contradictory and stifling land laws are out of step with the growth of our free institutions and with the march of civilization itself.

CONCENTRATION OF TITLE HOLDING

Land is a natural resource and the private holding of land is a natural monopoly which tends to a concentration of land holding.

The history of titles in this country presents three phases. First, the holding of large estates in a few hands similar to the feudal system. Large grants to the Duke of York, Lord Baltimore, William Penn, General Oglethorpe were typical of our colonial days. The breaking up of these large grants into small individual holdings followed the Revolution and continued until about the year 1890. During this period, the number of titles not only increased in the aggregate, but increased in proportion to population. Land went through the process of commercial development and was largely sold in individual lots. Manhattan Island, starting with a single title from the Indians, became divided into 77,000 individual lots. In Greater New York there are 813,000 separately assessed parcels.

From 1890, however, to the present day, the trend has been in the opposite direction, towards a concentration of titles.

Today, Manhattan Island, with a population of nearly two million people, with 77,000 separate lots, has about 40,000 title holders. Of these 40,000 land owners in Manhattan, about 35,000 own single lots having relatively small values. These small holders are the rapidly disappearing home owners of a preceding generation. The bulk of the four billions of land value in Manhattan today is owned by about 5,000 people. Less than one per cent of the population own approximately 95 per cent of the land value. The number of land owners in Manhattan Island is steadily decreasing not only in the aggregate but also in proportion to population.

WITHOUT ties to bind the people to the land, they have been driven, especially of late years, in ever-increasing multitudes to the towns. Here they have herded apart from the better classes, forming an atmosphere and a society marked on the one hand by an absence of the elevating influences of wealth, education and refinement, and on the other by the depressing presence of almost a dead level of poverty, ignorance and squalor. They are not owners either of the scrap of land on which they live or of the tenements which cover them; but they are rack-rented by the agents of absentee landlords, who know less of them than Dives knew of Lazarus.

CARDINAL VAUGHAN.

I HAVE been a convinced supporter of Henry George's main proposal ever since I heard and read him. I see no other escape from our social troubles so clear and just. I have also remained a Free Trader since my youth.

HENRY W. NEVINSON.

The Dole

EVER since the "dole" in England has been doled out from the dolers to the dolees, the question has been raised as to the excellence of the idea and it is being denounced on every hand by press and pulpit.

The chief charge against it is its demoralizing influence. I sometimes think that it must be a dreadful thing to be "demoralized" and again it might be a very delightful and interesting experience.

Now just what is a dole? Well, to be perfectly frank it is a governmental gratuity; it involves a process of taking wealth from one class of citizens and handing it over to others. That is the dole. That is what it is and that is what it is ultimately for. Now, let us pause to inquire further and see what we will find. What is the purpose of a protective tariff except just that? What is it but a dole? Did you ever hear the beneficiary of a protective tariff talk about the demoralizing influence of this dole, when called by another name? Of course not.

The Grundys, Hawleys and Smoots of this country are already so badly demoralized by this practice that they laud it to the skies. They tell us that we can never be prosperous as a nation unless we constantly increase this national dole.

What constitutes the revenues of the English aristocracy? Why a dole of course. What else is it? What do aristocracies live on but doles, large doles, respectable doles, but nothing else but doles. How do governments get the money for doles? By taxation, of course. How do the aristocracies of England and the Continent of Europe get their revenues except by private taxation?

What have we in human society but universal mendicancy reaching from the bottom layer, where with whining voices and beseeching eyes they supplicate for little doles clear across to the top where aristocracts demand doles, and what is more get them. They own and run the dole-distributing machine. Do the aristocrats of Europe or America complain of the "demoralizing influence" of the doles and tolls they have taken through the centuries, and are still taking? Of course not. They look upon these doles with such favor that any suggestion that they should be lessened fills them with profound alarm.

It is only demoralizing—mark well the word—when it is given in small quantities to small and insignificant people who lack the education and discernment to see through the fraud of it all. There has never in the history of mankind been a privileged class who were not the recipients of a dole. Indeed, they prize their doles higher and defend them more jealously than anything else in the world.

The dole goes to the little fellow because he cannot find work. The dole goes to the big fellow, who as a class deprive the little fellows of the chance to work by owning the source of work and charging more for it than the little fellow can pay. The bald fact is, our whole system of distribution is founded on the dole. Ground rent in private hands is nothing but a dole, a private tax for which nothing is returned. A dole to the little fellow is at best a mean and contemptible substitute for justice and its chief object is to forestall revolution. There has never been a dole-free society except on the world's frontiers. Aristocrats habitually live on highly capitalized doles.

The dole is a very ancient and highly venerated institution. It is only when the multitude of people who have ceased to be citizens and have become victims of society and have asked for a little dole—oh! such a little dole—to keep their shrunken bodies and shriveling souls from separating, that the term "dole" has come into public view.

Operating under a land system that automatically renders millions of them propertyless, helpless and hopeless, the dole comes to the rescue at the last mile post on the edge of an abyss into which to fall is to die. Is it demoralizing? Of course it is—all doles are.

From the bottom to the top, think of the wriggling, squirming mass of unprincipled politicians and unscrupulous citizens angling for place, power, and pelf before the Ways and Means Committee months on end before a tariff revision session of Congress, all over and around doles. Consider the unspeakable mass of twaddle, piffle and rot involved in the arguments used by the supporters of this age-old infamy and you cannot escape the conclusion that it not only demoralizes their morals, but their brains also. There is not a sane man living who can successfully defend the system of dole-making and taking.

Can the dole be abolished? Certainly. All we have to do is to abolish the dole at the top. When that is done, the need for a dole anywhere will disappear.

The dole is one of the outstanding evidences of an insolvent social organization. It dates back into the remote past, carrying down through the centuries to the vivid, palpitating present, and it doesn't fit, it cannot fit, it cannot be made to fit, we have outgrown it. The world is shedding its swaddling clothes, it is becoming self-concious, it is finding itself assailed on every side by questions, problems and forces before which it quails because it lacks the necessary knowledge to deal with them.

The dole, any dole, all doles are makeshifts. They cannot be used to underpin a democratic society. We are a lot of Lilliputians toying with the tools of giants. We but dimly grasp the vastness of our strength. We are wholly unable to use it socially well or wisely. We are like a rudderless ship on an uncharted ocean, a prey to every vagrant breeze.

A dole-breeding, tariff-tinkering, charity-mongering world is in no position to challenge the moral quality of any policy, any system or any legislation that lends to the discussion of moral qualities for the simple reason that the whole topheavy structure is based upon and rests upon the most highly capitalized iniquity on the face of the globe. The private monopoly of nature and all that nature contains, this is the supreme dole and a doleful thing it is.—HENRY H. HARDINGE.

Land Value Statistics

AS time has passed since the beginning of the period when the Henry George philosophy appeared, with its challenge to the old conception of political economy, the necessity has always been arising of having more reliable data regarding land values. It has become increasingly evident that little exact knowledge of this kind is or has been available. Many estimates have been made regarding such values, based upon assessments for taxation purposes and statistics of various kinds more or less related to economics of this character. But few States or local communities have assessments in which there is a clear separation of land values from other classes of property, making such information so meagre, taking the nation as a whole, that general estimates are extremely unreliable and always hazardous.

An additional difficulty—and an exceedingly confusing one—in making such estimates is the element of speculation that is always entering into the consideration of land values. Owners are always seeking prices involving future capitalization of current rental returns, frequently leading into frenzied speculation periods followed by disastrous collapses. But notwithstanding the inadequate amount of accurate information, plus the disturbing element of speculation, it has frequently happened that land values were being estimated—quite definitely claimed, in fact—to be one-half of all other property values, though more conservative estimates concluded that such values were one-half all improvements on land, which latter claim is somewhat verified by known facts.

It is this element of speculation, so deeply imbedded into the system of private ownership of land, that is so upsetting to all calculations as to the real amount of such values, and how far actual land rentals would reach in meeting public expenditures, and therefore justifying, in its absorbtion by the public, the claim that it is an ample amount to meet all governmental expenses, and thus eliminating all other taxes—thereby the Single Tax.

But dismissing this feature, it is interesting to look over some rather reliable data relating to land values. During the time when Lawson Purdy was at the head of the tax assessment department of New York City—it was developed that in one taxing segment of Greater New York the per capita land value reached something like $1,100, while in another district it was only about $800.00. These values, and others of a similar nature, made known in other large centers of population, led to the general con-