like; but the situation exists amidst all forms of government, tariff systems, money and military systems. A common effect must be traceable to a common cause. What is it?

Strangely, the trouble seems to lie in the fact itself of industrial progress, the very object of our admiration and worship. In a new country, crude and undeveloped, the social problem does not exist. Great wealth is absent, but so is intense poverty. A substantial equality reigns. But with progress comes poverty. Behind the palace stands the hovel. Boulevard is balanced by slum; the companion-piece of the millionaire is the proletaire. Where progress has achieved its highest triumphs extremes meet. Why?

The authorities trace the trouble to our productive system. Too little capital, they say, exists; labor is dependent upon capital for a living. If wages are low and men unemployed the reason is that there is not enough available capital to employ them. The solution, then, must be found in our working harder, saving more closely and thus increasing the capital of the community with the hope that labor may obtain a portion of this capital in wages.

The weakness of this explanation is evident when we remember that in the new country where capital is absent extreme poverty is also ab-

sent, and that it is in the city where capital abounds that poverty festers and dark alleys breed the fiercer vandals and more hideous Huns which Macaulay prophesied would destroy our civilization.

The authorities next lay the blame on labor. This, they say, is too abundant. Animals multiply as fast as their food supply will permit; and man is but an animal. However great the annual output of wealth the supply of population will rise to meet it as the volume of a gas expands to fill its confining body, however much the size of that body may be expanded. Poverty thus lies in the nature of man himself, and, unless he can overcome the propensity whereby he increases like the beasts that perish, he must reconcile himself to the conclusion that "the poor we (shall) have always with us."

Like the first, however, this argument will not bear inspection. If men multiplied as fast as their means would permit we could have no comfortable class—which we have—to say nothing of a millionaire class. The little savings would promptly be swallowed up by the new mouths; the millionaire would count his family by the tens of thousands and soon all would sink back together into the social swamp.

Further, the very conditions which economists charge up to an increasing population can be found in their worst form in a country with a diminishing population. Ireland affords the classic example, and the famine-slaughter of millions in India leaves poverty there as gaunt and terrible as before.

Finally, in England, the home of Malthusianism, "in spite of an unexampled increase in numbers, the wealth annually produced . . . per head (during the nineteenth century, has nearly doubled."

If, then, neither insufficient capital nor superabundant labor be the cause let us turn from wealth-production to wealth-distribution. This, the economists have taught, separates wealth into three grand shares—wages for labor, interest for capital and rent for land. Further, one of these Ricardo has taught and George has emphasized tends like the lean kine of Pharaoh's dream to swallow up everything else. It is Rent. Every increase in population, every new invention, every improvement in industry, government, education or social condition tends to raise rent. This increase comes in large part out of the other two shares, wages and interest, as shown by the impoverishment of

labor and the fall in the rate of interest. Progress intensifies this condition. It is as though a great wedge were thrust horizontally through society, splitting it into two classes, a handful of rent-recipients rising ever higher in affluence and an army of producers, laborers and capitalists sinking ever lower under the resistless pressure.

What, then, is the remedy? To abolish rent? No; this is impossible. Rent is indestructible. It must be taken from the land owner and given to the people. This can be done by taxation. The resulting revenues will be so abundant as to make all other taxation superfluous. Further, no other tax is just. Gradually, then, abolish all other taxation, straight and crooked, and absorb all rent by the "Single Tax on the Value of Land." This, the public collection of rent, will break land monopoly, afford employment to labor and capital, release from the cities the pent-up thousands, open the social safety valve and prevent the coming explosion, solve the social problem, establish distributive justice and make possible the Golden Age.—Prof. Thomas Elmer Will, in the "Multitude."

DISINFECTION VERSUS VACCINATION.

In the April (1902) Arena, the editor, Mr. B. O. Flower, offered editorially the following interesting and suggestive account of "How Cleveland Stamped Out Smallpox."

Mayor Tom L. Johnson, of Cleveland, Ohio, is unquestionably the bravest, strongest, most sanely progressive and fearlessly true municipal chief in America to-day. He has achieved victories for honest economic and social government in the face of the most powerful and determined opposition, and the only reason that his victories have not been more sweeping and state-wide in influence has been due to the almost invincible influence of corrupt interests long entrenched in power and waxing great through injustice and at the expense of the people. The true statesmanlike qualities that mark Mr. Johnson's public work are as conspicuously illustrated in his wisdom in selecting men to assist him in municipal duties as in his magnificent personal fight made in the interests of juster social and economic conditions, and in his efforts to call American citizens back to the democratic ideals that are the hope of free government.

A striking illustration of this keen discernment in the selection of men charged with the most weighty re-