

The Railroad trainman, Volume 14  
By Brotherhood of Railroad Trainmen  
December, 1897  
p. 1032

## "THE SINGLE TAX FALLACY."

EDWARD D. BURLEIGH.

Under the above heading, Mr. W. H. Stuart undertakes to answer part of my article in reply to his in the May number. "The fallacy," in his opinion, is the claim that land monopoly is the fundamental monopoly.

Mr. Stuart says he has studied the single tax and thoroughly understands it and that his not accepting it is no proof of want of knowledge, but his article shows so clearly that he does not understand it and I have such faith in his honesty and sincere desire for industrial freedom that I cannot give up the belief that if he really knew what the single tax is he would advocate it.

He seems to assume that "because the form of production has changed from the so-called "feudalistic" to the so-called "capitalistic," it can never change again. Would it not be more reasonable to suppose that since one change had been made others are possible? And may not other changes as important as the above be in store for us? By his own showing "capitalistic production" depends on the ownership by the few of the "tools and instruments of production" and the necessity of the many to sell their labor to that few. Now if, as he assumed in his former article, the rent line were contracted to such an extent by the introduction of the single tax that rent would be reduced to one-tenth or one-twentieth of what it is to-day, land that could be had free of rent would be correspondingly better and more productive. Men would therefore be under no necessity to sell their labor to capitalists, they could employ themselves and in their own cases if necessary, restore "feudal production." And the possibility of this would probably render it needless. The very productive natural opportunities to be had free of rent would soon enable any industrious man to accumulate sufficient capital to make him entirely independent of the "Capitalist Class."

Mr. Stuart says he is "quite sure" that "the starting point of capitalism is the private ownership of the tools and instruments of production," but he fails to show any good reason for his confidence. In fact he admits his error when he says "It is quite true, historically, the divorce of the workers from the land preceded their divorce from the instruments of production." Suppose they had never been divorced from the land, is it likely that, with free access to the source of all wealth, including all capital, they could

ever have been divorced from capital?

Mr. Stuart says "the development of machine industry on a large scale has placed the average worker at the mercy of the capitalist class." This statement is as absurd as it is untrue. Notwithstanding the change from the so-called "feudal system" of production to the so-called capitalistic, that is, from production chiefly on a small scale by each worker for his own use, to production chiefly on a large scale, in factories and mills, for sale, the fact still remains that each worker produces for his own consumption as truly now as he ever did. It is to do this that he works at all. And if natural opportunities were open to him and he could not obtain employment in any large productive enterprise on terms satisfactory to himself he would promptly return to the "feudal system" of production, and feed, clothe and shelter himself by that method. He would use the method that would best accomplish the desired result. If not, why not?

It is the divorce from land and not "the development of machine industry" that has placed the average worker at the mercy of the capitalist class." In fact it is that which has brought the so-called "capitalist class" into being, as indeed Mr. Stuart himself admits, though perhaps unintentionally when he says: "It is quite true, historically, the divorce of the workers from the land preceded their divorce from the instruments of production." Without this first divorce the other would have been impossible, and therefore no "capitalist class " could have arisen.

Mr. Stuart says " Monopoly of machinery is a term that no Single Taxer can understand in connection with a system of free access to land on equal terms." Here he is again mistaken. It is perfectly easy to understand the term, but it means something which is impossible. All machinery is produced by labor applied to land. With land and labor free, no such monopoly could exist. The idea is preposterous.

But Mr. Stuart says: " 'Free access to land' on equality of payment, or absolutely free access without payment of any kind whatever would not in the least prevent the present monopolization of machinery, and its ownership and control by a continually diminishing number of capitalists. It is important that this should be thoroughly understood. So, for the information of Single Taxers, I will quote an illustration which I used in the April Journal: 'Imagine a society where land is held free of rent under the occupancy and use tenure proposed by anarchists, or under the Single Tax plan of each user of land paying to the community its economic rent value. In such a society, let us suppose, an hundred shoemakers working at their individual benches, and owning their own tools and raw material, are able to supply the wants of the community for shoes, from the sale or exchange of which they are able to maintain the average standard of living. Let us suppose that one of the shoemakers invents a machine or set of machines that will, with the labor of forty men, make the same

number of shoes in the same time as the one hundred hand workers formerly did, and at such a reduction in labor cost as would make competition by the hand workers impossible. One or more of the men having the necessary capital build a shoe factory; put in the steam power and machinery; hire forty of the shoemakers, and proceed to supply the demand for shoes. Now what becomes of the sixty hand workers displaced by the system of capitalist production as exemplified in the ownership and operation of the shoe factory? Well, let us say that ten of the displaced workers find employment in making the new machines, and as shoes are cheaper, their sale is increased, this gives employment to ten more of the idle shoemakers. We have now sixty employed and forty idle. What will the latter do? If you are an intelligent (!) Single Taxer you will reply at once: 'Why, start another factory, of course!' Very well. Let us suppose there are no patent laws; any one has a right to make and use duplicates of the machinery. So another factory is started. But the addition of another factory does not increase the demand for shoes. No one buys a new pair of shoes every time a new factory is built.' Suppose the new factory, by superior capital and management, drives the first one out of the business and thus monopolizes all the trade, still sixty men only are needed as before to supply the shoe trade. There are still forty idle men. Suppose that the second factory only succeeds in getting half the trade. In that case thirty men in each factory supply the demand, leaving the same number idle. Here we have the capitalist system at work, a few owners of the 'tools and instruments of production,' who do no productive labor themselves and the large mass of real producers who are divorced from those 'tools' and forced to offer their labor power to the capitalists for- a wage that represents, not the value of their labor, but what they are willing to accept in preference to idleness and possible starvation. What becomes now of my critic's confident assertion that 'Once give labor free access to land and the condition precedent to capitalistic production would disappear?'" What becomes of it? It is triumphantly justified by Mr. Stuart's own illustration. The only trouble is that he forgets the beginning of his supposition before he gets to the end of it. He starts out by supposing that labor has free access to land, and then goes on to assume that it has not. He assumes that when some people invent machinery and build factories and thus cheapen shoes to the community and reduce the number of shoemakers necessary to make them, that the other men who were formerly shoemakers must sit idly by and starve unless they can induce some one to hire them to make shoes or shoemaking machinery; and not only this, but that those who are employed must accept starvation wages or exchange places with the idle men. The truth is that, with free land, the invention of machinery and the building of factories would benefit all. Those thrown out of that particular work would find something else to do, and getting the factory products with less labor would have time to get more of other things, and those still employed at the old work, under the new conditions, would also be able to demand higher wages than ever before. The "capitalist" would get only what he earned, namely, his addition to production. It is a great mistake to

assume, as Mr. Stuart does, that the "owners" of factories are always "nonproducers." Some owners are, that is very true, but others, by their labor in organising and directing the labor of others, in watching the markets, in studying out the best and most efficient ways of producing results, add materially to the amount of the product, and to this addition they are justly entitled. Idle owners could not exist under the conditions in Mr. Stuart's supposition, for free land would secure to each worker all he earned, just what his labor was worth, whether he worked for himself or another, for, being free to work for himself, he would surely not work for another for less, all things considered, than he could make as his own employer. "Owners" could, therefore, not get a portion of what is produced by the men they employ, as they do now; they could get only what they produced themselves.

Again, Mr. Stuart says: "It is tacitly assumed that in agriculture, at least, all are on an equal footing." By whom? Not by any Single Taxer worthy of the name. The man with capital and skill has an advantage in production over the man without them. But skill can be acquired by study and practice, and capital is wealth, and wealth is produced by labor applied to land. When, therefore, laborers have free access to good land they can soon acquire both skill and capital. In fact, as I showed in my former article, men with capital to lend will be only too anxious to induce others to take and use their capital, and competition among capitalists will undoubtedly reduce commercial interest to a very low figure.

But Mr. Stuart continues: "When capitalist methods dominate agriculture as fully as they do other industries, what advantage more than now will accrue to the man without capital?" Under the Single Tax, as I have shown, "capitalist methods" would not "dominate" any industry. Men work, whether by "capitalist methods" or any other, to provide themselves with food, clothing, shelter and luxuries, and if they cannot get these things by one "method," land being free, they will get them by some other method, even if they have to resort to that employed by Robinson Crusoe. But such a resort would most likely be unnecessary.

I feel like asking the reader's pardon for the next quotation, but it rather seems necessary to make it since Mr. Stuart evidently regards it as a knock-down argument. Here it is:

"I remember a meeting of our local Single Tax Club. The speaker of the evening had been eloquently dilating on the enormous advantage that would accrue to the masses by 'free access to natural resources' by the adoption of the single tax, etc. At the close of the address, on the invitation of the chairman to the audience to ask questions, a gentleman arose and stated that he knew personally two men who had taken up adjoining claims of government land in the center of the State. They were practical

farmers and had some capital to start with. The land not being patented they had no taxes to pay. They put the land in wheat for two successive seasons; had fair crops which they sold for an average price of 50 cents per bushel. The first year they lost \$400, the second year \$600, or \$1,000 in the two years. Within a few miles of them were large farms of from ten to thirty thousand acres sown in wheat, on land that was valued at \$20 or more an acre, that paid taxes, supplied with the modern 'tools of production,' who sold their wheat at the same price and made a fair profit. The question the gentleman asked was, 'In what way, under the operation of the single tax, would the two men referred to be benefitted?' The question was a poser, but the chairman managed to explain that under the single tax the two men would have saved the amount paid in protective duties, and also that the government owning the railroads, their grain would have been carried for much less than at present. 'But,' replied the questioner, 'would not the bonanza farmers have shared equally with the two men in the advantage of free trade and cheap railroad rates? Would not the same relative difference in the cost of production inure to the advantage of the large method of production, and would not free competition under the single tax be just as efficient in driving the small farmer to the wall, as it has been in driving the small manufacturer?' The Single Tax Club still owes the gentleman a reply."

If so, the members must have been very queer Single Taxers. Such questions are in their nature foolish, for the reason that so much is left out which is necessary to a full understanding of the case. In the first place, the questioner may have been mistaken as to his facts. But suppose he were not.

Though these two men were "practical fanners" they may not have known enough about that particular branch of farming to insure success, or they may have been better farmers than they were business men. The fact that they failed successfully to compete with the larger farms does not show that such competition is impossible. But suppose it did? What of it? If wheat can be raised more economically on large farms than on small ones, if the people can be better fed in that way, then wheat should be raised on large farms, and it will be to the advantage of all that it should be. These two men should turn their attention to something else. The single tax would benefit them by giving them a chance to do so.

As to the advantage of free trade and cheaper railroad rates: the former would benefit both large and small farmers alike, but the latter would not, for it is a wellknown fact that large concerns are able under present conditions to get favors from railroads in the way of lower rates and rebates that small concerns cannot get. With government ownership of all railroads and free competition in their operation, this advantage would undoubtedly be greatly lessened if not entirely destroyed.

But suppose that "the large method of production" should have such advantages, even under the single tax, that producers by any other method would be "driven to the wall." Is that any argument against the single tax? It is a mistake to suppose that single taxers necessarily favor production on a small scale. Whenever the result of production on a large scale is that production is increased and cheapened, that people can therefore get more of the articles thus produced or get them more easily, then that method should be used. But this is not always the case. It sometimes happens that production on a small scale is more economical because the producer can watch the processes more carefully, can better prevent leaks and waste and can also produce a better article than where the persons most interested are further removed from the processes. Then it must not be forgotten that much of the advantage of production on a large scale, as now carried on, is due to the fact that employers can appropriate a portion of what should in justice go to the employees, and would go to them if good, natural opportunities were open to them, as they would be, by Mr. Stuart's own showing, under a system that would enormously contract the rent line and thus reduce rent to one-tenth or onetwentieth its present amount.

Mr. Stuart then says: "Let us lay this proposition down as axiomatic, that under free competition, whether private ownership of land prevails, or under a single tax tenure, or under absolutely free use of land, that the business or industry that employs the largest capital, the most efficient machinery and the least manual labor, with the most superior organizing ability and management, will surely drive out their weaker competitors and monopolize that particular industry."

For the reasons given above I cannot consent to the laying down, "as axiomatic" of any such proposition. Larger capital does not necessarily mean greater strength. It may even mean less. More capital than can be used to advantage is an element of weakness. Idle capital wastes.

Mr. Stuart speaks of capital and machinery. But what is machinery but a form of capital? We may lay down as axiomatic the proposition that under really free competition the fittest to survive will survive, and what else would Mr. Stuart have? Would he have the unfittest survive? Is it not plainly for the advantage of all that those who can carry on a business best should carry it on? But Mr. Stuart evidently has no conception of what really free competition is, for he speaks of it as existing under "private ownership of land," whereas it is impossible under that system. Is competition really free where one party can accept or reject offers as he will, while the other must

accept or starve? Mr. Stuart forgets that any monopoly established by superior service, under free conditions, would have to be maintained by superior service, and also that no monopoly of that kind could rob either its employees or its customers. The employees would be protected by their ability to make a good living as their own employers and the customers by the competition which would at once arise as soon as larger profits than ordinary presented the temptation.

But Mr. Stuart says: "But so far as the workman is concerned, it makes little difference to him whether one giant combination or a half dozen smaller ones control the business. He is 'not in it' in either case, and as far as he is concerned, the tools and instruments of production constitute a monopoly, in the benefits of which he does not share, nor can he share until, under a just system of collective ownership, he becomes part owner in all the means for the production and distribution of wealth."

Here, as usual, Mr. Stuart overlooks the fact that, under the single tax, when the rent line had been so greatly contracted as he declares it would be and rent had been reduced and wages raised by the consequent opening, free of all charge, of very productive land to the would-be laborer, all men could employ themselves at good wages and would therefore laugh to scorn his imaginary monopolist who should propose their accepting starvation wages in his service. The would-be exploiter of labor would be the one "not in it." He speaks of "a just system of collective ownership," but such a thing is impossible by any compulsory, state-socialistic methods, for they all involve depriving some people of their rightful property and the compelling all to co-operate, whether they like it or not. "Collective ownership" can be just only when it is voluntary and with such "collective ownership," however large, single taxers have no quarrel. On the contrary we believe that large voluntary associations for carrying on business will be common under our system.

In this quotation occurs also an example of the loose way Mr. Stuart uses words. He speaks of "the means for the production and distribution of wealth." He evidently uses "distribution" here to mean the carrying of things from where they are made to where they are to be consumed. It can have no other meaning in that connection; but that meaning is not the proper one for this word in economic discussions. The transportation of things is an essential part of their production. Production is not complete till wealth is in the hands of the consumer. But "distribution" has a definite economic meaning. It relates to the division of the wealth produced by labor and capital, applied to land, into rent, economic interest and wages. This is the only sense in which distribution has any meaning apart from production.

Mr. Stuart does not seem to get my point in regard to the Western Union Telegraph Company. In the first place he quotes my statement that as far as the Western Union is an injurious monopoly it owes its power to its control of patents and its association with railroads, and then says, "ye Gods, observe the 'if.'" Now, as I neither wrote nor implied an "if" how can the "Gods," or any one else, observe it? What I wrote was "as far as the Western Union Telegraph Company is an injurious monopoly," not "if it is an injurious monopoly." The Western Union is a grinding monopoly and for the reasons stated; but would Mr. Stuart have us believe that it is nothing else, that it gives no service to the public? Notwithstanding it is a grinding monopoly it does some good, and this it could continue to do if deprived of the power to grind.

Mr. Stuart asserts that the company "controls no patents that give it any advantage over would-be competitors." This is a rather surprising statement, and I trust Mr. Stuart will pardon my venturing to doubt it. Still, it may be correct, and I am perfectly willing to admit, for the sake of the argument, that it is, for it only makes the case stronger against land monopoly. Large capital and shrewd management, under free conditions, could not constitute the Western Union an injurious monopoly. If they made it a monopoly at all it would be one founded on public service, which would be a blessing and not a curse. The company's injurious monopoly must be founded on something else, and it is so founded. Leaving out patents that foundation can be nothing else than land monopoly, as any one able to look and willing to see can easily perceive. Private railroads, such as we have today, are founded on land-monopoly. I presume Mr. Stuart will not deny that. It is the privilege they receive from government, of controlling long strips of very valuable land that gives them their power for evil; not their ownership of engines and cars.

Mr. Stuart says: "There is nothing to prevent a dozen competing systems starting up tomorrow; in fact a dozen competing systems have started and been absorbed by their more powerful and shrewdly managed rival." Here I must again beg leave to differ. There is something to prevent competing systems from starting, and that something is the hopelessness of the attempt.

With the railroads in private hands no telegraph not in close union with them can hope to succeed. The Western Union enjoys that close union and the consequent monopoly of suitable land. The field is occupied. There is no room for another such company. If there were, does Mr. Stuart think there is not money and brains enough in the country if that were all that was necessary, to start and run one?



"How can a tariff 'protect' the cotton seed oil industry when we are exporters of it and never imported a gallon?" triumphantly asked Mr. Stuart. Simply by keeping out competing articles. It is not at all necessary as he seems to think that a "duty" should be on a particular article in order that such article may be "protected" by a tariff. Mr. Stuart goes on: "So also of the flour trust, we are exporters of flour to the entire world; it is the product of wheat; think of a tariff on wheat to protect the American farmer." It is true that flour is made of wheat, but it is not wheat; it takes more than wheat to make flour. It takes flour mills, and these are made largely of things protected by our beneficent tariff.

As to the sugar trust, it is hardly worth while to waste words on any one who refuses to see that it is the recipient of large favors from the government through the tariff. Sensible people will hardly believe that with land free to labor all over this country and with absolute free trade among ourselves and with the rest of the world, a trust of any kind could exist. If trusts could not survive under such conditions then it is evident that the reverse of these conditions produces and fosters them.

Mr. Stuart triumphantly asks if it is protective tariffs that sustain the cotton seed oil, flour and sugar trusts, "how does it happen that there is only one of each of these trusts?" Let me ask him the same question. If these trusts are founded, as he claims, on large capital and good business management, is it to be supposed that they monopolize all there is of these things in the country?

After speaking of the temptation to others to start rival trusts because of the great profits made by the present ones, Mr. Stuart says: "Come Mr. Burleigh, don't dodge this very plain question: Would the adoption of the single tax change all this?" Mr. Stuart may set his mind at rest on that point. I have no desire to "dodge" any of his questions. There is no occasion. To this one I will reply, of course it would; and if he were not blinded by devotion to a foolish and, let us hope, impossible system of "collective ownership" of wealth he would see that it would. As has been shown again and again the single tax would make it impossible for any one to hold valuable land unused and would remove the motive for holding any other. It would kill land speculation, would therefore greatly contract the rent line, thus opening to the poorest abundant and rich opportunities to cease to be poor. It would make all men free by making them financially independent. Trusts cannot flourish in such an atmosphere. Mr. Stuart continues: "Would 'laborers own their own tools and instruments of production' (sugar refineries, for instance) 'and no small class of capitalists' (sugar

barons, for instance), 'could monopolize those things'—that is sugar refineries?" Yes, laborers would own their own "tools and instruments of production," not necessarily "sugar refineries," though, through association that would also be easy. But they could earn their living independently of employers, if employers did not give wages, accommodations and treatment that were satisfactory to the laborers. How long does Mr. Stuart think the owners of expensive "plants" of any kind would hold out when they saw their capital wasting away and all their desired employes busily engaged making a good independent living?

Mr. Stuart says, "coffee land is not monopolized." If so it is the only land worth having that is not. I will venture therefore, to presume that he is mistaken. Mr. Stuart quotes my statement about the big four meat combine, that it "owes its power almost entirely to its control of land and land values through ownership of land and control of railroads" and then proceeds to show that he does not understand it. Their monopoly does not rest on the ownership of the stock yards, for there is plenty of room for other yards. It rests partly on their ownership of large cattle ranches which makes them partly independent of other cattle raisers, but chiefly on their connection with railroads. As in the case of the Western Union Telegraph Company, there is no cure for this but in the abolition of privately owned public highways. If such things are to be allowed these men have as good a right to own them as anybody else. "But," Mr. Stuart asks, "suppose the big four meat combine did control the only location in the country that was specially adapted for carrying on so great a business, and suppose the single tax went into effect, what would prevent them from paying the single tax, retaining the location and monopolizing the industry as fully as they do now?" Nothing. And why should anything? But such a location would then command so high a price that profits on it would be reduced to the ordinary level and all the community would share, as they should, in the special advantages of that location. But, as Mr. Stuart himself shows, this supposition of his is absurd, for there could be no such particularly advantageous location for stock yards; and with land monopoly in all its forms, including transportation monopoly, abolished, these concerns could get and keep a monopoly of their business only on one condition, that of public service.

Again Mr. Stuart says: "According to Mr. Burleigh's theory, Andrew Carnegie has acquired his fifty millions because of special legal privileges he possessed to the exclusion of others, to a protective tariff, or due to land monopoly in owning the few acres of cheap land on which his works are located." Here again Mr. Stuart is mistaken. And, by the way, before we go further it might be interesting to learn how Mr. Stuart explains Mr. Carnegie's acquisition of wealth. Mr. Carnegie was not

always wealthy; therefore we cannot say he got rich because he had large capital. Does Mr. Stuart wish his readers to infer that he thinks Mr. Carnegie does not possess legal privileges, that he is not favored by the tariff and that the private ownership of land does not enable him to rob labor? It is not necessary that the laws should select Mr. Carnegie to shower their favors upon. Anyone in his position could enjoy the same advantages and many do enjoy practically the same; but the trouble is that all cannot do so. It is also needless to explain to the readers of this Journal that the land monopoly which gives Mr. Carnegie the power to appropriate so large a part of the earnings of his men is not the ownership of the site of his works, but the private ownership of land in general, which deprives the mass of men of the exercise of their equal right of access to nature's bounties and compels them to sell their labor to their more fortunate fellow beings for less than the full amount of their earnings.

Mr. Stuart ridicules the idea that if Andrew Carnegie's men had free access to land they could all have rolling mills of their own; yet that is nevertheless just what they might have, through association. If not, why not? But they would not need to have in order to be independent of him. They could work at something else.

Mr. Stuart then says: "If any further argument or illustration is needed to prove that the ownership of land is not the 'fundamental monopoly' upon which all other monopolies are based, it can be furnished in the history of the Standard Oil Company. Those who have read H. D. Lloyd's 'Wealth Against Commonwealth' are aware that this company had acquired an enormous capital before it ever owned a foot of oil land, or bored an oil well, or pumped a gallon of it to the surface. It possessed no special privilege, either local, national or legal, from which others were excluded, except those advantages which unlimited capital and shrewd and unscrupulous management gave them over their rivals. The Standard Oil Company neither owned nor controlled the land. This company acquired its great wealth under single tax conditions of wealth production. It employed its capital, not in the acquisition of 'land and natural resources,' but in laying pipe lines from the oil districts to cities where it could be refined, and at such places erected buildings on cheap suburban land and went into the business of refining oil."

If any argument or illustration were needed to prove that land monopoly is the fundamental monopoly the history of the Standard Oil Company would furnish both. Because it at first owned no oil land Mr. Stuart jumps to the conclusion that land ownership had nothing to do with its start, though he admits that "at the zenith of its power and to protect itself against any possible competition, the Standard Oil

Company obtained control of the cheap oil lands of the country, and now with its foreign allies controls, absolutely, the oil trade of the world." Why did it want this land? And then he adds: "Had the single tax been in effect during the first ten years of the Standard's existence it would have been saved immense sums in being relieved from all taxation on its pipe lines and refineries. For as they were 'capital,' and as from the single tax point of view, private capital is a 'good thing' whose production should not be discouraged by being taxed, the Standard Oil Company would have gone almost scot free of all taxation."

What "single tax conditions of wealth production" existed when this company got its start? Was all land taxed to its full rental value? Was all wealth free of taxation? It was not, by Mr. Stuart's own admission. Were all highways controlled by government? Was there no land speculation? Were all men free to employ themselves on productive land, or was the best land to be had free of rent so poor that only starvation wages could be got from it? To ask these questions is to answer them.

Then think of calling pipe lines capital. Pipes are capital and so are rails, but pipe lines and railroads are not capital but highways, and neither individuals nor companies can make them without a loan of governmental powers.

Any one who has read Henry D. Lloyd's "Wealth Against Commonwealth" knows if he had eyes to see when he read, that the Standard Oil Company got its start through land monopoly and nothing else. It was by means of arrangements with railroads (privately owned public highways) by which that company got rebates on not only all the freight which it shipped, but on that which all its competitors shipped, that it laid the foundation of its monopoly, and it continued it by the laying of pipe-lines (highways) which are impossible without land monopoly, and lastly by buying up oil land itself and thus firmly securing its position.

Let me make one short quotation from "Wealth Against Commonwealth." After speaking of the secret contract made by the originators of the Standard Oil Company with the railroads Mr. Lloyd says: "The high contracting parties to this treaty for the disposal of an industrial province were, on one side, all the great railroad companies, without whose service the oil, crude or refined, could not be moved to refineries, markets, or ports of shipment on river, lake or ocean. On the other side was a body of thirteen men, 'not one of whom lived in the oil regions, or was an owner of oil wells or oil lands,' who had associated themselves for the control of the oil business under the winning name of the South Improvement Company. By this contract the railroads

had agreed with this company of citizens as follows:

"1. To double freight rates.

"2. Not to charge them the increase.

"3. To give them the increase collected from all competitors.

"4. To make any other changes of rates necessary to guarantee success in business.

"5. To destroy their competitors by high freight rates.

"6. To spy out detail of their competitors' business."

I may add that these "citizens" were all men of small means. Is there no land monopoly there? Is it not plain that this whole scheme depended on the private ownership of public highways and would have been impossible without it!

In conclusion let me say that Mr. Stuart's attempts to disprove the truth that land monopoly is the fundamental monopoly, have, as I think I have shown in every case, ended in dismal failure, as such attempts must always end. And though Mr. Stuart permits no expectation of his own conversion, I do cherish the hope that this discussion may be the means of inducing others to examine this matter for themselves and having found the cause of industrial slavery to be the private ownership of land, to join the ever increasing host of believers in the single tax and help to get it adopted and thus abolish forever the last vestige of human slavery.