

THE SINGLE TAX.

Devoted to the Cause of Taxing Land Values.

Eighth Year—No. 88.

GLASGOW, SEPTEMBER, 1901.

Price, 1d.; by Post, 1½d.

THE SINGLE TAX. CONTENTS.

Notes and News.

Tom L. Johnson on the Progress of the Movement.

Labour Questions and Empire.

The Land Question and the Labour Problem.

Bazaar Notes.

Signs of the Times.

The Housing Problem.

District News.

Mr. Stead on the Single Tax.

Democracy *versus* Socialism.

Published Monthly, Price One Penny.

Post Free in Great Britain and Ireland, 1/6 per annum.

Post Free in United States and Canada, and South America, 50 cents.

Payable in advance.

All Communications to be addressed to THE EDITOR,
13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

Receipt of a free copy of the *SINGLE TAX* by post is an invitation to become a Subscriber.

Notes and News.

We direct our readers' attention to pp. 65-66 in this issue devoted to the Bazaar. It has now been fixed to take place at the Trades' House, 85 Glassford Street, Glasgow, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, 20th, 21st, and 22nd March, 1902.

* * *

The subscription sale books in connection with the Grand Prize Drawing can now be forwarded to any address. The Bazaar Committee trust these will be bought up right away, and their sale pushed by friends everywhere possible. The sale of these books affords a splendid opportunity to bring the Taxation of Land Values before those who are for progress, and to explain the question in all its various aspects.

* * *

The ladies, at their first meeting held on 21st September, unanimously joined in persuading Mrs. Wm. D. Hamilton, Campsie View, Bearsden, to act as convener of their committee. This decision meets with universal approval, and the ladies of the movement everywhere are cordially invited to co-operate with Mrs. Hamilton and the Ladies' Committee in making their part of the undertaking successful.

* * *

When the late Albert Johnson and his brother Tom were in England together a year or two ago, his brother said to him one day, as they strolled through a great art gallery—one of the famous exhibitions of the world:

"Albert, if you had your choice of a single picture, which one of all this great collection would you select?"

With scarcely a moment's hesitation, Albert Johnson pointed to a canvas depicting a man, implored on the one side by his wife to return to work, and called on the other side by his fellow-workmen to strike. "There," he said, "there is one of the great common tragedies of life. In which direction lies the paramount duty? I'd rather have that piece of canvas than all the rest of the paintings put together."—Henry George, Jun., in *Philadelphia North American*.

* * *

In "The Zambesi and its Tributaries," p. 30, Dr. Livingstone says, "the Zulus appear to keep as sharp a look-out on the Senna and Shupanga people as ever landlord did on tenant; the more they cultivate the more tribute they have to pay. On asking some of them why they did not endeavour to raise certain highly profitable products, we were answered, 'what's the use of our cultivating any more than we do? The Landseens would only come down on us for more tribute.'"

Substitute *rent for tribute* and apply the moral to existing conditions at home.

* * *

Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Boston, Mass., U.S., visited the rooms of the Scottish Single Tax League last month. There was, unfortunately, no possible chance of a meeting being arranged owing to our friend's short stay in the city. In a letter to the secretary of the League, Mr. Garrison says:

"I regret exceedingly, that circumstances allowed me only a glance at Glasgow and a brief interview with Mr. Burt and yourself. If I am spared to come again to Scotland, I shall hope to stay long enough to meet and address the Single Tax friends. I cannot help thinking yours is the most efficient organization in the world for spreading the gospel of Henry George. Since I have been in Great Britain, in spite of the absorption of public attention in your unhappy war, I have been struck by the many utterances from many quarters on the land question, and am sure it has been very near the surface of politics to crop out so often."

* * *

Copies of the remarkable report of the Illinois Bureau of Labour Statistics for 1894, which dealt at length with the evils of the present system or lack of system in taxation in Illinois, can be had free on application at the business office of the *Chicago American*, 214-216 Madison Street. Readers at a distance may have the report mailed on forwarding 10 cents to cover postage.

* * *

The *New Liberal Review* for August contains a review of the life of Henry George by T. P. O'Connor, M.P.

* * *

"The Story of my Dictatorship" has just been translated into German, and is presently appearing in the *Deutsche Volkstimme*, the official organ of our German co-workers. The book was translated into Japanese when it first appeared, under the title of "The President of China." By post from *Single Tax Office*, 1/-

The correspondence in the *Dundee Advertiser* on the Taxation of Land Values goes merrily on. One of the correspondents writes:

"New Zealand has placed the practicability of taxing land values beyond question, as sixty of its municipal bodies now rate land values for local purposes. Time-serving politicians may attempt to side track the taxation of all land values by schemes of betterment, but public opinion is against them, and best of all, the men who have made this question of taxation the study of their lives, won't stand idly by and allow schemes to be put before the people that are economically useless. The value of land is not created by the landowner, he therefore has no right to it. The fact that in New Zealand at the recent elections not a single candidate proposed to repeal the Land Value Taxation Acts is a proof that such schemes make for progress and a sound system of taxation."

* * *

Mr. Robert Scott, Durlinghurst, Sydney, N.S.W., in sending a subscription to the *Single Tax*, writes:

"I like your paper very much. I keep it circulating with those who promise to read it, so that one number passes through many hands. The paper is so full of S.T. news that it serves splendidly for propaganda work. Our men are everywhere the most active in the field of reform."

* * *

In sending his subscription to the *Single Tax*, Mr. W. H. Waldon, Redfern, Sydney, N.S.W., writes:

"The paper meets with my hearty approval. I'll endeavour to forward in my next some new subscribers. Accept my best thanks for your real live organ on the greatest of questions in the solution of the social problem. We intend holding a meeting on Henry George's birth-day."

* * *

The Garden City Association have convened a conference, to be held at Birmingham on Friday, 20th September, "to consider the experiment of Mr. Cadbury in removing their works from Birmingham to Bournville, how it can best be followed by manufacturers, co-operators, and others, and in what way local authorities and other organisations could co-operate with such movements."

* * *

The plain, straight way, in our opinion, to the wider solution of the housing problem is the taxation of land values. What is wanted, as a first step, is the overthrow of land monopoly. All round Birmingham and every progressive town, where the people are scandalously housed, the available building sites are held idle at speculative prices. The Taxation of Land Values will force them into use. Without freer access to land a satisfactory or speedy solution of the problem is impossible.

* * *

The *Edinburgh Evening News* says, "the finances of New Zealand are in a prosperous and flourishing condition."

* * *

A lady visitor from Chicago who had a look round the municipal services of Glasgow last month with a Glasgow Single Taxer, writes:

"You cannot realise what an inspiration my experience of Glasgow will be to me when I return to Chicago, where there are so few of us, comparatively, who believe in the christianity that is applicable to civic and social matters. I believe that loving one's neighbour is a vital, practical principle, and not a pretty saying of our Master—it is a love that must have justice for its foundations."

* * *

The Single Taxer replied, "I rejoice if Glasgow can give some help to Chicago. I was four years in that city myself and spent the first three winter months looking for employment. The sign, 'no carpenters wanted,' is still fresh in my memory. As an officer of the Amalgamated Society of

Carpenters, I began to be interested in social and economic doctrines, and hoped much from union of workmen. But trades unionism became too sectional to satisfy me, socialism is visionary, but your countryman, Henry George, has shown me an application of the gospel to human institutions, which may be commenced even in our own day."

* * *

Mr. James O'Donnell Derrick, President of the Dundee Single Tax League, has just been appointed Organiser of the Irish National League in Scotland. Does this mean that the Irish National League of Scotland is commencing to appreciate the true solution of the Irish Land Question? Anyway, knowing Mr. Derrick's uncompromising adherence to the taxation of land values, we heartily congratulate him on his appointment, and wish him success.

* * *

Judge O'Connor in his special minority report of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation (reported fully in our July issue) has just given Irishmen a splendid lead on the land question. This report we have now published in pamphlet form, price one penny, by post, 1½d. The members of the Irish National League should secure a copy and read it along with T. W. Russell's pro-landlord production. We have no fear of the result.

* * *

Mr. H. M. Hyndman has resigned his position as leader of the Social Democratic Federation. In his letter of resignation he says:

"As one of the highly-educated well-to-do class myself, I am quite astounded at the ignorance and apathy of my countrymen, and I am deeply discouraged at the result of our long-continued propaganda."

* * *

As a piece of pure unadulterated egotism this could hardly be surpassed, but we are not at all surprised at Mr. Hyndman's discouragement. The Social Democratic Federation undertook an impossible task. Their notion of abolishing competition and the wage system and running the industry of the country by the State could not stand intellectual examination, and consequently they have been beating the air for twenty long years.

* * *

If it is any consolation to the socialists, many of whom, nearly all of whom, outside the leaders, believe in the taxation of land values, that question is advancing to the entire satisfaction of Single Taxers everywhere. It is just about 20 years since "Progress and Poverty" appeared, and to-day Henry George is triumphant.

* * *

The taxation of land values is coming, and coming soon in Great Britain. It has already appeared in legislation in Australia and New Zealand, and with most satisfactory results. Time and events are on our side.

* * *

Commenting on Mr. Hyndman's discouragement, Dr. Stanton Coit in *Democracy*, says:

"My advice, then, to the hundreds of ineffectual workers like myself in the cause of democracy is that every day we must burn our ships behind us and build anew, and we are not justified in permanent discouragement until all devices have been exhausted and every genius in the land has been converted, and, having tried, has failed."

* * *

We must confess that we are not quite sure what Dr. Coit means. If "every day we must burn our ships and build anew," we cannot see how any progress is ever to be made. One thing seems certain, would-be social reformers would do well to heed the solemn warning of John Ruskin, and investigate before they commence to teach. Otherwise they cannot complain if they find themselves branded as blind leaders of the blind.

Dr. Coit thinks there is no room for discouragement "until all devices have been exhausted, and every genius in the land has been converted, and having tried, has failed." For ourselves we do not look for very much from such quarters. As a matter of fact it requires no genius to understand the social problem and its solution. All that is required is an honest and unreserved adherence to those elementary principles of justice, which lie at the root of every religious as of every ethical movement.

* * *

As Henry George says :

"Social reform is not to be secured by noise and shouting ; by complaints and denunciation ; by the formation of parties or the making of resolutions ; but by the awakening of thought and the progress of ideas. Until there be correct thought there cannot be right action ; and when there is correct thought right action *will* follow. Power is always in the hands of masses of men. What oppresses the masses is their own ignorance, their own short-sighted selfishness. The great work of the present for every man, and every organisation of men, who would improve social conditions, is the work of education—the propagation of ideas. It is only as it aids this that anything else can avail. And in this work every one who can think may aid—first by forming clear ideas himself, and then by endeavouring to arouse the thought of those with whom he comes in contact."

* * *

The *Glasgow Daily Record and Mail*, August 15th, reports that the long suffering ratepayer of Paris is about to find relief by a tax of 1½d. in the pound on the market value of all vacant ground. The new tax is expected to realise £180,000 per annum. We should like to have a little more detailed information on the subject.

* * *

Louis F. Post, writing July 25th from Chicago, says, "How brilliant the outlook for the *Single Tax* is. It seems as if the good time must be coming sure. Our friends in Colorado are very confident of success with their amendment before the people, and Tom Johnson's tax movement is getting bigger every day. Before he gets through, indeed, before the 'fall' elections, the people of Ohio will know something worth knowing about taxation."

* * *

Mr. Max Hirsch, in an article in the August issue of *Taxation* (the monthly journal of the Single Tax League of Western Australia), says: "The federation of the Australian Colonies has made a large instalment of the Single Tax an inevitable necessity to five out of the six federated States. There remains nothing but the tax on the unimproved values of land to keep the States solvent."

* * *

A Highland Reform Association has just been formed in London (Donald Murray & Mackenzie McBride, Hon. Secys., 12 John Street, Bedford Row, London, W.C.). The first plank in the programme reads, "To restore to the people of the Highlands and Islands their rights in their native soil." This looks like the Single Tax 20/ in the £. We wish the new association success.

* * *

A member of the S.S.T.L. resident in St. Andrews writes that the taxation of land values is causing some discussion in the town, and that a resolution on the question is likely to come before the St. Andrews Town Council shortly.

* * *

The *Glasgow Bailie*, of August 21st, gives Councillor Burt, president of the Scottish Single Tax League, a "star turn" in its "Men you Know" column. In the course of a very flattering three column article, the *Bailie* says, "Mr. Burt was one of the earliest presidents of the Scottish Land Restoration League," winding up with the statement, "We need such men as Mr. Burt in Glasgow. In the Council he not only deserves a hearing—he does more, he commands it."

Discussing the strike policy, *The New Age* says, "If half the energy spent in strikes and kindred disputes were expended in the destruction of the land monopoly, the advantage to labour would be incalculable. Let a tax be levied on the land values of the country, and the land monopolists would be compelled to forego their dog-in-the-manger policy. Land would infallibly become free to labour in precise proportion to the amount of the tax levied on the land values, and the freer land became to labour the more capable would labour become of determining the conditions under which it would exert itself."

* * *

London's Poor.—According to the report of the Public Health Department of the Corporation of London, which has just been published, one in every twenty-five citizens is either an inmate of the workhouses or the lunatic asylums of the city. How many out of the remaining twenty-four are hovering between the two destinations it is difficult to say. The city of London is, of course, the richest in the world ; its value per square inch is as good as gold paving, but it contains more misery and poverty proportionately than any other city probably in the kingdom.—*Daily Paper*, August, 1901.

* * *

In sending a subscription, Mr. A. L. Black, Durban, Natal, writes:—"We in our far off home take a very keen interest in the progress of the movement in the old land. We look forward to the time when you will be able to carry your Bill for the taxing of land values. We have had a Land Commission sitting for a considerable time, at which our League gave evidence from the Single Tax view, and we have reason to believe that a land value tax will be among the recommendations of the Commission."

* * *

Commenting on the reports of the Royal Commission on Local Taxation, *The Chicago Tribune*, July 7th, says, "The movement for the taxation of land values in Great Britain appears to have a good deal of momentum."

TOM L. JOHNSON ON JUDGE O'CONNOR'S REPORT AND THE PROGRESS OF THE MOVEMENT.

August 19th, 1901.

MY DEAR MR. PAUL,

Yours of the 3rd ult. and the Judge O'Connor Reports received. I am very much obliged for both, and am circulating the Report. It is a splendid work. King Edward will not read it ; few land-owners will, most of them will put it down as a revolutionary proposition ; but just so sure as Henry George's work made possible Judge O'Connor's Report, just so surely will his Report leave its mark in the minds of men.

I have claimed for a long time that the Single Tax doctrine was quietly working in high places, and with men of influence, and every now and then we find some evidence of it. The Judge's very conservative statement will appeal to men who close their ears to us, but when the principle is once accepted it will bear fruit rapidly enough, and on some occasion, like the election of Abraham Lincoln, the advocates of freedom from industrial slavery will seem to spring up from every bush, as our entire people north of the Mason and Dixie line suddenly became abolitionists.

Our work here goes on well, and we are making headway along our lines. I am in hopes that the next election, which occurs in November, will show quite a gain in the members of the State Legislature who are imbued with our ideas.—Yours sincerely,

TOM. L. JOHNSON.

THE evil is expressed in a few words and sooner or later the nation will appreciate it and rectify it. It is the alienation of the soil from the State, and the consequent taxation of the industry of the country.—*Patrick Edward Dove*.

LABOUR QUESTIONS AND EMPIRE.

By WM. D. HAMILTON.

Reprinted from *Westminster Review*, July, 1901.

AMID all the changes consequent on the policy of one Government or another there is a question of perennial and paramount importance, the question of labour. Changes of Government hitherto have but accentuated the necessity for a thorough understanding of this great subject. Science and art daily add fresh laurels to the already great triumphs of man over the forces of nature, inventions multiply, and wealth is produced with an ease and rapidity incredible to the men of even a generation ago, yet poverty persists.

What are the Conditions of Labour to-day?

For a generation labour has been politically enfranchised, having successfully overthrown, first, the tyranny of the king, and, secondly, the tyranny of the middle class. To-day it stands in possession of political freedom, and still the essential features of tyranny remain. Political freedom therefore is not sufficient: it is only the means whereby labour may achieve economic freedom, the complement of political freedom, and without which political freedom is a mere mockery. There are two classes of reformers at work endeavouring to improve the condition of labour—the social and political and the moral and religious reformers. The former class may very frequently embody the latter so far as the spirit of their work is concerned, but the latter class are unique and profess to effect all that is necessary without resorting to political action. The principal schemes of the social reformers are socialism, trades unionism, co-operation, and temperance. The moral and religious reformers rely, for the most part, on religious ordinance, but, as John Ruskin says, "the mistake of the best men in all ages has been the preaching of patience, and faith, and hope, and every other emollient, consolatory and otherwise, except that which God orders—justice." They are likewise ardent and liberal supporters of organised charities, forgetful often of the stern, eternal fact that charity must ever be vain while justice is denied. The two great parties in the State are also by profession social reformers. It is generally the policy of Socialists to write and speak as if they alone were the true exponents of the claims of labour and the guardians of its highest interests. Socialists in spite of their noble aspirations, believe that men in a state of freedom would trample on and devour each other as they now do in a state of thralldom; consequently they look for salvation to the State ownership and regulation of all industry. But, given equal opportunities, men with their God-appointed faculties need neither bureaucrats nor aristocrats to lord it over them, and when Socialists perceive this truth in all its fulness they must change their policy, or become the conscious instead of being, as at present, the mere unwitting jackals of reaction.

The solution of the labour problem, if it is to be found, must be such that it applies equally to all men. It is not a question of what are the rights of a section of men, but *what are the rights of all men*. It is the ignoring of this fundamental proposition that has caused, and is causing, many sections of otherwise earnest social reformers to dissipate their energies in a thousand different directions, to secure measures which, in the very nature of things, can only remotely palliate the evils they desire to cure.

Trades Unionism has at times been the means of raising wages,

or, at least, has been able to prevent a reduction in wages. This, however, is but on the surface of things. The truth is, that any increase of wages must come out of increased prices to the consumer, or be taken from rent or from increased production. If it comes out of increased prices to the consumer, it is quite evident that the wages of the general community are reduced to that extent; consequently,

viewing wages as a whole, it cannot be maintained that any improvement has taken place, other men being poorer just to the extent that trades unionism has increased for the time being the wages of a section. If the increase in wages, however, be taken from economic rent, the general benefit to workers of every grade is assured, economic rent being the toll which land monopoly levies on all industry for the use of natural opportunity. Natural opportunities exist apart from, and are independent of, the labour of men; they are the free gifts of the Creator to all, and until these become the equal possession of all men, wages cannot possibly be said to have increased; as a matter of fact, if we view the enormous strides which have been and are continually being made in the easy and rapid production of wealth, wages relatively have really fallen. The temporary advantages, therefore, achieved by trades unionism, often gained at enormous cost and suffering, are speedily absorbed by rent exactions of one kind or another. The monopolist sits tighter than ever, limiting increasingly the opportunities to labour, while his position becomes increasingly lucrative as wages advance. The source from which all other monopolies derive their strength is land monopoly; *it is the arch enemy of labour*, and, like a mighty sponge, it soaks up all the advantages of social, moral, and material progress.

Some time ago the labourers in the Admiralty dockyards made a demand for an increase of wages. Mr. Goschen, in replying to them in the House of Commons, said "that an increase of wages would not go to the labourers, but to the sweating landlord. The labourers recently had received an increase of 2s. per week, and rents had gone up 20 per cent."

Mr. John Colville, in the House of Commons some time ago, said that "trade was good in Motherwell, and wages had risen, but the advantages did not remain with the working men of Motherwell, but had been taken by the landlords in higher rents. It was a crying shame and a positive disgrace."

I merely take the opportunity of mentioning men of such divergent political views as Mr. Goschen and Mr. Colville to show that when any man, independent of political bias, faithfully addresses himself to the solution of the labour problem he cannot fail to see that so-called increases of wages are not what they are imagined to be by those who fight so desperately for them, and further, that when obtained they are speedily transferred to the pockets of the land monopolist.

Trades unionism has not only failed to discover and attack the arch enemy of labour, but it has also mistaken, and up to the present seems determined to mistake, cause for effect. For example, it holds as a cardinal principle that the easy and rapid production of wealth is an evil; it looks with suspicion on labour-saving machines, and frequently prevents its members from working them.

Labour-saving Machines are not the cause of Unemployed Men.

If such were the case, then the labour problem could only be solved by reverting to the use of primitive tools. The wheelbarrow is a labour-saving machine for effecting the transport of goods more easily than it could be accomplished on the backs or in the hands of men. Between coin and barter, between the wheelbarrow and the mighty locomotive, what an enormous saving of labour has been effected in the exchange and in the transport of those commodities necessary for the use and convenience of man; yet notwithstanding this the demand for labour has increased a thousandfold. Wheelbarrows may have displaced porters who have hitherto transported goods on their backs, and locomotives may have rendered unnecessary the mail coaches and the carriers of a former day, but while these labour-saving machines have done this, they have done more: they have called into action the dormant activities of multitudes, and established thousands of industries which would have been absolutely impossible without their aid; and so it is with other forms of labour-saving machinery—the labour of some may be

displaced, but the final result must be the calling into productive activity of still larger numbers of men. All that men require is freedom to adapt themselves to the new conditions which labour-saving machines are constantly bringing about.

Trades unionism also limits in an arbitrary manner the amount of work which its members shall do. Although to the superficial observer the easy and rapid production of wealth by labour-saving machines is the cause of unemployed men, the real cause lies deeper. The real cause is the exclusive possession by a few men of that which is the heritage of all the generations of men—the earth, on which we live, and move, and have our being. Remove this cause, and the more machines a man can work the more wealth he will produce, while his wages will be the full product of his labour. But so long as the earth, or a part of the earth, is owned and held by one man, no man, no number of men, can supply themselves.

Take the case of Lord Penrhyn.

Some 5000 men, until the past few months, have found a means of livelihood in quarrying out slates from a mountain, which Lord Penrhyn is pleased (and is permitted by the laws of this country) to call his own. The men desire some slight amelioration in the conditions of their labour, Lord Penrhyn refuses, and shuts up the slate mountain; and Lord Penrhyn, by virtue of his privileged position, can absolutely command the destinies of these 5000 men. The production of wealth, therefore, to the extent of several thousands of pounds per week is absolutely stopped by the will of one man. Lord Penrhyn, being able to determine production in this arbitrary way, is lord of trade; for it is quite evident that every week there must be several thousands of pounds less demand in the market for those commodities which are the products of the labour of other men; and consequently trade to this extent is paralysed. Lord Penrhyn, however, belongs to that class which we reserve for our highest honours, and instal in hereditary legislative chambers, which control the destinies of the people. Before him and his class labour bows in grovelling and superstitious terror. Why? Because in the hollow of his hand he holds the right of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. If a tax of even 10 per cent. were levied on the annual value of the natural opportunity which Lord Penrhyn holds, the Penrhyn strike would be settled, and settled on a sound and enduring basis, in less than a month. Lord Penrhyn could not possibly hold this great natural opportunity indefinitely idle and pay even this small tax.

A tax on land values would prove to be, in short, the key of the door of nature. When men have free access to nature (and who shall deny them this access unless he is prepared to show his title-deed to the exclusive possession of the earth from God Almighty?) they can make as much wealth as they care to without hurting any one, and no man will work for another if he can make more by working for himself.

Another defect in trades unionism is that it is conservative in principle. It groups men in various rings with interests hostile to each other, and bitter demarcation disputes are, as a result, of frequent occurrence. These defects, like the others alluded to, are the products of a condition of tyranny, which will be speedily remedied when the real solution is truly apprehended.

Let us not deceive ourselves: we can only hope for a very slight and temporary amelioration of the condition of labour from trades unionism as it is to-day. I do not say that men should cease to be trades unionists; in fact, I cannot see what else they can do under existing conditions.

But if trades unionism makes mistakes and at times is tyrannous, employers' unionism is no better.

Instead of getting to the root of the matter, the employers, like the men, are content to deal with superficial matters only, and they mix up cause and effect in the most hopeless

manner. They are constantly groaning about an increase in wages, and the interference and dictation of union officials, but they accept as if Heaven had decreed them the ever-increasing exactions and interferences of the land monopoly that plunders them incessantly. Let the workmen be as unreasonable as they may, they, at least give a good return for the wages they receive or business would come to a standstill. What, however, does the landlord, the owner of the natural opportunity, give to the employer? Absolutely nothing that nature has not provided independent of him. The employers accept this extraordinary state of affairs without protest. If the men are not as wise as they should be, neither are the employers, and before they severally exhaust themselves and paralyse trade in the idiotic endeavour to cripple each other, they should conjointly put a period to the exactions of that class which fattens on them both and which is of no more use to society than Dick Turpin was to the society of his day.

I could multiply examples indefinitely.

Take one small example

which was brought to my notice the other day. A manufacturing concern of moderate dimensions situated in the country, remote from town or village, leased a piece of ground and started business. Above the works, on a wild moorland worth little more than prairie value, there was a slight depression which, if dammed at one end, would form a convenient reservoir. The landlord agreed to let the manufacturer have the use of this ground, or rather the water which fell on it, for £50 per annum. The manufacturer built the necessary retaining walls and sluices, and laid the pipes to his works, some mile and a half distant. The works prospered, and lately the lease ran out. On the renewal of the lease the landlord raised the water rent from £50 to £300 per annum. This was the price for allowing that industry to continue—and he got it. The manufacturer did not go on strike against the landlord, or ask his fellow manufacturers to federate against such an exaction. Had the operatives made a demand for a 5 per cent. increase of their miserable wage, the machinery of the federation would in all probability have been requisitioned, and a ruinous strike provoked which might have paralysed the industry, but the land monopolist may increase his demands by 500 or 600 per cent., and against this privileged system of highwaymanry the employers as a class make no befitting protest.

Talk about the corrupt exactions of an oligarchic gang at Pretoria or anywhere else! What is this which is done everywhere daily, in the name of law and religion, and which we bow to as if it were the will of God? Surely the employers, so far as a proper knowledge of the basic principles which underlie all trade and industry are concerned, are quite as foolish as the men. When will trades unionism and employers' unionism alike turn their attention to the operations of that land monopoly which eventually swallows up the fruits, not only of the industry of private manufacturers and traders, but of productive and distributive co-operation?

The Workers may secure great benefits from organised co-operation,

but they will only be allowed to enjoy these so long as the operation of co-operation is sectional. Let co-operation become general, and under existing conditions, the advantages will be transferred to the class which possesses absolute lordship over natural opportunities. In a word, should co-operation become general under existing economic conditions, the people would manage for themselves the work now undertaken by the private trader, but the saving effected thereby would not go to the people; like all other public advantages it would be confiscated by the land monopolist and be registered in higher rent or land charges. As the owner of the wild moorland exacted toll from the private manufacturer, so the ground lords will increasingly exact tribute from the co-operators.

Take the case of the great productive works at Shieldhall.

When these works were laid out, it was resolved that they should be model works of their kind. Grass lawns and flower beds were beautifully worked into the plan, while recreation and dining-rooms for the managers and men were got up on a scale hitherto practically unknown in ordinary industrial concerns. "Away you academic dreamers who talk of basic principles! Away with your theorising and vain speculation! Give us the practical man or men who will take things as they are and make the best of them, and you will find that things are after all just as they should be! Behold Shieldhall!" Yes, behold it! Already they have commenced to build up their flower beds, already they are extending their buildings skywards; flowers, lawns, air, sunlight, skyline and recreation-rooms will go before long under sheer pressure of necessity if Shieldhall progresses. Why? Because they cannot get an acre of the idle land around them under £1500 per acre. When they went to Shieldhall a few years ago it was £500 per acre, and even that price was a swindle. Now because they have done so well, the landowner demands £1500 per acre, and so they find it necessary to build up on the flower beds in the middle of the country. Co-operation, therefore, is as powerless as trades unionism or employers' unionism, as at present conducted, to deal with the dead hand of land monopoly or solve the labour problem.

What shall we say to these things, and what shall be our attitude? Are we to go on eternally, as at present, rolling up the hopeless hill of so-called social and political progress the stone of Sisyphus, or shall we assert our rights as men and demand our birthright?

The rulers and leaders of public opinion are to-day loudly calling upon all to immolate themselves on the altar of sacrifice, as by this means alone can the social salvation of the masses be found. We must press our conquests abroad: we must find an outlet for our "surplus population"; when these things are achieved, the social elevation of the nation will have become an accomplished fact. It is the old trick exposed long ago by Shakespeare, when he caused Henry the Fourth to say to his son:

"I had a purpose once to lead out many to the Holy Land,
Lest rest and lying still should cause them to look too near
unto my state;
Therefore, my Harry, be it thy course
To busy giddy minds with foreign quarrels,
So that action hence borne out may waste the memory of
the former days."

The Old Trick has been Resurrected in the Name of Empire.

We hear a great deal of empire in these days. It seems to be on everybody's tongue. Monarchs, Ministers of State, dukes, earls, lords, members of Parliament, lord mayors, lord provosts, bailies, aldermen, councillors, presidents of chambers of commerce, learned professors, ministers of religion, from the humble street preacher to the Pope of Rome, politicians and stump orators of all shades, and very shady some of them, men of rank and men of no rank; in fact, from the occupant of the throne to the ragged newsboy on the street, empire is the one-and-all-absorbing theme. Feeling has run high, very high, on this question of empire, and yet amid all this Niagara of talk, and inflammation of feeling, I have not met two men who could give an intelligent definition of what empire really is. Even one man may have many definitions. Take Lord Rosebery as an example. Lately he was in our midst delivering his Rectorial Address to the students of Glasgow University. Speaking of empire he says: "If any word can be invented, which as adequately expresses a number of states of vast size under a single sovereign, I would gladly consider it." Evidently this is one of Lord Rosebery's definitions—"a number of states of vast size under a single sovereign." If Lord Rosebery had stopped there, we might have reasonably

concluded that the definition was about as good as any we could possibly get, and in discussing the matter under such a definition we should have been able at least to make some progress towards an intelligent conclusion. Immediately, however, he proceeds to say: "And in the meantime the word empire represents to us *our history, our tradition, our race*. It is a *matter of influence, of peace, of commerce, of civilisation*, above all a question of *faith*, but it is also a *matter of business, a practical affair*. You have received from your forefathers this great appanage; no one outside an asylum wishes to be rid of it."

The inmates of asylums have always had our sincerest sympathy, but it would seem on the authority of Lord Rosebery that this is quite uncalled for.

Again he asks: "What is this empire?" and answering himself, continues—"The last calculations seems to be this, that *its area is between eleven and twelve million square miles*." Then he proceeds to say: "It is already beyond comprehension," and adds that "but for a small incident this empire might have been incalculably greater." Finally, so far as his definitions go, he says: "And what is empire but '*predominance of race*'?"

Let us recapitulate in the sequence that Lord Rosebery observed in his Rectorial Address his definitions of empire:

- 1st. A number of states of vast size under a single sovereign.
- 2nd. Our history.
- 3rd. Our race.
- 4th. A matter of influence.
- 5th. " " peace.
- 6th. " " commerce.
- 7th. " " civilisation.
- 8th. Above all a question of faith.
- 9th. A matter of business.
- 10th. A practical affair.
- 11th. Its area is between eleven and twelve millions of square miles.
- 12th. Predominance of race.

Now, how an empire could be one and all of these things at the same time puzzles me. It has puzzled a good many smarter men, and perhaps it accounts for the extraordinary discussions let loose on the subject.

Lord Rosebery says we have received this "great appanage" from our forefathers.

Perhaps this accounts for the yearning we have at times for our forefathers, so that we might kick some of them. It comes over us in waves when it is peremptorily demanded that we shall take our houses for twelve or eighteen months, although next month, or next week for that matter, we may be heaven knows where. We don't seem to think then that this extraordinary legacy amounts to much. Or when we go a-prospecting for a mere rood of these "twelve millions of square miles" for a garden, a house, or a factory, and find that it is in the hands of the trust lawyers or speculators, and that our only legacy is to "pay! pay! pay!" we feel in spite of all the tall talk of "heritage" and the glowing periods of Rectorial rhetoric that our forefathers have swindled us. When we walk over a wild moorland, or attempt to fish in a loch or river of this glorious appanage, and an armed man reinforced with sleuth hounds orders us on to the highway, on pain of prison, fine, or personal violence—well, we—we feel that if this is what our forefathers bequeathed to us, we wish we never had forefathers, or having them that they had lived long enough for us to rid ourselves of them.

When we reflect that in the very heart of this "great appanage," in London, close upon a million beneficiaries under the will live in crowded conditions worse than beasts, and that 80,000 women on an average nightly have no place to lay their heads, that in our Glasgow 439,000 out of 700,000 live in one-roomed or two-roomed tenements, and that all our large towns and cities have a similar proportion of squalor, suffering, and disease, if we have the hearts of

men we must refuse to rejoice at such a heritage; and, finally, when we see, as happened but a day or two ago, some thousands of poor old sandwich men entertained at a charity dinner, and discover that some nine-tenths of these had served their Queen and empire—that is to say, they did the murdering part of the work, we are driven to the conclusion that not only did our forefathers swindle us in their legacy, but that they who seek to perpetuate this state of affairs are swindlers in the councils of the people.

Lord Rosebery's Empire, no matter how he seeks to conceal it,

is an empire based on force, an empire of military dominion; his confusing definitions are merely resorted to so that the ignorant and thoughtless may be enlisted to support a scheme which has for its primary object not the subjugation of alien peoples alone, but the subjugation of the very people who are foolish enough to toil and sacrifice in building it up. To realise a Roseberian empire it is necessary to create a strong public sentiment of national and race superiority. The two most powerful agencies for moulding popular thought are requisitioned for the propaganda, the press and the pulpit, and in due time the whole of society is infected with the deadly poison, until even the most degraded victims of misrule here are shouting for that misrule to be extended to territories where a freer and a wider life is possible. We are a peculiar people, a holy people, an imperial and conquering race, and under God it is our bounden duty to go forth and slay and subjugate the peoples who fail to be impressed with either our holiness or our institutions!

The conditions and the institutions of the peoples we are invoked to make war upon are misrepresented. A portion of the truth may be told, but the remainder of the truth is judiciously suppressed, just as with reference to our own affairs great poets or authors are quoted with a flagrant and shameless ignoring of the context. Lord Rosebery asks us to remember how incomparably Shakespeare described the seat of empire:

"This royal throne of kings, this sceptred isle,
This earth of majesty, this seat of Mars,
This other Eden, demi-paradise,
This fortress built by Nature for herself,
Against infection and the hand of war,
This happy brood of men—this little world—
This precious stone set in the silver sea.

* * * * *

This blessed spot, this earth, this realm, this England."

To stop the quotation here is to misrepresent Shakespeare, and to misrepresent him for a purpose. Shakespeare causes John of Gaunt to describe in these words an England which he has known, but which had passed away. Here is the conclusion of John of Gaunt's speech so conveniently left out by Lord Rosebery. Let me as conveniently put it in:

"This land of such dear souls, this dear, dear land,
Dear for her reputation through the world,
Is now leased out—I die pronouncing it—
Like to a tenement, or peddling farm.
England, bound in by the triumphant sea,
Whose rocky shore beats back the envious siege
Of watery Neptune, is now bound in with shame,
With inky blots and rotten parchment bonds:
That England which was wont to conquer others,
Hath made a shameful conquest of itself,
Ah, would the scandal vanish with my life,
How happy then were my ensuing death."

This is the England and the empire

which Lord Rosebery and his class are seeking to extend and perpetuate, an empire "bound in with shame, with inky blots and rotten parchment bonds."

They have succeeded from the time of John of Gaunt until now. It is for the people of "this dear, dear land" to say whether the classes shall continue to deceive them longer. Such an empire as these men conceive cannot last; Salisburian rifle clubs and "burghers of the Queen" will be

as impotent to save it as the sneering and inflated impudence of a Chamberlain is to lend it dignity. Such an empire means the increasing enslavement of the workers, their concentration and degradation in cities and towns which are but an aggregation of pest houses in the East End and of unbridled luxury and wantonness in the West, while the country, God's own country, our heritage, is held up for speculation or for the selfish pleasure of the few, who with loud mouths call us to sacrifice ourselves to obtain open doors for trade abroad, while they shut hard upon us the only door to life and trade at home—the land.

A thousand city men—operatives, clerks, and tradesmen—volunteer in a crisis to serve what they, with the best intentions, think their country; only one hundred of these on examination are found to be physically fit. What does this mean? It means that not from without, but from within, are the forces which shall compass our destruction.

I have pointed out the forces which are robbing us continually of the fruits of our labour and of all the benefits of social, moral, and material progress. The chief defenders of this condition of things are the chief exponents of empire—Salisburian empire, Chamberlain empire, and Roseberian empire: they fatten on us to the extent of £200,000,000 or £300,000,000 per annum in land charges:

"They know no interest but their own,
They shake the State, they shake the throne,
They shake the world, and God alone
Seems safe in his Omnipotence."

But there are not wanting signs that the people, the sovereign people, are at last beginning to understand the game. They have fought and bled and paid for empire, and now they wish to enjoy some of it. The value of empire is the value of territory, or land value; this for some hundreds of years has been the appanage of a class, not the appanage of the people, as Lord Rosebery would make us believe.

The Taxation of Land Values,

opposed by the privileged classes and the speculators, will, in the early future, if the people slumber not, secure empire to all who work for it.

When territory is no longer private property, then, but not till then, shall we have a real empire where labour "meets delight half way," and where every noble impulse shall have scope to grow.

For such an empire who could not be relied upon absolutely to make every sacrifice? But for a Roseberian empire, based on twelve more or less mutually exclusive or destructive definitions, who but the unwise could support it?

Wife—Here's an advertisement in the paper that you'd better look into. It says a man is wanted, and he won't be worked to death, and he'll get paid enough to live on."

Husband—Says he won't be worked to death, eh?

Wife—Yes; and they promise pay enough to live on.

Husband—Some catch about that!—*London Fun.*

We deeply regret to have to record the death of Mr. John Colville, M.P. for North-East Lanarkshire, Scotland, which took place after a short illness at his home, Cleland House, Motherwell, on Thursday, 22nd August. Mr. Colville was an enthusiastic follower of Henry George, the only M.P. who openly declared himself as such. Henry George, he said to his constituency, had given society a solution of the social problem based on a true conception of justice, he had shown the true natural source of revenue for the upkeep of government, and the true path in social progress. In the death of Mr. Colville the Single Tax movement has lost a valued, uncompromising supporter, and a blank is left in the progressive politics of the country that is already keenly realised. We extend our sincerest sympathy to Mrs. Colville and her family.

THE LAND QUESTION AND THE LABOUR PROBLEM.

THERE is a disposition on the part of many to consider the Taxation of Land Values merely as a fiscal reform. In the first place there are our Socialistic friends who tell us that no alteration of taxation can affect vitally the condition of the workers, thereby implying that a tax on land values is simply in the same category as a tax on income, a tax on sugar, coal, or any other commodity, we use the word commodity because the Socialist's "land" is a commodity—a form of capital almost indistinguishable from other forms.

In the second place, those who advocate the purchase of the land, and the holding of it by the State, generally allude to the Taxation of Land Values as simply a fiscal change, not in any great way tending to break up land monopoly. They generally tell us that what they want is not so much the value of the land as the land itself to be utilised for the benefit of the people.

Then we have a very respectable class of people who see the burden of taxation falling to a greater degree on industry and the industrial classes than upon owners of ground values, and they would like to see a slight readjustment were it for nothing else than to close the mouths of demagogues. This, with a variation on the sacredness of contracts, is part of the burden of the song of the minority report on local taxation.

What they one and all imply is that the taxation of land values will not affect the relations of landed and landless. The third class especially want a very small tax so that if it should have any effect it may not be clearly appreciated by the people. With the others, the wish that the taxation of land values may make no vital change in social conditions is very largely father to the thought that it will not.

Let us consider the question. Why is valuable land held out of use or put to inferior uses? Is it not that its increasing value, due to increase of population and extension of industry, adds annually on the average a greater amount than the interest on its sale price will bring? If it is not primarily this, then such landlords are largely commercial fools, keeping land out of use for fun, or in ignorance.

The taxation of land values will make land held out of use, bear the same burden as if it were in use. It will, in a word, tend to destroy land speculation; and the full taxation of land values, which we call "The Single Tax," would destroy land speculation entirely, because, the whole value going to the community, there would be nothing to speculate in. Land values would fall, and the land become more available to those who want to use it than under any elaborate system of State ownership.

Through cheaper land, the housing problem can alone be solved; for the housing question is not a question of the scarcity of brick, stone, lime, or labour;

it is entirely a question of the artificial scarcity of land. Cheaper land, too, would stem the tide of rural migration into the town, lessen the competition for employment, and raise wages. All this is contained in the Single Tax, yet almost every peripatetic Socialist orator, with a single aim at the nationalising of everything, proclaims it a fraud.

What is almost always overlooked and misrepresented is the bearing of the Single Tax on the labour problem. Single Taxmen ask no special privileges, no coddling Acts of Parliament for labour, they merely urge that the taxation of land values would tend to give labour free access to the raw materials of production, without which the labourer is virtually a slave.

Here is in a Government Blue Book a splendid argument on this side of the question. In page 115 of the Report of the Royal Commission, enquiring into the depression in our West Indian Colonies, occurs the following:—

"It must be recollected that the chief outside influence with which the Government of certain colonies have to reckon are the representatives of the sugar estates, that these persons are sometimes not interested in anything but sugar, that the establishment of any other industry is often detrimental to their interests, and that under such conditions it is the special duty of your Majesty's Government to see that the welfare of the general public is not sacrificed to the interests or the supposed interests of a small but influential minority, which has special means of enforcing its wishes and bringing its claims to notice.' In regard, for instance, to opening up access to the land to the labourers, the Commissioners point out how both the coolies and the negroes like to have a little patch of land of their own, and to eke out what they make from that by working on the sugar plantations, but go on to say, 'The settlement of the labourer on the land has not, as a rule, been viewed with favour in the past by the persons interested in sugar estates. What suited them best was a large supply of labourers entirely dependent on being able to find work on the estates, and, consequently, subject to their control, and willing to work at low rates of wages.'"

Sugar planters are not the only people interested in keeping wages low; it is the end and aim of plutocracy everywhere. In the face of such evidence, the statement that the solution of the land question will not at the same time solve the labour problem is, to say the least, amusing. With free access to land wages must rise. Will access to land make coolies and negroes free and leave the white man the slave of capital?

The land question is the labour question. Man is a land animal, white men and black men are equally land animals, and equally dependent on land. It is the bottom question, and the question the solution of which is precedent to all real progress. Nationalise industries if you will, run cars, trains, operate telephones, telegraph lines, construct water works and sewage works, and the result will be an increase in the values of land. So if you were to conduct all industries, municipally and nationally, as well as these fundamental monopolies, it would just mean increased rent. And the Single Tax simply means the appropriation of this rent for the joint and common benefit of the whole community.

BAZAAR TO PROMOTE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

To be held under the auspices of The Scottish Single Tax League in the Trades House, 85 Glassford Street, Glasgow, on Thursday, Friday, and Saturday, 20th, 21st, and 22nd March, 1902.

PATRONS.

- LORD CARRINGTON.
 The Hon. LORD PROVOST CHISHOLM (Glasgow).
 Hon. TOM L. JOHNSON, Mayor of Cleveland, Ohio, U.S.A.
 Mr. ALEX. W. BLACK, M.P.
 " H. BROADHURST, M.P.
 " T. BURT, M.P.
 " ROBERT CAMERON, M.P.
 " J. H. DALZIEL, M.P.
 Sir W. B. FOSTER, M.P.
 Mr. GEORGE HARWOOD, M.P.
 " W. H. HOLLAND, M.P.
 " WILLIAM McKILLOP, M.P.
 " D. V. PIRIE, M.P.
 " EDMUND ROBERTSON, M.P.
 " THOMAS SHAW, M.P.
 " ARTHUR W. SOAMES, M.P.
 Capt. F. F. THOMAS, M.P.
 Mr. WHITELEY THOMSON, M.P.
 Mr. JAS. TOMKINSON, M.P.
 " CHARLES TREVELYAN, M.P.
 " ALEX. URE, M.P.
 " J. H. WHITLEY, M.P.
 " J. WILSON, M.P. (Durham).
 " EDWIN ADAM, M.A. (Edin.)
 Provost BALLANTYNE (Peebles).
 Mr. LEWIS H. BERENS (London).
 " A. BILLSON, ex-M.P. (Liverpool).
 Bailie BILSLAND (Glasgow).
 Coun. THOS. BURKE (Liverpool).
 Mr. W. P. BYLES, ex-M.P. (Bradford).
 Mr. GEORGE CADBURY (Bournville).
 Coun. THOS. CAMERON (Lennoxton P.C.)
 " ARTHUR DEWAR, ex-M.P. (Edinburgh).
 Coun. Dr. ERSKINE (Glasgow).
 Bailie FAIRLIE (Falkirk).
 Mr. H. C. FAIRLIE (Glasgow).
 Bailie FERGUSON
 " FIFE,
 Coun. GALBRAITH (Paisley).
 " Dr. GAREY (Glasgow).
 Mr. WM. LLOYD GARRISON (Boston, U.S.).
 Coun. GEORGE GREEN (Lanarkshire C.C.)
 Mr. HENRY GEORGE, Jr. (New York, U.S.A.)
 Bailie A. J. HUNTER, (Glasgow).
 Coun. GEO. LAMB, ex-Mayor (Bootle).
 " THOS. LINDSAY (Lennoxton P.C.)
 " WM. MARTIN (Glasgow).
 Mr. WM. MAXWELL (Chairman Scottish Wholesale Co-operative Society).
 " J. A. MURRAY MACDONALD (London).
 " RICHARD McGHEE, ex-M.P. (Lurgan).
 " D. M'LARDY, P.C. (Bishopbriggs).
 " H. S. MURRAY (Galashiels).
 Ex-Bailie J. D. M'GREGOR (Greenock).
 Mr. A. MACKIE NIVEN (Johannesburg).
 " H. H. PAIN (London).
 Provost PATON (Largs).
 Mr. P. S. PEAT (Glasgow).
 " LOUIS F. POST (Chicago, U.S.A.)
 " A. D. PROVAND, ex-M.P. (London).
 Coun. A. H. SCOTT (Manchester).
 Provost SPITE (Clydebank).
 Bailie D. M. STEVENSON (Glasgow).
 Coun. JAMES STEWART (Lanarkshire C.C.)
 " H. W. STEWART (Edinburgh).
 TRADES COUNCIL (Burton and District United).
 TRADES COUNCIL (Glasgow).
 TRADES COUNCIL (West Bromwich).
 TRADES AND LABOUR COUNCIL (Wolverhampton).
 Coun. THOS. UTLEY (Liverpool).
 Ex-Provost WATSON (Falkirk).
 Coun. J. C. WHITELEY (Sheffield).
 " D. WILLOX (Glasgow).
 Bailie ROBT. WILSON (Pollokshaws).

Mr. Wm. Maxwell, Chairman Scottish Wholesale Co-operative Society, writes—"I will gladly add my name to your list of patrons, and hope to be of some service in your proposed effort."

The Glasgow Trades Council, the West Bromwich Trades Council, the Burton and District Trades Council, and the Wolverhampton Trades and Labour Council have readily consented to become patrons, and wish the Bazaar every success."

* * *

Mrs. Frances M. Milne, San Luis, Obispo, California, author and poetess, sends five copies of her book entitled, "A Cottage Grey," containing her autograph and portrait; five copies of her book entitled, "Heliotrope," and a copy of her verses on the "Passing of the Village." In sending these, Mrs. Milne writes—"I have read with much interest the news of your Single Tax Bazaar, and have ventured to send you a small contribution (the books above mentioned). I wish I had something of more worth, but such as I have my warmest wishes for your work go with it. The thought of your Bazaar carries me back to our grand "Anti Poverty" days, and the splendid fair which the Anti-Poverty Society held in New York City. I can never forget the eager interest with which I read of its progress. I may be able to send you photographs of California scenery."

* * *

Mr. A. Mackie Niven, Johannesburg, gives his name with pleasure as a patron, sends £10 as a subscription to the Bazaar, congratulates us on the new form of the *Single Tax*, and sends 18 new subscribers from Cape Colony and Natal, "where the question," he says, "now excites a good deal of interest."

* * *

Mr. J. S. Jamieson, Partick, writes—"Of course Mrs. Jamieson and I will do everything we can to promote the success of your Bazaar. We mean to give you every assistance we can to get that £1000, and if possible to help to make it £2000. Mrs. Jamieson will contribute some of her own work, and I will send you something also for sale. The taxation of land values seems imminent, and I have a strong belief that one of the two great political parties will be forced to adopt the principle before many years are over. Your Bazaar should give you sufficient of the 'sinews of war' to help them along. Wishing you every success."

* * *

GRAND PRIZE DRAWING.

A few friends have given several articles to the value of £105, to be devoted to a **Prize Drawing** in connection with the Bazaar. They are as follows:—

12 Prizes, - - - value £105.	
1. Upright Grand Piano, - - -	value £45 0 0
2. Bedroom Suite, - - -	" 21 0 0
3. Bicycle—Lady's or Gent.'s, "	" 15 0 0
4. Watch " " "	" 6 6 0
5. Sewing Machine, - - -	" 6 0 0
6. Edison Phonograph, - - -	" 2 10 0
7. Mangle, - - - - -	" 2 5 0
8. Camera, - - - - -	" 2 2 0
9. Pair of Field Glasses, - - -	" 1 10 0
10. "Acme" Wringer, - - -	" 1 5 6
11. Life of Henry George and his works, - - - - -	" 1 1 6
12. Case of Pipes—Meerscham and Briar, - - - - -	" 1 0 0
Total Value, - - -	<u>£105 0 0</u>

Books containing 21 tickets at Sixpence each (United States and Canada, 12½ cents), are about to be issued, and the Bazaar Committee hope to have the assistance of all concerned, both at home and abroad, in promoting their sale. 10/- per book of 21 tickets. **Send for at least one Subscription Book now, and so give this special feature of the Bazaar a good send-off.**

FOR THE LADIES INTERESTED.

The ladies of the Single Tax movement in Glasgow and neighbourhood, held their first meeting in the Rooms of the League, on Wednesday, 21st August. A Ladies' Bazaar Committee was formed, and at the special request of all present, Mrs. Wm. D. Hamilton, Campsie View, Bearsden, agreed to act as convener. After some discussion on a number of points, it was resolved to meet again at 6 o'clock on the evening of Tuesday, 3rd September—the evening of the Henry George Memorial Meeting.

* * *

The success of the Bazaar depends largely on the ladies interested, or who can be interested, and Mrs. Hamilton will be glad to have the names and addresses of lady friends willing to act as receivers of work, or who would assist or contribute in any way to make the undertaking successful.

* * *

The Committee have issued a special circular to Members of the League, subscribers to the *Single Tax*, and to known friends of the movement outside the organisation, seeking their assistance and co-operation.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

The Liberal Leader on the Taxation of Land Values

Speaking at a Liberal and Radical Demonstration at Peckham, London, on 7th August, 1901, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, M.P., said :—

"Now, take for a moment the housing question. Everybody talks about it, and nobody does anything. The facts are familiar to you all. Let me point out one curious thing, a curious double action, with regard to housing. Overcrowding drives up rents, and high rents create overcrowding, and so you are in a vicious circle. If they, the Government, are going to begin a great scheme, they have at one point at least received a good lead from some members of the Royal Commission, which lately sat upon it. Let me read what these Royal Commissioners say. They report in favour of the rating of site values. They say that site and structure, which are now combined for rating purposes, differ so essentially in character that they ought to be separately rated, that when separated structure and site value were capable of bearing some heavier taxation, that they should be made to bear it subject to strict respect for existing contracts, and that the differential rating should take the form of a special site value rate. And then they say :—

'More especially since anything that tends to relieve the pressure of local taxation, or to prevent the growth of it, must ultimately sooner or later benefit the owners of site values, it seems desirable that any increased provisions made by the State in aid of services locally administered should be accompanied with some make-weight in the shape of owners' site value rate.'

"What is this that we find in the report—I admit, a minority report—of a Royal Commission? It is what all land reformers in and out of the London County Council have been saying for years. Now the majority on this Royal Commission say that the system established is neither equitable or practicable. Which do you think the Government will throw over when they come to deal with the question? This minority report is the report of the Chairman of the Commission, a Cabinet Minister himself, Lord Balfour of Burleigh, and of two of the greatest Treasury experts in the public service, Sir George Murray and Sir Edward Hamilton. Will they take their report or will they throw it over? Will they, to this mild and tentative extent, admit that land is made for men and not men made for land—(hear, hear)—and that the prerogatives and immunities attaching to land must give place to the welfare of mankind."

LANDLORDS are perhaps the only great body of men whose interest is diametrically opposed to the interest of the nation.—*H. T. Buckle.*

THE HOUSING PROBLEM.

By JAMES LOVE, Camden, N.J., U.S.A.

AMONG primitive men, I mean men who, like our Indians and some Islanders, have made but small advances in the arts, their is no shadow of a "Housing Problem." Though they may not have very elaborate houses, they *all* have houses, and every man is the peer of his fellows. It remains for advanced "civilizations" to evolve both a monstrous inequality and an "Economics" to defend it—to evolve a social state in which, as Dr. Johnson said, "No man is entirely happy except when he is drunk,"—to evolve superlative powers to build houses, and, at the same time, a Housing Problem!

Thus, at the beginning of this twentieth century of Christian civilization, that problem is still to solve. And, though rejecting the only calculus that leads to solution, the Economists and their disciples persist in working at it vigorously. For an Article in the April *London Quarterly* reviews no less than seven recent prints—"The Health of Nations," "Homes for the London Poor," "The Dwelling House," "Essays on Rural Hygiene," "The Housing Question," "Houses for the Working Classes," "No Room to Live"—all bearing upon the subject.

As may be inferred from its source, the writer of that article is a Conservative, giving his approbation to no remedy whatever, not even (because they *are* municipal) to municipal tramways. And he makes little mention of "Rent," probably because the taxation of ground rents, aiming straight at the solar plexus of monopoly, he could not even think of, much less write about, without having a sinking spell. He seems to see, confusedly, that the libraries, schools, tramways, parks (which being public undertakings he alludes to disparagingly) always tend to increase the value of land; for he says—

"When a poor man pays his rent he is also paying for his share of certain other things which are being done for him. About one-fourth of his rent is really rates." Yet calmly adds—"We doubt if the sacrifice made by the great landlords of London to what they regard as their duty has ever been sufficiently recognised." Evidently in the belief that society is tending to the dogs, he closes with a sigh—"We live in an age of doubt, and their is no good in denying the reactionary temper of the times," which is bringing about "a policy as deplorable as it is inevitable."

In one sense, indeed, there *are* signs of reaction—a tendency to return to more primitive conceptions of justice in the interpretation of law.—Thus, the Code of Iowa reads (and with small variations the laws of all the States), "Every disposition of property (meaning land) is void which suspends the absolute power of controlling the same for a longer period than during the lives of persons then in being and for twenty-one years thereafter." And Washburn on Real Property renders the Common Law thus—"To give validity to a partition of land *all persons interested* should be made parties to the proceedings. Such parties and none others would be bound by the judgment."—Do these expressions of American Statutory, and of English Common Law, when *justly* interpreted to include the *first* disposition—the *first* partition, sustain any of our private titles to land? Sustain grants to John Doe, his heirs and assigns *forever*?—Uphold partitions of land against the deeply interested coming generations whom it was not possible to notify, and who cannot therefore "be bound by the judgment"?—And the parchments set aside—where continued millions of minors and married women are interested—can "adverse possession" be appealed to?

Justice, as she now stands blindfolded by custom and bearing a sword, may promptly answer Yes.—But times do come, you know, when the concurring decisions of centuries are overruled. And the Supreme Court of Popular Conviction to which the case of "The People *versus* Landlords"

must, after a full hearing, soon be submitted, shall not fail to hand down the decree in rather imperious tone—

"The conveyances are faulty. Your partitions void. Though 'the land of England by virtue of grants made by certain Kings and Queens long since dead has hitherto belonged to but few of its people—by virtue of a decree of Almighty God the land of England belongs to the whole people of England.' And, as of England and its people, so of all other lands and peoples. The judgments of the courts below, hitherto confirmed by this court, are now reversed."

In the "Nineteenth Century" for March

I find another paper, "The Housing Problem," by the well known Rev. Samuel A. Barnett, who for thirty years, in London, has been engaged in practical work among the poor, latterly in connection with Toynbee Hall. He commences, "Good times have not solved the housing problem. Trade is abundant and wages high, but the complaint of want of 'room to live' . . . still rises. Facts disgraceful to civilization are continually coming to light." "The housing problem rightly rouses the passions of pity and indignation. It is hard to be still when . . . where houses are bad the death rate is double, poverty irremediable, and degradation hopeless. The nation is rich, and the people perish for want of home room. There is no language too strong to express the feelings of those who have seen with their eyes how the poor live." "Or," he might add, "to express the feelings of Christ could He come again and see how the rich live."—Yet he thinks there "is a class who will refuse to live within the restriction of decent houses," and that "to consider the lowest class as the first object of improvement is to let feeling blind reason"

As to remedies he says, "The best thing which can be done for a slum is to break it up—to treat its people as the police do loafers (make them move on), or as housewives do a dusty room, remove the dust to another place." The congestion might be removed, he thinks, by lower railway fares. "The railways might be required to do more in compensation for their monopolies." And he quotes Mr. C. Booth who is inclined to think that "improved locomotion is the first, if not the only thing needful."—And this too in face of the conspicuous fact that every railroad and tramway, every reduction of fares from the beginning has caused land values to rise, and the congestion to be intensified,—morals to sink lower, and buildings to rise higher.

But, unlike the Review writer, Mr. Barnett touches that which, in the organization of the universe, precedes human existence, and without which man would be a disembodied spirit—**Land**,—on the treatment of which rests the whole social problem. He says, "There must be some change in the law to give enterprise an opportunity." "If builders could get land on which it would pay to build they would set to work to-morrow."—And to make land more accessible he suggests:—

I. The owners of condemned houses might be paid only for the land, remarking that "a butcher's bad meat is not paid for when condemned."

II. All vacant lots might be "rated" (taxed), and Parish Councils could have authority to buy at rateable rates. And he quotes from an ex-chairman of the County Council Housing Committee, that if rates could be removed from houses and put upon lots only (land), that it would greatly assist building. For in the outskirts the house is worth six times the lot, while near the centre the lot is worth six times the house. He says, "Builders are waiting to build houses for people waiting to occupy them," and any plain man can see acres of land "ripening for owner's benefit, who, in a few years, will reap the fruits of others industry."

Yet—alas for the rarity of human sanity under the sun—the perplexed good man adds—"The last fact which I would submit to reformers excited by the action of owners who raise rents and evict tenants . . . or who build jerry houses . . . is, that they are only speculators, using within the

limits of law and public opinion the foresight and the energy which make the wealth of the nation.

So—as I lay down Mr. Barnett's piece, I incline to use the words of a tramway conductor yesterday, in handing me back a coin, "That piece wont pass, Mister, it's mutilated."

The cause of poverty amid abundance,

the problem of civilization, treated of by Mr. Barnett in ten pages, is sought for by Professor Thorold Rogers, of Oxford, in an octavo of nearly six hundred. His really very valuable (not for its conclusions but for its facts) "Six Centuries of Work and Wages." From this I make a few very short citations to show that, after all, Oxford and Toynbee Hall have the resemblance of twins.

"To get abundant supplies of food for the poorer citizens in one way or another was the constant anxiety of democratic Athens and of Imperial Rome." An intimation that poverty always has been and always will be.

"The English Poor Law was the outcome of great crimes committed by Government, and is aggravated even now by customs permitted by Government."

The fund that helps Lazarus "comes not from the pockets of those who grow wealthy from his want, but from others who are made liable, in their degree, to the same extortion."

"Why at his own doors, at Beaconsfield, Burke must have daily seen serfs who had less liberty than those Rohillas, whose wrongs he described so pathetically and dramatically."

"The errors and failures of joint stock enterprises (railways) have been incessant . . . and a halfpenny a mile would have produced great dividends had not the nominal capital been increased threefold by the blunders of those who projected them, by the rapine of those who gave them legal status, and by the follies and recklessness of those who have managed them."

"He speaks of the "rapacity" of landlords and of "the impossibility of developing self-reliance and courage under the terms of precarious tenure."

"The well being of a mere landlord is a matter of no consequence but to himself."

"There is nothing in the history of civilization more odious than the meanness of some English landlords, except it be their insolence."

"Already there is an ominous sympathy with the theory for making that a national estate which Englishmen have been studiously excluded from sharing by ordinary purchase as private owners."

"To use an American phrase . . . the Russells, and the Bentincks, the Cecils, the Portmans, the Grosvenors, and the rest, with the Corporations, have had for a long period 'a ring' or 'a corner' in the land market, and can force buyers to give famine prices."

Though before his death he may have recognised the grand distinction between the valuable products of labour, and the valuable legal power to rob labour of its products—two values that, under the term "property," are both popularly and "economically" confused—in this book he writes—

"To suggest that the owner of land should be deprived of his property is dishonest, and were it carried out would be disastrous."

It is Pascal, I think, who remarks that "Two similar faces, neither of which alone would cause a smile, are laughable by their resemblance when brought together." Both the Clergyman and the Professor see great evils in the private ownership of land, see that it is robbery in fact—and on the grandest scale—yet both fall prostrate before it like Central Africans before a fetich.

Still, in a matter so grave, one can't laugh. It seems to me I'd rather swear. My old friend, Professor Wachsmuth, in relating the impositions of a geological trip, broke out—"The ugly village tavern woman charged me two dollars a day—like a big hotel! And besides did give me a trade dollar in change. Damn! I was most mad!"—So, after the impositions of this economic trip, I too might find relief in putting feelings into words.

District News.

Greenock.

An open air meeting was held at the Public Square, on Friday evening, 23rd August, Mr. John Innes, of the Greenock Trades Council, in the chair. The speakers were ex Bailie M'Gregor, Greenock, and Messrs. William D. Hamilton, and John Paul, Glasgow. There was a good attendance. At the close, copies of the current issue of the *Single Tax* and other publications bearing on the land question were sold and distributed. Names and addresses were also handed in by several of the audience for future work.

Abercarn.

Alderman P. Wilson Raffan, J.P., recently delivered a lecture on "Schemes of Social Salvation," at the White Lion Coffee Tavern, under the auspices of the Abercarn Junior Liberal Association. Mr. C. Alford presided. Alderman Raffan, who spoke at considerable length, outlined the various schemes of social regeneration which have been advocated by leading thinkers. After reviewing various proposals, the lecturer referred to the Single Tax proposals of Henry George, and indicated that, in his opinion, these offered a solution of the social question. At the close, a cordial vote of thanks was passed to the lecturer, on the motion of Mr. A. E. Meredith, seconded by Mr. A. E. Davies, and a similar compliment to the chairman terminated the proceedings.

Bradford.

Mr James Firth, writing in the *Bradford Observer* on the local sewage problem, says: "Liverpool is opening its eyes; and it is quite time Bradford citizens began to open theirs. In their desperate efforts to solve the housing question the Liverpool City Council have found out that by not having power to rate land according to its value they are immensely increasing their municipal difficulties. First, they find that they are sacrificing a rich fountain of municipal revenue, which involves a great rise of present rates, which rates are simply annual subscriptions, seeing they have to be paid in addition to rent. Secondly, they find they are making all the land they require for housing purposes, or other public improvements, artificially dear against themselves. By making sites dear, we make rents artificially high; and so it comes about quite naturally that neither by private enterprise nor by municipal enterprise can the poorer classes of the community be decently housed in large cities, except at a loss.

The Liverpool City Council is certainly not a revolutionary body. Sixty-five per cent. of them are Conservatives. Yet this very Conservative body has been so operated upon by the logic of events, so struck by the amazing folly of the present absurd arrangement, that they have petitioned Parliament by an overwhelming majority for permission to rate "site values." So great, indeed, was the majority that it would have been substantial if not a single Liberal had voted in it. April 17th, 1901, will long be remembered in Liverpool.

How soon is sleepy Bradford going to move? As the housing question has converted Liverpool, perhaps the sewage question may convert Bradford; for it is the same mischievous and unjust principle that is at the bottom of both difficulties, and of many others—the principle of giving away our site values and site rentals to others, and so making land artificially dear that otherwise would be cheap.

New Zealand.

Mr. Percy Wakefield, who left London in the early part of the year for New Zealand, writes from Wellington, N.Z., 3rd September, to Mr. F. Verinder, secretary, English Land Restoration League, "The rating on unimproved land values

is rapidly developing in New Zealand. Only a few weeks ago the town of Invercargill adopted it by a large majority, and the Premier has announced his intention to make the system mandatory or compulsory throughout New Zealand."

New South Wales.

Mr. J. R. Firth, Redfern, Sydney, N.S.W., writes, 16th July: "We've just passed through another State General Election, and I'm glad to say that nearly every member of our new Legislative Assembly is pledged to an Amended Municipalities Bill, included in whose provisions would be 'local option in taxation' and 'manhood' suffrage. That sterling Single Taxer, Mr. Edmund Lonsdale, has again been elected member for Armidale. Mr. Lonsdale, for sticking to his principles, was defeated at the '98 election, but his constituents have now repented and renewed their lapsed confidence. Several other Single Taxers were in the field, including Peter M'Naught for Redfern and R. T. Ball for Albury, but although they polled very strongly they were not elected."

HENRY GEORGE MEMORIAL DAY.

The Scottish Single Tax League held the Henry George Memorial Meeting on Tuesday, 3rd September, 1901, at 7.30, in the Lecture Hall of the League, at 13 Dundas Street, Glasgow. Mr. Lewis H. Berens delivered the principal address. A report will be given next issue.

Keighley.

The Keighley Single Taxers held a public meeting at Devonshire Hall, Devonshire Street, Keighley, on Saturday, 7th September, to commemorate the birthday of Henry George. Mr. George Brigg, M.P., presided. Mr. J. H. Whitley, M.P., Halifax, Mr. Edwin Adam, M.A., and Mr. John Paul were the principal speakers.

Greetings from the Single Tax League of South Australia.

30 Pirie Chambers, Pirie Street,
Adelaide, July 24th, 1901.

Our heartiest greetings on the occasion of the anniversary of our great leader's birthday. The grand and enduring work which you in Glasgow have accomplished has made its influence felt in far off Australia, and has lifted on the cause throughout the world by a generation.

We, in Australia, have been privileged to demonstrate by its practical application the justice and perfect feasibility of the great reform which we advocate, and it is generally recognised, even by our opponents, that gradual increases of land values taxation to replace unjust methods of raising revenue are inevitable.

The forces that stand behind our cause increase day by day, and year by year. The hard-headed business man who sees the reform from a purely commercial point of view, the enthusiast who sees in it a movement for the emancipation of mankind, and the politician who sees in it the only way out of political chaos, are all working towards our goal.

With best wishes.—Yours in the cause,

CRAWFORD VAUGHAN, *Secretary.*

The Glasgow Single Taxers and the Scottish Single Tax League heartily reciprocate the greetings of our South Australian co-workers. The Australian and New Zealand Single Taxers have fought well. They have won the first legislative fruits of our movement, and Single Taxers everywhere now look to Australia and New Zealand with keen interest for encouragement and inspiration.

So long as we, or any other, doth own the earth to be the peculiar interest of lords and landlords, and not common to others as well as to them, we own the curse, and hold the creation under bondage.—*Jerrard Winstanley.*

MR. STEAD ON THE SINGLE TAX.

In the "Review of Reviews" for August, Mr. Stead, in summarising and criticising "The Lord of the Sea," by Mr. P. Shiel, says—

"Mr. Shiel appears to be of the school of Dr. Wallace and Henry George, or of some other of the numerous sects of land nationalisers. He is convinced that rent is robbery, and that the millennium would dawn if the rental was paid to the Governments, to be disbursed by them for the benefit of the people, instead of going into the pockets of landlords, to be used by them for the benefit of their families. This idea is not new, neither is it true, for it requires very little thinking to come to the conclusion that if the present Government, for instance, had the whole of the rent-roll of the United Kingdom to play with it would only have a larger sum to waste on wanton war and unnecessary expenditure. The very last thing it would do would be to inaugurate the millennium. Mr. Shiel or his hero appears to have persuaded himself that if land were nationalised and all rents paid to the Government, men would earn enough in one day to keep them in comfort during six; and that sin and sorrow and all the miseries of this mortal world would vanish as an evil dream before the wings of the morning. It is not necessary to argue this question. Mr. Shiel is not a political economist; he is a sensational novelist, and he has a right to choose his own standpoint."

We as Single Taxers do not care to be classed as land nationalisers, but if what is meant by land nationalisation is the ultimate taxing out of land values and the abolition of all other forms of taxation we have no objection to the name. But we decidedly object to be considered in favour of giving to any Government the values of land in addition to all the present revenues derived from very many crooked projects. And we certainly think that, in justice to the followers of Henry George, Mr. Stead should do a course of reading (and thinking) on the Single Tax question, as he invariably manifests an ignorance of the question that is painful to perceive. Not that it matters a great deal to the Single Tax cause what view Mr. Stead holds of it, as the said Mr. Stead suffers terribly from literary indigestion, does most of his thinking with his heart, and, by intemperance and exaggeration, generally hinders more than he aids the causes with which he is identified, but if he could be induced to do a little thinking on the question it might be to his own everlasting benefit. The idea that rent is robbery is neither new nor true any more than wages are robbery, and do not find any school of land nationalisers, as Mr. Stead is pleased to designate us all, who hold such an idea. If rent is robbery does it cease to be robbery when it is paid to the Governments? What Single Taxers believe is that the private appropriation of rent is robbery, not rent, or the taking of rent, and we are certainly convinced that we would have taken a good step towards the millennium if the rental of land was paid to the Governments, to be disbursed by them *for the benefit of the people* instead of going into the pockets of landlords, to be used by them for the benefit of their families.

This idea, Mr. Stead informs us, is neither new nor true; granted that is is not new, that it is as old as More, Spence, Quesnay, Turgôt, Ogilvie, Dove, or Spencer, what does that matter? But if it is not true that is a different thing. "It requires very little thinking to come to the conclusion that if the present Government, for instance, had the whole of the rent roll of the United Kingdom to play with it would only have a larger sum to waste on wanton war and unnecessary expenditure." It is quite evident that it does not require much thinking to suggest an argument like this. Does Mr. Stead do so little thinking that he cannot understand that the private rent rolls of the Rhodes', Beits', Salisbury's, &c., have been the chief cause of the war? Where would the present Government be but for its rent rolls? They hold position and power, not by ability, energy, and genius, but simply because they have rent rolls.

Would Lord Salisbury be Prime Minister? Would the Cecil family reign in St. Stephen's if private property in land were abolished? The truth is that the war spirit has always been fostered by the land speculators of the world. But let us put the question in another way. Suppose all the values of the land of Africa had been used entirely for public purposes, regardless of race or colony, would there have been such people as the Rhodes-Beit fraternity, and would there have been war? Let us suppose further, that we have no taxes anywhere, and that the value of land is the sole revenue of Governments, what interests will the land speculator then have in creating and fostering the war spirit?

We have referred to these remarks of Mr. Stead, not because he is the only one who uses such arguments, but because he has stated with his usual literary ability the cast-iron conception of the Single Tax of George Bernard Shaw, and the ordinary Socialist, and Socialistic reformer, who see in the Single Tax nothing but so much revenue. The taxation of land values means much more than the securing of revenues for State and municipal purposes. It means the breaking up of land monopoly and the utilisation of the land by the people. Give the people of these islands the right to use the land of their birth, and all the gold mines of the world will not tempt them to emigrate and increase the land values of African land speculators.

We are glad to say that, despite such misrepresentations as this in the "Review of Reviews," the cause of the taxation of land values, the only practical method of securing the common ownership of land values and the equal right to use the land, goes marching on. WM. CASSELS.

*** The Burdens of Local Taxation and Who Bears Them.**

Though it has gained the unqualified praise of the leading American Professors of Political Economy, this pamphlet places the most advanced and correct views on the above important question clearly and concisely before its readers. Students of our paper, or of the Single Tax Philosophy generally, will find in it nothing specially new or instructive; but we can earnestly recommend its perusal to those who have yet to qualify themselves to understand the A B C of the question of taxation, and of its direct and indirect effects. More especially would we recommend its study to the Adam Smith Professor of Political Economy at the University of Glasgow; for the sake of the reputation of our ancient University, in whose name his official position entitles him to speak, we trust he will endeavour to study and digest its presentation of the elementary principles of taxation before he revises his notorious work on *The Taxation of Land Values*. The gist of the pamphlet may be inferred from the author's (Mr. Lawson Purdy, M.A., Secretary New York Tax Reform Association) final summary of the whole question, as follows:—

"The general conclusion of the whole matter is that taxes upon things capable of reproduction are paid by the consumers of the things taxed, and that taxes upon things not capable of reproduction, but of fixed quantity, are paid by the owners, and only by those who are the owners at the time the tax is imposed."

* *The Burdens of Local Taxation and Who Bears Them.* By Lawson Purdy, M.A., Secretary New York Tax Reform Association.

LABOUR QUESTIONS AND EMPIRE.

An Examination of Labour Questions; and a reply to LORD ROSEBERY'S Rectorial Address, at Glasgow, on

"QUESTIONS OF EMPIRE."

By WM. D. HAMILTON.

ONE PENNY.

"Single Tax" Office, 13 Dundas St., Glasgow.

DEMOCRACY VERSUS SOCIALISM.* (FIRST NOTICE).

WHILST recognising, with the author of this most timely and valuable book, the services Socialists have rendered in the recent development of economic science and the awakening of political thought, whilst appreciating, with him, the "high ability, character, and attainments" of many within their ranks, we must confess that we have often desired that someone would impartially and critically examine the doctrines of Socialism, the economic, ethical, and political conceptions on which they are based, as well as the industrial, political, and social changes which they involve. The book now before us accomplishes this task, and that in a manner which should recommend it even to those who may dissent from its views. Though certainly a book for the thinker rather than for the partisan, for the student rather than for the general reader, it is one which no student of any branch of sociology, of ethics, politics, or economics, whatever may be his individual tendencies or partialities, can afford to ignore. Its emphasis of the degrading and demoralising social ills which to-day seem the inevitable accompaniment of the present civilisation, should recommend it to every earnest social reformer, irrespective of the particular school of thought to which he may belong. Its frank appeal to the reasoning faculties, rather than to the emotions, should make it welcome to all of a philosophic turn of mind, to all, in fact, capable of following a closely reasoned argument. Its candid admission that the advocates of the theories it criticises and subsequently condemns are actuated by the noblest sentiments that can spur men to activity, should rob its crushing criticism of all its sting, and compel even them to admit that it is, indeed, the work of an unbiassed, earnest, and sincere seeker after truth, who condemns no theory without understanding it, or accepts any theory without submitting it to the severest tests that reason can devise. Hence it is a book to be recommended to all who would acquaint themselves with the present position of Social Science, to all who would guide their own activities and aspirations by the light of correct thought.

An Analysis of Socialism.

In Part I. of his work Mr. Hirsch presents us with a clear and definite analysis of Socialism, an analysis which we think will be unreservedly accepted by Socialists themselves, as it is based entirely on statements, mostly quoted verbatim, emanating from avowed and recognised Socialistic sources. He first examines the economic, ethical, and political conceptions on which it is based, its industrial and distributive proposals; and, finally, the passionately urged claim of modern Socialism to be considered scientific. This last named inquiry will, we think, be generally recognised as most instructive and important. Everyone competent of thinking on the subject must recognise that there must necessarily be certain constant and immutable natural principles, or "laws," determining the results of our social, as of our industrial, activities, in accordance with which we must shape our actions if the motives that inspire them are to be fulfilled, if the ends to which they are directed are to be attained. As everyone more or less clearly recognises, the results of our actions, social as well as industrial, are not determined by the motives that inspire them, but by the means we adopt to attain our ends: if these are in accordance with the demands of Nature, they will succeed; if not, they are inevitably doomed to failure. Whether we like it or not, whether we recognise it or not, Nature, to use Lord Bacon's words, is not conquered save by obedience; and this is true of our social as of our industrial activities. Mr. Hirsch clearly recognises this; and it is in the light of this

fundamental scientific conception that he examines the doctrines of Socialism, and searchingly investigates its claims to be scientific, to be in accord with "well ascertained natural laws governing the conduct of men in society."

Its Economic Conceptions.

In the first place Mr. Hirsch submits the fundamental economic conceptions of Socialism to a most searching criticism. Its theory of value, its views of competition, its basic notions concerning that most vague and mysterious term "capital," which form the key-stone and corner-stone of Socialistic doctrines: are all carefully examined, compared with facts, and ultimately discarded as discordant therewith. In fact, Mr. Hirsch traces the errors of Socialism mainly to its obviously false views concerning competition and "capital." Speaking of competition, he says—

"The main difference between Socialism and other non-socialistic methods of social reform will be found to be that, while the former condemns competition as such, the latter condemn the one-sided and inequitable conditions under which competition is now carried on, and looks forward to the removal of these unjust conditions and to the establishment of a really free and equal system of competition—the possibility of which Socialism denies—as the cure for the fundamental injustice of modern societies."

Again, after pointing out the real and essential differences between accumulated stores of wealth, the product of human labour, the function of which is to aid production, to promote exchange, and to increase the productive power of labour, and legalised privileges and monopolies—titles to land, to special advantages, and so on—the function and result of which is to enable some few to command an ever increasing portion and proportion of the fruits to the labour of others: *both of which are, unfortunately, huddled together by Socialists, and included under the mystic term "capital."* After pointing out that real capital—*i.e.*, wealth devoted to the production of more wealth—is constantly being consumed and disappearing, whilst spurious capital—special privileges and monopolies—is to-day constantly being created by legislative enactment, and can only disappear with the repeal of the law creating same—Mr. Hirsch continues—

"It is, therefore, obvious that the diagnosis of the social malady upon which the doctrines of Socialism are founded is faulty in the highest degree, and that, therefore, the remedy which it proposes cannot be the true remedy. Making no distinction between real and spurious capital, between what is permanent and obviously unjust and injurious, and what is ephemeral and has never been proved to be unjust or injurious, it condemns both alike. By combining, under one denomination, these two widely different classes of property, Socialists obscure the action of both, and have, therefore, been unable to see that the relations between labour and the owners of real capital are profoundly affected by the existence of these monopoly-rights. That the power which the capitalist possesses over labour is not due to his possession of real capital, but to the weakening of the economic position of labour through the baneful action of monopoly-rights, will be shown in subsequent chapters."

A promise which our author does not fail to carry out in a most thorough and satisfactory manner.

Its Ethical Conceptions.

"The conception which Socialism has formed with regard to the relations existing between individuals and the social entity to which they belong," says Mr. Hirsch, "is totally opposed to that formed by Liberalism and Democratic Radicalism, and is practically identical with that prevailing under the despotism of the post-reformation period. Apart from Socialists, it is, at the present time, to be found only among the belated survivals of that period, who march in the rear of English Toryism, or compose the junker-parties of

* "Democracy versus Socialism: A Critical Examination of Socialism as a Remedy for Social Injustice, and an Exposition of the Single Tax Doctrine." By Max Hirsch (Melbourne). Published by Macmillan & Co., London. Price 10/- net.

Germany and Austria. It consists in the denial of the existence of abstract or natural human rights, and its converse, the assertion that all individual rights are derived from the State, as well as in the logical deduction from these premises, that any and all such rights may justly be cancelled by the State, if the latter is of the opinion that its interests will be served thereby." . . . "Socialism boldly pronounces judgment against the older standard of industrial ethics, and declares, that not to the labourer who produces it, but to Society collectively, belongs the wealth which any man's labour produces, and that Society has absolute and exclusive proprietary rights in all the produce of individual labour."

Against this reactionary view, against which Democracy for centuries has been unceasingly struggling, and which, however much it may recommend itself to Lord Salisbury, the Sultan of Turkey, the Madhi, or even to the superior young men of the Fabian Society, would be indignantly repudiated by everyone who has any glimmering of the message and mission of Democracy, Mr. Hirsch marshals a host of facts and arguments which should go far to compel its most bigotted adherent to reconsider and re-examine his position. As he concisely and yet eloquently expresses it, after pointing out the vast gulf separating the claim "to equal possession of desired things," and the claim "to equal opportunities to produce desired things":—

"Ethics as well as economics show that there is only one true and beneficial system of distribution: the one which, founded on justice, leaves in the possession of every individual all the produce which the exercise of his faculties brings forth, or which others freely surrender to him as a gift or in return for services rendered to them, always provided that no one is granted a greater share than others in the common opportunities to produce or render services without his making full compensation to these others for any loss of opportunity which they may suffer in consequence."

Its Distributive Proposals.

As everyone knows, the industrial proposals of Socialism would substitute collective ownership and management by the community, or rather by duly appointed officials, of the entire business of the community, for private ownership and private control and management. This, of course, would involve the adoption of some artificial or arbitrary system of distributing the products of the industry of the community; and though Socialists are still far from an agreement as to what would constitute a just system of distribution, which is its animating aim and object, yet there is a growing consensus of opinion, at least among English socialists, that Socialism would involve, not a distribution according to needs, or according to services rendered, but rather an equal distribution in value, regardless of needs or of services rendered. Socialists make no endeavour to show that this would be just, not even that it would be beneficial, both of which they generally take for granted. Our author, however, after a very close examination of the probable effects of any such course of social action, formulates his conclusions on this vital question as follows:—

"Not only monotonous uniformity, but general poverty, is thus the inevitable result of Socialism. Equality of income will be achieved, at least among the regulated masses. But it will not be done by raising the income of all to a level above that enjoyed by the great majority of the people to-day. On the contrary, the income of all will be reduced to the level of that which is now the lot of those whose condition appeals most strongly for relief. Instead of raising the material condition of this unfortunate minority, Socialism must lower to their level the material condition of all. A monotonous equality in unavoidable poverty will be the condition of the whole people in the socialised state."

Its Social and Political Outcome.

Mr. Hirsch's matured views, based on his searching analysis of socialistic doctrines, of the ultimate social and

political outcome of Socialism, may be gathered from the following extracts, with which the present notice of his valuable contribution to social and economic science may well close. He says—

"The great part of the population, all those who do not form part of the regulating hierarchy, will be subjected by Socialism to such regimentation, discipline, and compulsion as prevails in militant organisations. The slow and painful evolution which in the course of centuries has rescued the masses of the people from such a state of subjection; which has created the comparative freedom for which past generations have gladly ventured life and fortune; which, superseding authority by individual responsibility, has yielded the opportunity for the moral elevation of man, would thus be turned upon itself. Man would again become part of a social mechanism which, disregarding individual desires and aspirations, would suppress all individuality, personal initiative, and aspiration.

"The ultimate social and political outcome of Socialism must be an all-pervading despotism on the part of the rulers, and a degree of slavery on the part of the ruled masses, such as has not existed in Europe even during the worst times of Roman and mediæval oppression. The slavery which accompanied Communism in ancient Peru would be reproduced, in an aggravated form, among the nations of Europe. Inevitably the time would come when all initiative, all individuality and patriotism having been crushed out, a catastrophe, like that which destroyed the Inca State, would overwhelm the nation, forming, perhaps, the starting point of a new evolutionary process, by which, through a like apprenticeship as that of the last thousand years, the people might re-arrive at the point at which they now stand, and, choosing a worthier course, would enter upon the road to a wider and truer freedom, from which Socialism endeavours to seduce them."

In brief, like ourselves, Mr. Hirsch holds that the real solution of existing social problems is to be found, not in the sacrifice of such limited and partial freedom as we possess, but rather in its radical extension, until all legalised privileges and monopolies are swept away, and equal freedom, equal opportunities to live, to labour, and to enjoy, are in reality, and not in name only, secured to all. But with this portion of his work we shall deal in our next issue. Sufficient has, we think, been said to show the trend of his thought, and to recommend his book to all interested in the social and political questions of the day.

L. H. BERENS.

JUST PUBLISHED.

LAND VALUES AND LOCAL TAXATION.

Being a Report presented to His Majesty The King
By **JUDGE O'CONNOR, K.C.**,
A MEMBER OF THE
ROYAL COMMISSION ON LOCAL TAXATION.

ONE PENNY. 5/- per 100, Carriage forward.

PUBLISHED BY

THE SCOTTISH SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, 13 Dundas Street,
Glasgow.

THE SOCIETY FOR THE TAXATION OF LAND VALUES,
Crane's Buildings, Liverpool.

THE ENGLISH LAND RESTORATION LEAGUE, 376 and 377
Strand, London, W.C.

LIST OF BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS

Which may be had, Post Free, by sending Postal Order or Stamps to
SECRETARY, SCOTTISH SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, 13 DUNDAS
STREET, GLASGOW.

By HENRY GEORGE.

	<i>Cloth.</i>	<i>Paper.</i>
Progress and Poverty,	1/6	1/
Social Problems,	1/6	1/
Protection or Free Trade,	1/6	1/
The Conditions of Labour: a reply to the Pope's Encyclical Letter on the Labour Problem, ...	1/	6d.
A Perplexed Philosopher,	1/6	—
The Science of Political Economy,	7/6	—
The Peer and the Prophet,	—	6d.
The Land Question,	—	3d.
The Crime of Poverty,	—	1d.
Thou Shalt Not Steal,	—	1d.
Taxing Land-Values,	—	1d.
Thy Kingdom Come,	—	1d.
Causes of Business Depression,	—	2/- per 100.
Life of Henry George (by his son, Henry George, Jr.),	5/8	by post, 6/
Outlines of Lectures, with coloured charts (by Louis F. Post),	—	1/
Japanese Notions of European Political Economy, The Story of my Dictatorship (Anonymous), ...	2/	1/
Government by the People (by the Authors of The Story of my Dictatorship),	2/	1/
Evolution of Landlordism (by James Philpott), ...	—	7d.
Taxation of Land-Values (by Alfred Billson, M.P.),	—	1d.
A Just Basis of Taxation (by Frederick Verinder), Official Report of Conference at Glasgow, 20th October, 1899, to Promote the Taxation of Land-Values: contains Glasgow Corporation Bill for the Taxation of Land-Values, as printed by House of Commons,	—	1d.
The Taxation of Ground-Values (by J. F. Moulton, M.P.),	—	4d.
Individualism and Socialism (by Grant Allan), ...	—	1d.
The Taxation of Land-Values (by H. S. Murray), ...	—	1d.
Studies in Landlordism (by H. S. Murray), ...	—	1d.
Free Trade, Social Problems, and the Taxation of Land-Values (by Edwin Adam, M.A., LL.B.), ...	—	2d.
The Taxation of Land-Values: an address to the Bearsden Liberal Association (by William D. Hamilton),	—	1d.
Work and Wages (by James Fairlie),	—	3d.
The Great Problem of Our Great Towns (<i>London Echo</i> extra),	—	1d.
Shortest Road to the Single Tax,	—	7d.
The Land Question (2pp. leaflet),	—	3/6 per 1000.
Birthday in Land (by William Ogilvie). Written between 1776 and 1781,	3/	—
Economic Principles (by Mrs. Eliza Stowe Twitchell),	—	6d.
Why do we Tax Houses?	—	2/- per 100.

"THE SINGLE TAX."

MONTHLY—ONE PENNY; Post Free, 1s. 6d. per annum
to all parts.

Office—13 DUNDAS STREET, GLASGOW.

TO LAND REFORMERS.

The Executive of the Scottish Single Tax League appeal to all
sympathisers to become members of the League. Minimum
Annual Subscription, 1-

2/6 Secures membership of the League and a copy of the
"SINGLE TAX," post free, for twelve months.

5/- Secures membership, the "SINGLE TAX" for twelve months,
and copies of Pamphlets and Leaflets published during the year.

TO ADVERTISERS.

We have NO WASTE COPIES WHATEVER, all our
"returns" being distributed at Political, Literary, Social Reform,
and other Public Meetings.

The "SINGLE TAX" finds a place in the Public Libraries
and Reading Rooms, and in Social and Reform circles in the cities
and towns throughout Britain, in all British Colonies, and in the
United States of America.

SCOTTISH IMPERIAL CYCLES.

Built with B.S.A., Eadie, or Abingdon Fittings.

Path Racers from 19lbs. weight.

Cycles to Order from £8 10s.

Repairs, re-enamelling, and re-plating done expeditiously

J. MILLIKEN.

191 High Street, Glasgow.

ESTABLISHED 1884.

OPPOSITE COLLEGE STATION.

✂ FOR MEETINGS. ✂

HALLS TO LET

AT the SCOTTISH SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, suitable
for Meetings of from 30 to 100. Opposite
the North British Railway Station, Queen Street,
Glasgow.

ONE STAIR UP.

Central and suitable for Friendly Societies,
Trades' Unions, Political Associations, &c.

TERMS MODERATE.

NEW FOUR PAGE LEAFLET.**WHY DO WE TAX HOUSES?**

2/- per 100, Carriage Paid, from Single Tax Office.

FIELDS, FACTORIES, AND WORKSHOPS;

Or INDUSTRY, Combined with AGRICULTURE and BRAIN WORK.

By P. KROPOTKIN.

New Edition, - ONE SHILLING.

Swan, Sonnenschein & Co., Paternoster Sq., London, E.C.

READ**THE LIFE of HENRY GEORGE,**

BY HIS SON,
HENRY GEORGE, Jun.

Dedicated to all who strive for the Reign of Justice.

Price, from this Office, 5/8. By Post, 6/.

DEUTSCHE VOLKSTIMME.

ORGAN OF GERMAN SINGLE-TAXERS.

PUBLISHED FORTNIGHTLY.

PRICE for Six Months, 3s., Post Paid.

ADOLF DAMASCHKE, EDITOR,
BERLIN, N., ARKONAPLATZ, S.

Published for the Proprietors by JOHN PAUL, 13 Dundas Street; and Printed by
JOHN GALDER & Co., 126 Renfield Street, Glasgow.—September, 1901.