

SINGLE TAX CANDIDATE EXPLAINS HIS IDEAS

From the *N. Y. Globe*, Nov. 4, 1921, by BRUCE BLIVEN

“**M**OST of the candidates for the mayoralty are interested in lessening existing evils.

“The Single Tax party is interested in curing them once and for all.”

In these words Joseph Dana Miller, candidate on the Single Tax ticket, explained for *Globe* readers his party's attitude toward the campaign.

“The two big problems facing the city are unemployment and housing,” says Mr. Miller—just as all the other candidates do. “The Single Tax Party is the only one in the field with a sound, workable solution for both these questions.

“The housing shortage can be cured by putting taxes only on land values, and exempting all improvements of every character. The only relief for the shortage yet produced has come through the measure exempting new residential building from taxation for ten years. That is a partial Single Tax measure, but it doesn't go far enough. It should be universal and permanent.

TO RELIEVE UNEMPLOYMENT

“Unemployment would also be relieved by the application of the Single Tax. The exemption of taxation on any product of labor would lower the selling price and at the same time land would be forced into use, thus lowering the cost of living. The landowner, prevented from keeping his land idle, would have to engage labor to help it to produce, and a great demand would be created for the services of those doing something useful, whether as so-called capitalists or laborers.”

The transit question would be solved by Mr. Miller by municipal ownership, and the construction of additional facilities as needed, these to be paid for out of taxes on land in the outlying sections reached by them and made more valuable by their new facilities.

“This principle,” Mr. Miller says, “is now embodied in the rapid transit act but has not been used.

“Under the present plan, the city borrows money for extensions, collects principal and interest out of the riders, and then these same riders have to pay for the subway all over again in the form of increased rents to the landowners whose property has been enhanced in value.

“This increase in land values—and therefore in rents—in the Bronx alone, was ten times the cost of the original subway.

THOUGHTS FOR STRAPHANGERS

“The people who live there and have had their rents boosted can reflect in misery upon this as they ride home in the evening jam—a jam which might be lessened if the part of their nickels used for paying for the subway went for better service.”

The solution for the housing question proposed by the Socialists—that the city build houses itself and rent them to the people—is ridiculed by Mr. Miller. “Any one with a grain of economic knowledge,” he says, “will realize the futility of the city's building homes for the people. This experiment has been tried fully in Great Britain, with disastrous results.

“If, under our present form of government, the city should build homes, who would get them?

“Those nearest to the seat of government! And if some tenant were objectionable, would the city dispossess him? And if he were righteously dispossessed, can we not visualize the horde of politicians clamorously urging that his rights had been violated?

“Government is brought into contempt when you lay upon its shoulders burdens which it has not the intelligence nor the capacity to carry.”

OTHER WRONGS TO BE RIGHTED

Other matters in which the Single Tax candidate is interested are:

Parks and playgrounds. More of these are needed, but cannot be had because ground values are prohibitively high. The Single Tax would cure that.

More schools. Lack of school facilities in New York is a permanent, not a temporary, problem. It is due in part to the sudden movement of population within the borders of the city, putting a strain on school equipment in one section, decreasing it in another.

As a temporary expedient, but not as a substitute for the Single Tax proposal in any way, Mr. Miller thinks the financial interests of the city ought to change their attitude on lending money on city property mortgages. “I have in my possession,” he says, “a booklet issued by one of the well known and strongest trust companies, in which they state clearly and concisely that they are not lending money on New York City dwellings, but are sending their money south and southwest. Is it any wonder that labor attacks the banks and advocates the establishment of working men's savings institutions?”

WHAT A MAYOR CAN DO

Mr. Miller admits that many of the economic reforms he advocates lie outside the province of the mayor. He says, however, that while in office he would try to educate the people on the fundamental facts, and, in particular, seek to teach them that no relief may be expected from persons who are entirely lacking in economic ideas.

“The land question today is to the fore in all countries,” he says. “In New York it happens to express itself as a housing shortage, but it exists equally everywhere—except

in a few happy spots where it has been partially solved by the application of Single Tax ideas. Sydney, Australia, for instance, raises all revenues from a tax on land values. As a result, suburbs have developed enormously—about 60 per cent. in twelve years—while the population has increased only very slightly. Buildings in the congested area are taller and better constructed, and a great improvement toward homes for working people in suburbs has started. New York needs the same principle applied. Our campaign is for the purpose of putting the land question into politics.”

It is interesting to note that Mr. Miller, who is the founder and editor of the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*, and the *SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK*, belongs to the same family with Charles A. Dana. Miller was born in New York City in 1864, and has spent most of his life here. When he is not engaged on his favorite theme of economic wrongs and how to right them, he is a fashioner of graceful and interesting verse.

The Incompatibility of Socialism with Judaism

FROM THE JEWISH FORUM

(Revised by the Author for the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*.)

EVER since Haman condemned the Jews because “Their laws are different,” they have been charged the world over with the same accusation.

Outside of Russia, where the Jews are being persecuted and ostracized by the Bolsheviki as reactionaries, in Poland and other places where unspeakably horrible and cruel deeds are perpetrated against the Jews, the charges are made that the Jews are advocates and leaders of Socialism, Bolshevism, Communism, etc.

There is no denying that many Jews are infected, more or less, by these economic ideas. The question is, are the Jews psychologically or traditionally collectivists, lovers of a strong centralized government, or are they individualists?

If the Jews were made up of different elements, a mob or sect, without an historic past or literature, there would be no use to think over the subject. But it is a well known fact that the Jews are, more than any other people, and have been for thousands of years, a nationality, made up of people of a very near or similar character, with very slight admixture of strange elements. While individual characteristics reflect the surroundings to a small degree, the psychology of the nation, as a whole, is more or less a fixed one, and can be traced throughout its ancient and modern habits, its laws and literature.

Now if Socialism, Communism or Collectivism possess any truth, or some merit akin to Jewish ideals, or, if by diligent investigation into the psychology of the Jewish people, any trace of an inclination towards Collectivism or Socialism, in any form or degree, could be found, then the Jews, who have been willing for thousands of years to suffer for the truth of their ideals, would gladly assume a responsi-

bility for advocating Socialism, and other isms, in and out of season.

Here is a case of “*Lo Dubim V'lo Yaar*” (No bears and no forest). There is something to Socialism, aside from its being based on false foundations, contrary to every religious law and ideal revered by the Jew, as he has always been, and still is a stubborn individualist.

There are so many schools and types of Socialism, that to try to prove the inconsistencies and differences would take many an article. And since every group or clique is hatefully accusing the other groups of misrepresentation, we need confine ourselves only to those fundamentals on which the conception of the various groups or schools are based.

What is accepted as a true statement by the Collectivists is, that the economic system of most of the world is capitalistic; that the world is divided into two main groups, capitalists or employers—those who own all the things required in the production of necessaries; and laborers, or proletariats, those who own almost nothing and work for wages, producing goods. The capitalistic class lives through interest, rent, and profit, and thrives on the exploitation of the working class. There are other classes, as, for instance, a middle class: storekeepers, salesmen, etc.; another class which gives service, but does not produce nor work for wages: artists, writers, lecturers, teachers, etc. But these classes are disregarded.

To make this world a better one than it is, Socialism maintains that we must get rid of the prevailing system; the collectivity of the people must own all the capital and through its government employ every able bodied person in a disciplined army of production. On this all Socialists agree. How the whole people or the government will acquire the capital, and how to employ the people, are the greatest differences amongst the various groups. Let us examine the so-called fundamentals of Socialism. Is the present economic system of Society capitalistic? In other words, do so-called capitalists exploit the laborers? And if so, what is it that gives them the power to do so? It could not be that the simple ownership of tools and machinery in itself is enough, since tools, etc. are produced by labor and skill applied to nature. Why, then, cannot labor and skill produce other wealth, such as tools, etc. for use by labor? (Many mechanics, like carpenters, do have their own tools.)

Then, again, every workman knows that a great majority of so-called capitalists—employers—work more hours with body and brain than many of the commonest laborers would consent to. Yet more than 85 per cent. of these business men sooner or later fail or die poor. The success of the minority cannot be traced to its possession of depreciating machinery, or other products of labor.

What is more, every workingman knows that the so-called employers' part in production is as much, if not more needed, than that of any of the employees, and everyone knows that those who require service are workingmen in