

THE
**SINGLE TAX
REVIEW**

A Record of the Progress of Single
Tax and Tax Reform Through-
out the World



SPRING NUMBER

April 15th, 1905. Vol. 4, No. 4

Yearly Subscription, \$1. Single Copies, 25 cts.

PUBLISHED AT NO. 11 FRANKFORT STREET
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW,
JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor and Publisher.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

DIRECT LEGISLATION AND THE SINGLE TAX	<i>Robert Tyson</i>	1
EQUITABLE TAXATION	<i>C. J. Buell</i>	5
REPLIES TO PETER AITKEN ON COMPENSATION <i>L. H. Berens, Dr. Edward D. Burleigh, Samuel Milliken</i>		9-15
FAIRHOPE CRITICISED	<i>W. E. Brokaw</i>	16
REPLY	<i>E. B. Gaston</i>	19
WHAT ONE SINGLE TAX CONGRESSMAN CAN DO	<i>Hon. Robert Baker</i>	20
LETTER OF G. BERNARD SHAW		26
REPLY BY THE EDITOR		28
HON. WM. F. DRAPER ON TARIFF REVISION	<i>J. A. Demuth</i>	29
PRESENT STATUS OF THE MOVEMENT		33
AFFAIRS AT FAIRHOPE		34
ROOSEVELT ON "BUCKY" O'NEIL		35
J. H. WHITLEY, M. P.		36
NEWS—DOMESTIC		37-41
NEWS—FOREIGN		41
FAIRHOPE'S TROUBLES		42-47
TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE		48-53
DEATH OF GEO. ADAMS		54
BOOK REVIEWS		55
PERSONALS		59



THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

A Record of the Progress of Single Tax and Tax Reform
Throughout the World.

DIRECT LEGISLATION AND SINGLE TAX.

(For the Review.)

By ROBERT TYSON.

I think that many of us Single Taxers have had our attention too exclusively directed to mere direct propagandism, ignoring certain political reforms which are of the greatest value to our cause. The disadvantages of this attitude are three-fold, for—

First, we delay the realization of our wishes by not using the most effective means to get Single Tax principles embodied into law.

Secondly, we lose the benefit of a most important and effective means of indirect propaganda, which under favorable circumstances is ten-fold more effective than ordinary direct methods.

Thirdly, we lose the powerful outside sympathy which comes from extending our own sympathy and help to kindred reforms which are not antagonistic to ours. You remember what Henry George said about the various methods of the political leaders of the Irish Nationalist party? If they had remembered that the Irish land question was also an English land question, and had acted accordingly, England would have been "seething with revolt" against landlordism instead of looking askance upon the Irish claims. I cannot lay my hands upon his exact words just now. Perhaps the editor can quote them for me. But I well remember the words of our great leader: "Sympathy begets sympathy."

Following this line of thought, I earnestly bespeak the hearty, friendly, sympathetic work of Single Taxers on behalf of Direct Legislation by the Initiative and Referendum. Most of us know what this great political reform is; but I may as well briefly refresh some of our memories, thus:

Direct legislation is a direct vote of the people upon proposed laws, municipal or legislative, together with power in the people to order such a vote. "Proposed laws" include proposals to repeal existing laws.

The two main features of direct legislation are (1) The Optional Referendum, which gives the people a veto power over laws passed by municipal councils or the legislature; and (2) The Voters' Initiative, which gives the people power to initiate new measures that the municipal council or the Legislature refuses or neglects to pass.

THE OPTIONAL REFERENDUM.

First, as to the people's veto on certain measures passed by the council or legislature. Provision is made that no such measure shall go into effect for thirty or sixty days, or some such time, from date of passing. If during that

interval a petition signed by a certain percentage—say five per cent.—of the qualified electors is presented, asking for a popular vote on the measure, then it must be voted on by the people, and if they say No, that measure does not become law. The people have vetoed it. And the mere fact that such a veto exists, makes the council or Legislature very careful what proposed laws they pass.

THE VOTERS' INITIATIVE.

Suppose that circumstances brought some public question to the front, and there seemed a fair chance of a popular majority in its favor. An initiative petition, headed by an exact draft of the proposed law, would be presented to the council or the Legislature, which would by that presentation be obliged to consider and discuss the measure asked for by the petition. If they declined to pass it, then it would have to go to a vote of the people, and would become law if the people said Yes.

But the council or Legislature, when the matter came before them, might say, "We will not pass this bill just as asked for, but we do not object to pass a bill which goes a certain length in the same direction." They would then prepare their modified bill, and the two bills would go to the popular vote, that is, the bill asked for by the initiative petition and the modified bill of the council or Legislature. Then the people—the electors—could accept one or the other, or reject both; and whatever they did would be law.

It may be remarked that the percentage of voters for initiating a new law is usually put somewhat higher than is required for a petition for getting a popular vote on a law passed by the Legislature.

LOCAL OPTION IN TAXATION.

Most Single Taxers are familiar with direct legislation in the narrow shape of local option in taxation; and in that shape it is recognized as a valuable means of putting Single Tax into operation. But what I urge is that better work can be done for Single Tax by taking the wide ground of direct legislation instead of the narrow stand of local option in taxation. Direct legislation has stood the test of experience in Switzerland, Oregon and Utah; it is an easy propaganda; and where it is in full force it is an infallible means of getting a Single Tax law. Oregon, for instance, has full direct legislation, and is a most inviting field for Single Tax effort.

TORONTO'S EXPERIENCE.

Mr. George H. Shibley, President of the People's Sovereignty League, Washington, D. C., is energetically pushing a method of getting direct legislation by pledging candidates. This method has been put in force very successfully in the city of Toronto. I cannot better illustrate my main points than by briefly stating the circumstances:

Two or three months previous to the Toronto municipal election in 1903, about thirty organizations were federated under the name of the Toronto Federation for Majority Rule. A circular letter with literature was sent to the Mayoralty and Aldermanic candidates shortly before the city elections, and favorable replies were received from four mayoralty and about twenty-five aldermanic candidates. Many copies of a "Voters' Agreement" were circulated, and a list of the candidates answering favorably was published in four or five daily papers on the Saturday before election day. The outcome of the elections was direct pledges from Mayor Urquhart and fourteen aldermen; at

least three other aldermen being also favorable. This is a majority of the City Council.

No specific use was made of the powers thus obtained, but when the city elections of 1904 were pending, the Federation for Majority Rule renewed its attentions to the candidates by sending them five questions, with spaces for answers and for the candidate's signature. Following are the questions:

QUESTIONS FOR CANDIDATES.

1. Do you believe that the will of the majority should prevail in this city: "majority" meaning a majority of those entitled to vote and who do vote?

2. To give effect to the will of the majority, are you in favor of the People's Veto by Optional Referendum and of the Direct Initiative by Petition or Collective Request as explained below?

3. Concerning the People's Veto, will you, if elected, use the power of your office to support the Optional Referendum in the City Council in regard to the subject specified below?

4. As regarding the Direct Initiative, will you, if elected, use the power of your office to submit for the decision of the voters any measure that is asked for by eight per cent. of the electors?

5. Will you, if elected, use the power of your office to carry out the will of the majority as expressed by any Referendum votes that may be taken?

Along with these questions was sent the following "statement of objects and methods in brief":

1. *The People's Veto.*—That any by-law or resolution relating to the granting, amending, or renewing of franchises shall wait thirty days in the City Council before being finally passed. If during that time five per cent. of the electors by petition ask for its submission to a popular vote, it shall be so submitted, and the decision of the voters shall be obeyed by the aldermen.

2. *The Direct Initiative.*—That if eight per cent. of the electors by petition present to the City Council any by-law or resolution that they desire to have passed, and the Council declines to pass it, then it must be submitted to a vote of the people not later than the next municipal election, if presented in time, and the aldermen must obey the will of the voters as expressed at the polls.

The result of the 1904 campaign was that at least twenty out of the twenty-three members of the Toronto City Council stood pledged to the Initiative and Referendum as embodied in the above questions.

USING THE PLEDGES.

So far, the movement was not in any sense a Single Tax movement. The thirty federated associations were mostly labor unions; indeed, the only others were the Direct Legislation League, the Proportional Representation Society, the Socialist League, and the Single Tax Association. The Secretary of the Federation was, and is, Mr. James Simpson, a bright young Socialist, since elected a member of the Toronto Board of Education.

During 1904 the Toronto Single Tax Association determined to take advantage of the informal direct legislation rule thus created. Accordingly, they circulated an initiative petition, asking the Mayor and Council of Toronto to submit the following question to a popular vote at the municipal election on January 2nd, 1905:

"Are you in favor of the city obtaining power from the Legislature to exempt dwelling houses from taxation to the extent of seven hundred dollars of the assessed value; said exemption to include all buildings used as dwellings,

but not to apply to the land, and not in any way to affect the right to vote on said property."

At the head of the petition was a brief statement setting out the house famine and the way in which it would be remedied by the \$700 exemption. Below was a space ruled for exactly ten signatures on each petition blank, and the words "Witness to above signatures," with blank for name and address. This wide ruling for just ten signatures, and space for the witness, are useful practical points.

GOOD SOLID WORK.

More than 120 persons circulated these petitions, and nearly four thousand signatures were obtained. Deputations from the Single Tax Association presented the petition to the City Council, and waited upon the committee to which the petition was referred, and again upon the Council. It was with very great reluctance that the Controllers and Aldermen consented to let the question go to the people, but they could not get round their pledges. So they consented.

Then the Single Tax men and women worked like beavers. Bills were posted throughout the city; two sets of "dodgers" were printed, nearly fifty thousand of each, and volunteers came up by the score to make a house-to-house distribution of these "dodgers," one of which was a carefully written four-page pamphlet. In this case amateur work was better than "professional" work. The polling sub-divisions were manned by card distributors. The result is stated in the following editorial from *The Toiler* of January 6th, 1905:

A BIGGER VOTE THAN THE MAYOR'S.

"Nearly sixteen thousand voters of Toronto have endorsed the demand that the City Council shall ask the Ontario Legislature for power to exempt from taxation to the extent of \$700 all buildings used as dwellings. That is two to one in favor of it, and is about a thousand more votes than Mayor Urquhart got. Judging from the number of votes polled, the \$700 exemption was the most popular thing in this election. It was the excellent work of the Single Tax Association, backed by organized labor, that is responsible for this splendid result.

"Now let us follow up this splendid beginning. The City Council is pledged to carry out the will of the majority as expressed in any popular referendum vote. Let us, therefore, see that the \$700 exemption is included in the list of legislative items that the City Council is asking of the Ontario Legislature. Then let us bring all possible pressure to bear on the Legislature to give the people of Toronto legal power to make this beneficent relief of industry from taxation. The people want it. They must have it."

In conclusion, I have to point out that the obtaining of the thousands of signatures opened the door to a Single Tax propaganda the like of which was never known in Toronto before. The movement was supported editorially by an influential evening daily newspaper, *The Star*, which helped to focus public attention on the Single Tax idea. Then the thousands of pages of literature, having a direct bearing on a vote about to be taken, were read with an attention which would never have been given to an abstract propaganda document; hence such a diffusion of Single Tax knowledge as never before in the city. Public interest has been directed to the question, and the events to come in furtherance of the object of the petition will tend to keep it there.

All this is the result of utilizing the Direct Legislation movement. Fellow Single Taxers, the moral of the foregoing is obvious. *Verbum sap.*

EQUITABLE TAXATION.

(For the Review.)

By C. J. BUELL.

CHANGES IN EXISTING PLANS NECESSARY TO SECURE AN EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION OF THE BURDEN OF TAXATION FOR THE SUPPORT OF NATIONAL, STATE, AND MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENTS.

What is an equitable system of taxation? Evidently a system that does not, in its operation, conflict with any of the natural rights of any man. What are the natural rights of man? I hold with Blackstone, Thomas Jefferson, Herbert Spencer, and Henry George, that the first and most fundamental natural right of every man is his right to use the earth—his right to apply his energies to the forces and materials of nature—and that right inheres equally in every man in the community.

The second fundamental right of man follows necessarily from the first. It is his right to be a free man, to be the owner of himself, and consequently of the products which his energies have brought forth from the storehouse of nature.

In other words the gifts of nature are for the equal use of all, while those things that any individual, by his labor, has separated out, or changed, from their natural condition are his as against every other man—his to use, to give away, if he please, to barter with another—or to destroy and cause to return to their elements, if he wills it. Of course, it follows that in using the forces of nature and enjoying the products brought forth by his efforts, each man is bound to so conduct himself as not to interfere with the equal right of any other man.

Now it follows that any system of taxation that interferes with these natural rights of man must necessarily be inequitable, and hence must be condemned as not tending "to secure an equitable distribution of the burdens of taxation for the support of National, State, and Municipal government."

All taxes now levied in this country may be classified under three general heads:

1. First, taxes collected from people for the privilege of holding exclusive possession of certain portions of the earth.
2. Second, taxes assessed in some form or other against the products that men have drawn forth from the earth by their labor.
3. Poll taxes—taxes collected from men because they are live men, not dead men.

This seems to be a natural classification and it would be difficult to imagine a tax that would not fall under one or another of the above heads.

Under the first heading come those taxes that are now levied upon land, as in the states of Minnesota, Rhode Island, California and some others, where the land is assessed separately from the structures and improvements thereon; and in other states where this separation is not made, that part of so called real estate taxes that represent the value of the land.

Under the second heading come all taxes on imports or exports, all "internal revenue," excise or license taxes; all taxes on houses or other structures, furniture, merchandise, farm implements, cattle, horses, growing or harvested crops; all taxes on the instruments of transportation or the operations of exchange; all taxes on money, mortgages, notes, bonds, bank stocks or other

commercial paper. Under this head also come all taxes on the accumulation of wealth, as income taxes, or on its transmission from one to another, as inheritance or succession taxes.

Let us examine these taxes in order to determine whether they square with the principles of equity; for if they do not they are condemned by the very terms of our text and the conditions of this discussion.

The third class—Poll taxes, violate the rights of man in that they impose a penalty on his very existence. Where the payment of a poll tax is made a condition on the right to vote, it violates also the *natural* right of every man to participate in making the laws by which he is to be governed.

The entire list under class second are taxes that take from people in proportion to the good things of life they have about them, or in proportion to the necessities of life they must purchase for the sustenance of themselves and families.

All taxes on imports or exports, on products in course of exchange or on the processes of transportation; in short, all of class second except taxes on buildings used for homes, household furniture, incomes and inheritances, are not paid at all by the persons against whom they are nominally assessed; but simply show themselves in increased price, and are paid in the end by consumers in proportion to their necessities, with no regard to their wealth, ability to pay, or the benefits derived from society. Under such taxes it is possible for very wealthy men who derive enormous benefits from society to pay very little or no taxes at all; while many a poor man with a large family is compelled to pay many times more, though he may be paying ground rent to some landlord for all the social benefits he has the use of, and for all that part of the earth he is permitted to enjoy. Such taxes place a fine upon home getting, deter men from marrying, increase in proportion as we obey the scriptural injunction to multiply and replenish the earth.

The income and inheritance taxes are much favored by some shallow thinkers; but, if incomes are honestly acquired, they belong, by the *most* sacred right of property, to their possessors. If not equitably acquired the remedy lies in repealing the laws that permit the inequity. If a man has a right to the ownership of his natural powers, he certainly has a right to the product those powers have brought forth, and he also has a right to transmit those products to whomsoever he wills. Income and inheritance taxes violate man's ownership of himself, and are usually favored by a class of people who deny the doctrine of natural rights *entirely*, and assert that all rights are derived from the state.

All these taxes in class two, in addition to violating the principles of equity, are a direct obstacle in the way of the development and improvement of the race. The more industrious and enterprising a man is the more he is taxed. The more honorable he is, the less he lies about his wealth or his income the more he is taxed. If the objects of taxation were to kill off the best specimens of the race, to crush out honesty and candor, to encourage lying, perjury and fraud, to bring out and strengthen all these objectionable characteristics that a developing manhood is ever trying to eliminate from human nature, then taxes on wealth and income should be commended. Otherwise they are to be condemned as iniquitous and violative of every principle of natural right.

In this connection it is well to call to mind a source of revenue earnestly advocated by Prof. Ely and others of his school, and extensively adopted in many American cities. I refer to taxes of one sort or another on street railway or other privileges granted by municipal authorities. In such cases a rate of fare is fixed far in excess of the actual value of the service rendered, and then a part of the unjust income of the company is taken away, and put into the public treasury. In other words a street railway company is permitted by law

to overcharge its patrons, and then the law attempts to get back a part of the overcharge by taxing the company's gross earnings, or by charging so much per mile or per car for the privilege of charging those who ride more than the ride is worth.

Such a tax is not a tax on the street railway companies at all, but is a tax on those who pay fares to the company, collected by the company from each person every time he rides, and then turned over to the city treasury. The remedy here is evidently to make the rate of fare no more than the actual value of the service rendered and not to impose any tax.

We have left for consideration only taxes of the first class, taxes on land; and in this class there is great danger of perpetrating injustice. It is plain that any tax that in any way prevents man from using the earth—any tax that stands between man and his natural right to employ his labor in drawing his sustenance from the bounties of nature, must be essentially objectionable. It violates the very first fundamental principle of equity. Such taxes have been levied extensively in India and in some European countries, and always with most disastrous results.

Most of the land taxes levied in the United States, however, are not subject to this objection. They are assessed only upon that part of the value of so-called real estate due to the development of the community and the erection of public works—not upon that part of the value produced by the owner. Hence they impose no obstacle to the use of land, but rather encourage its use by making it cost more to hold it idle.

From what source, then, can revenue be derived, so as not to violate the principles of equity and the rights of man?

If there are functions that must be performed by society through its chosen agents—if in the natural order of human development the State is necessarily evolved—then the presumption is that in this same natural manner the very doing of this needed public work would produce a value which would be a natural source of public revenue. The labor of each individual brings to him the natural wages of the effort expended; so we might justly expect that the really needed service done by the State would bring to society its natural social wages. And the parallel goes further—it is even more complete. Just as the wages of each individual flow into his own possession by attaching themselves, in the shape of added values, to the materials upon which he has expended his energies, just so, in the same natural manner, the wages of the community created by social development and public works, flow into the possession of the community, by attaching themselves in added value to the lands which are naturally the common inheritance. It is a principle recognized and accepted everywhere that the construction of needed public works adds a value to the surrounding lands equal to, or in excess of the cost of such construction. Accordingly among all civilized people the principle is recognized, to a greater or less extent, that the benefitted land holders must pay for the public works that confer the benefit. Of course no one could justly be called on to pay more than the equivalent of the benefit conferred. Nothing should ever be taken from one citizen by another, nor from any citizen by the State, nor from the State by any citizen, except an equal value is given in exchange. Anything less than that is robbery.

But it is a well known fact that any really needed public work is worth all it costs.

In this connection, however, there is another fact that needs brief consideration.

We have accepted the postulate that all have equal natural rights to the use of the earth. But as different parts of the earth possess different degrees of desirability for human use, and as all have equal natural rights to these best

places, and as only some can possess them, while others must take up with less valuable locations, the logic is irresistible that whatever be the special value of those favored spots, their favored possessors owe to their less favored brethren a sum exactly equal to that value. Whether the value of those naturally favored locations be divided equally among all the citizens in order to maintain their equality of right to the earth, or whether such values be used to pay for public necessities that all men have an equal right to use, is a matter that only the people of each community can justly decide for themselves.

Here, then, seems to be the natural source of public revenue. Those values of land that are due either to natural conditions or to the construction of needed public works, are the natural wages of society; and it is as much the duty of society to take its wages and use them for public purposes, as it is the duty of each individual to insist on getting, to do with as he pleases, the natural product of his own labor.

Of course, it will be seen that much of the revenue of most civilized States is now derived from those natural sources, and is therefore to that extent in harmony with the principles of equity. Such of it as is not is nothing better than robbery.

In the State of Minnesota, a careful study of the reports of the State auditor and of the books of the assessors in the cities reveals the fact that about two-thirds of all State and municipal revenue is now drawn from those values which I have tried to show are natural social wages. In all other States where statistics were accessible, I find from one-half to three-fourths of all State and local revenue to be derived from the same source. In all cities a large part, if not all the revenue for needed street work or park improvement, is collected in special assessments against the benefitted land holders. From a careful study of this policy in many American cities, I find that it has been adopted more extensively and its details worked out more equitably in the city of St. Paul, Minnesota, than in any other American city.

We are now prepared to answer the question that forms the subject of this essay. "What changes in existing plans are necessary to secure an equitable distribution of the burden of taxation for National, State and municipal purposes?"

So far as municipal and State revenue are concerned, it is evident that the only changes required are such simple modifications of the constitution and laws as will permit of the extension of the policy of assessing the cost of public works against those land holders who are directly benefited by their construction. Also such changes as will assess all general taxes (instead of one-half to three-fourths as now) against those general land values which are not produced by the land holders, but are produced by the presence and activities of the whole people, and to which the whole people have a natural right.

An examination of the facts in the case shows that those changes would increase the amount of taxes collected from only that class of people who are now holding land idle or but partially improved; while it would greatly lighten the burden that now falls on all those who have adequately improved their holdings and are putting their land to the most useful purpose.

In many States no constitutional change is needed—nothing but the repeal of those unwise and unjust laws that now tax one man more for making land useful, exerting labor upon it, and producing good things from it—than another is taxed for holding equally valuable land idle, for no other purpose than that he may reap the benefits that come from the development of society and the construction of public works, without himself paying an equivalent.

So far as the burden of national taxation is concerned, no changes in the constitution of the United States are needed in order that it may all be drawn from social wages. The policy of assessing the cost of public improvements

QUESTION OF COMPENSATION.

against the benefited land holders is as applicable to national works as to municipal. This was made very plain by the discussion in the last Congress relative to the zoological gardens and park to be erected in the northwestern part of the District of Columbia.

When the States shall have made the changes suggested, Congress may then avail itself of that provision of the national constitution which provides for the apportionment of direct taxes among the States according to population; for, as those values of land that constitute social wages are wholly due to the presence, activities and necessities of population, it follows that to apportion national taxes among the States according to population would be to apportion them according to land values, and hence to call upon each State to furnish its equitable share for the support of the national government.

But Congress need not even wait for the States to adopt these changes. None of our national revenue is now derived from social values; but is all taken from the people in such a way as to come out of their individual wages. If they were to be apportioned among the States and collected as State taxes now are, much more than half would be taken from social values, and thus a long step would be taken toward equity.

And nothing would so stimulate the discussion of the whole problem of taxation, nothing would so soon force the people to the adoption of an equitable system of State and local taxation, as to be confronted with the necessity of raising directly those additional sums that are now taken from them in such a manner as to prove many times more burdensome, and with the added evil that the individual does not know how much he pays for national purposes, nor just when he pays it. The change proposed would enable every taxpayer to refer to his tax receipts and learn just how many dollars and cents the national, State or municipal government costs him annually. He would be able to form some opinion as to whether he had got the worth of his money.

Thus it appears that the changes necessary to an equitable system of taxation are very simple and easily understood. All that is needed is to educate the people to see the necessity for these changes.



REPLIES TO MR. PETER AITKEN ON THE QUESTION OF COMPENSATION.

By L. H. BERENS.

(Honorable Treasurer English League for the Taxation of Land Values.)

Single Taxers everywhere are inspired by the same ideals, upheld by the same convictions. Their one aim is to see the curse of landlordism removed, the blight of landlordism uplifted. Their advocacy of the Single Tax, or rather of the Taxation of Land Values, is but as a means to this end. They realize that the first important step in this direction will break down the power of land monopoly, and remove the evils of landlordism. For, manifestly, to give but one example, the worst evils of landlordism, as applied to our mineral resources, do not arise from the tribute the privileged holders of our coal and iron lands are enabled to extort from the coal and iron workers on the deposits they graciously allow to be put to use, but rather from their withholding of other similar resources from use. The land in use is yielding its blessings, not only to the land-holders and the land-users, but also to the innumerable other work-

ers whose wants they supply, and who, conversely, find remunerative work in supplying their wants. On such land the springs of industry have been set loose, to the advantage of all concerned; but on the land withheld from use, the first link in the great chain of co-operative production is wanting, to the injury, not only of would-be coal and iron workers, but of the community as a whole. In truth, the real hindrance to economic freedom, the direct enslaver and impoverisher of the industrial masses of the country, is *not* the exclusive possession of land by individuals, or trusts, but land monopoly, the power to withhold land from use. And it is this power, as Single Taxers together with the large privileged land-holders and their parasites as yet alone seem to realize, which would immediately come to an end with the imposition of a substantial installment of the system of taxation known as the taxation of land values. In short, as it seems to me, the great claim to originality, I had almost written, to immortality, of our great teacher, Henry George, is that, excluding only Patrick Edward Dove, he was the first to bring home to the thoughtful of the world that by this means all the advantages, real and imaginary, of the exclusive possession of land could be reconciled to the demands of social justice, and combined with all the benefits accruing to the common ownership of land.

Henry George, however, was far too philosophic to imagine for a moment, or even to desire, that the great and far-reaching reform he proposed could or should be inaugurated immediately and at one fell swoop. He knew and faced unflinchingly the barriers in its path. He realized to the full the economic ignorance of the disinherited many and the strong social position and almost overwhelming social influence of the privileged few. As "Behind ignorance and prejudice," he told us in his immortal work, "there is a powerful interest, which has hitherto dominated literature, education and opinion." It was this powerful interest he so courageously attacked, and to combat which he unstintingly devoted his life, even though he realized, as clearly as Mr. Aitkin, that "a great wrong always dies hard, and the great wrong which in every civilized country condemns the masses of men to poverty and want will not die without a bitter struggle." The publication of "Progress and Poverty" inaugurated that struggle, which has become more widespread and more bitter with every succeeding year. And the real question behind Mr. Aitkin's article, the question it at once raised in my mind, as doubtless in that of others, is whether we Single Taxers are really working on the right or best lines, whether we have reason to be satisfied or dissatisfied, encouraged or discouraged, by the success we have so far achieved, with the progress our basic ideas and ideals have made within the short space of some twenty-five years? As one who has closely watched and to the uttermost of my powers have taken part in the movement, both in Australia and Great Britain, since 1885, I would fain claim space, in contradiction to Mr. Aitkin's suggestion, to answer this first question in the affirmative. I firmly believe that the progress made has been as great and as rapid as we had any real reason to hope for: that it not only bids us to be of good hope for the future, but indicates that we have been working on the right lines, and should encourage us to renewed and, if possible, more vigorous efforts for the overthrow of that most fertile source of all social curses—Land Monopoly.

As regards Mr. Aitkin's suggestions, I cannot see that they would in any way promote, though they might easily injure, the further progress of our cause. If the choice were between the continuance of the present accursed system and the buying of all the land of the country, then I should agree with him that "it would be greatly to our advantage to buy out the landowners, even at their own price." Nor should I think that by advocating and voting for any such scheme I should be sacrificing my Single Tax principles. The one advantage of this proposal is that it would in part remove,

but in part only, what Mr. Aitken terms "the terrible spectre of confiscation," of which our interested opponents make such good use, and which he evidently regards as the chief obstacle to the general acceptance of our proposals and of Henry George's teachings. I for one do not believe this. In any case I would remind Mr. Aitken, and those who agree with him, that the buying up of the whole land of the country is so far removed from the field of practical politics as to justify practical men in classing it amongst impracticable, unrealizable ideals. And manifestly our cause must necessarily suffer if we allow it to be associated in the public mind with any such scheme. On the other hand, thanks to the unceasing efforts of Single Taxers to-day in America, Australia and even in conservative Great Britain, the taxation of land values, the first direct step toward the Single Tax, is well within the field of practical politics, and is daily gaining fresh friends and increased support. True, there is much work yet to be done, many spectres yet to be laid to rest, many real difficulties yet to be overcome. But I, for one, have no doubt but that we should only injure our cause and render our work unnecessarily difficult by coquetting with or advocating any unnecessary, unjust and utterly misleading compensation proposals. And hence, that we should do well unswervingly to persevere along the lines laid down for our guidance by our great master, which have already enabled us powerfully to influence, if not to dominate, the progressive thought of the world.

LONDON, Eng.

By Dr. EDWARD D. BURLEIGH.

Mr Peter Aitken's article on "The Chief Obstacle to the Single Tax and how to Remove it," is curious reading. He plainly sees that landlords have no moral right to "rent," never did have, never could have; that "rent" is rightfully the property of the whole people; that a man's earnings are his own and cannot rightfully be taken from him; and yet he writes a big article to advocate robbing the worker, under the forms of law, to pay "compensation" to landlords for the loss of something they never had any right to, and have been wrongfully appropriating for some hundreds of years. It would seem as if the "compensation," if any, should go in the other direction. Really it is almost impossible to treat the article seriously, especially in view of the fact that, as Mr. Aitken confessed in conversation, the time could never come when compensation could be even claimed, much less granted.

If Single Taxers proposed to "nationalize" the land, to abolish all private titles and let it out in lots to suit, then the question would undoubtedly come up, and claims for compensation would be made by those whose land was taken. But Single Taxers do not propose to nationalize land. They propose to abolish all other taxes and levy a "Single Tax" on the rental value of land. They propose to leave the *form* of land ownership just as it is now; to take away no landlord's land, but merely to require him to pay a tax on it equal to its annual rental value. Every landlord holds his land subject to such taxes as the State may levy on it. Whether the Single Tax were introduced suddenly, as we should like it to be, or gradually, as it is likely to be, there could never come a time when anyone would even think of asking, or paying, "compensation." How could the question ever come up?

Mr. Aitken is anxious, as we all are, to get people to listen to our proposal, and, to do it, he seems to propose a "bunco" game on them, to make them think that the landlords are to be compensated for the loss of their present privilege of appropriating the public property, when he has no idea of ever doing it. And he seems to think that such a scheme would remove "the chief obstacle to the Single Tax."

What does he take the people for? How long would it take the gentlemen he names, or even the common run of ordinary people, to find out the truth of the matter? And what could he expect them, then, to think of those who had tried to deceive them? And how much would such a course be likely to advance the cause?

Let us rather follow the example of Henry George, and say boldly just what we mean. Let us show the people, as fast as we can, that private *property* in land is *wrong*, and why; that private *possession* of land is *right*, and why; that we propose to end the former as soon as we can and perpetuate the latter, and to place it upon a firm, impregnable foundation of right and justice, instead of the quagmire of injustice it now legally rests upon. Let us show them that we respect "the sacred right of property," and would not attempt to appropriate a cent for any public use, outside of the rightful property of the public, the "rent" of land. Doing this we shall occupy a strong position, one that cannot be successfully assailed, and we shall eventually win, as surely as truth is destined to prevail over error and right over wrong. I cannot see that we have anything to gain in the long run by misrepresenting or beclouding our position.

Mr. Aitken says; "And however we may disguise it, what we want is simply to impose taxation so as to take land out of the control of private owners and throw it open to whoever will make the best use of it; in the words of Henry George, to make land common property." We wish to do this in *fact*, not in *form*, and as we are *not* going to do it in form, it does not seem clear how or when we could compensate, or what we could compensate for.

Mr. Aitken says that our refusal to compensate "of course arouses opposition not only from landlords, but at first from every man of *common* honesty, and this opposition is what I conceive to be the chief obstacle to our cause." This arouses opposition from landlords, as a rule, "of course," but not "of course" from "every man of common honesty." Some men of "common honesty" get a wrong idea of what we propose and will not investigate or listen to explanations, but most men will listen, sooner or later, and can then be shown what we really propose. Even some landlords have been converted to a belief in the Single Tax, and many more, no doubt, will be. Mr. George says, somewhere, that he appeals to them with as much confidence as to any other class. And why not? They would lose their privileges, it is true, but they would gain what would much more than make up the loss to them.

Mr. Aitken says that the benefit landlords would receive, as their share of the common benefit, "cannot logically be called compensation for the special privilege they now possess." And why not? Why do they value their present privilege? Is it not because they suppose that it increases their happiness? If it could be proved to them, as it *would* be, that the adoption of the Single Tax would increase their happiness, notwithstanding it destroys their privilege, would they not feel that their loss was more than made up to them, that they were compensated? And what other compensation would be right? It certainly cannot be contended that it would be right to continue their privilege in another form. If the people are ever to be relieved of the burden of the landlord's privilege, the privilege must be abolished, not changed in form only. Why postpone the time of its abolition by giving the landlord the privilege in another form for a time? If it is not to last forever he must relinquish it sometime. Is he likely to be any more ready later on?

Further on Mr. Aitken says: "For not only are our doctrines imperfect, measured by the ideal, we are not even the most advanced exponents of practical justice. The socialist doctrine: 'From every man according to his ability, to each according to his needs,' is a much higher expression of the sense of justice

than the doctrine of the equal right to the use of the earth. Nevertheless we quite honestly reject it because we do not consider it practicable."

Does Mr. Aitken mean to say that a thing may be "right in theory but will not work in practice?" So far from the "Socialist doctrine" which he quotes, being "a much higher expression of justice than the doctrine of the equal rights to the use of the earth," it is no expression of justice at all, high or low, while the other *is*. Every person is equally entitled to life. The use of the earth is essential to life; *therefore* all are *equally* entitled to use it. When, for any reason, no matter what, the right to use any particular piece of land acquires a value (that is, will yield rent) that value belongs of right to all the people.

Each person has, of right, an exclusive claim to himself and consequently to all his faculties and the entire product of his exertion, except if he uses better land than all can freely get, when he owes society so much of his product as equals the rent of such land, but *no more*. All the rest of his product belongs exclusively to him because he has an exclusive claim to himself and an equal right with all others to use the earth. Therefore, all taxes, except the land value tax, as well as all fines, or pecuniary penalties of whatever kind, are robbery, and should be abolished, leaving the land value tax as the only tax, the *Single Tax*. But what claim has one man on the earnings of another? None whatever. The world owes no man a living; it owes every one an equal chance to make a living. This is why the socialist doctrine should be rejected; not because it is not practicable. In fact this is why it is not practicable, because it is not just.

Mr. Aitken, speaking of certain prominent and influential men who are supposed to be "almost persuaded," says: "Shall we send them away sorrowful because of their great possessions, by insisting upon their unconditional surrender, or shall we follow the Apostle's example and be all things to all men, if by any means we may win some?"

What is the meaning of this? Mr. Aitken certainly cannot want Single Taxers to resort to double dealing and misrepresentation to win certain people to what they would mistakenly suppose to be our cause, only to find out later that they had been imposed upon. And what would be the good of such converts thus made? A supposed convert to the Single Tax who did not see that private land owning (that is, the private appropriation of rent) was wrong, would be a very poor Single Taxer. His advocacy would hardly help the cause; it would be more likely to hurt it. We want people to listen to us; we want to make converts; but we do *not* want *supposed* converts who have been induced to listen and accept our teaching by means of wilful misrepresentation on our part. What else would it be to put forward such a scheme of compensation as Mr. Aitken proposes we should, when we knew and intended, all the time, that there could never come a time when it could be put in practice? Of course, Mr. Aitken does not *mean* to "bunco" people with a "gold brick," but what else does his plan amount to?

Really, the example of "the apostle" and the early Christian church, does not seem to me very encouraging. If, following that example would result in a nominal triumph of the Single Tax, with such a change in its character from its pristine purity as Christianity suffered, I think we had better not follow it, but go a little more slowly, if necessary, and preserve its character. The Single Tax, changed as much from what Henry George advocated, as Christianity has been changed from what Jesus taught, would be of very little use. Incidentally, it might be mentioned, in this connection, that Jesus let the rich young man go away sorrowful.

After quoting a Single Taxer as saying, "any one who confesses himself a disciple of Henry George and at the same time a believer in compensation,

confesses himself a fool," and Carlyle as saying that the British were mostly fools, Mr. Aitken says: "But we are all fools, and I don't know but the kind of fool who fails to welcome the co-operation of another fool in the work of liberating humanity, simply because the other fool believes in compensation, is the worst." There might be more force in this remark if "compensation" did not mean continuing the enslavement in another form. How can we welcome the aid of any one "in the work of liberating humanity" who insists on keeping humanity enslaved?

Mr. Aitken makes a long argument to prove that most people are reluctant to abolish any evil if its abolition involves any destruction of legal property-rights, no matter how unjust; but he makes it no more clear than Henry George does in his books, and yet George opposed compensation, notwithstanding. Why should we do otherwise?

Again, Mr. Aitken, after speaking of different ways of meeting proposals to compensate, says: "A much more effective method is to absolutely reject on high moral grounds any and all proposals to compensate landlords. * * * But who among us can hope to rival Henry George's final and crushing broadsides on this phase of the question? And if he has not convinced many, even of those in sympathy with his aims and character, how can we hope to succeed where he has failed? Who says he has failed? The end is not yet. Let us continue to proclaim the truth he uttered. It must win at last."

Mr. Aitken alludes to the abolition of slavery in the British colonies, and says: "Paying price for instant freedom was less repugnant to the sense of justice than prolonging the slavery even temporarily and in a modified form." He overlooks the fact that "paying price" *was* "prolonging the slavery," and "a modified form." It partially enslaved the people from whom the money was taken that was paid to the former slaveholders.

No one doubts that the proposal to abolish, without compensation, the privilege of land owning (that is, without continuing the privilege in some other form) is an obstacle to the acceptance of the Single Tax doctrines by many; but so is the proposal to abolish the protective tariff and the tariff for revenue. Shall we, therefore, advocate continuing them, to conciliate those who believe in them?

In suggesting a means to compensate landlords, Mr. Aitken seems to use the word "wages" in a very restricted sense, as including only money received from an employer, whereas, as used in "Progress and Poverty," and economic discussions generally (except by Socialists), it is used to mean all returns for labor, whether received direct from nature, or through the hands of an employer. If it were attempted to levy his proposed tax on *all* wages, how could it be done; if only on money paid by an employer, where would be the justice? Why should employees only contribute from their wages to compensate landlords, and not also those who work for themselves?

Mr. Aitken claims that the gradual establishment of the Single Tax would be virtual compensation, and therefore to advocate it is no better than to propose robbing workers to pay landlords for the loss of their privilege to rob them. But there is this difference: in the former case we accept the inevitable, if it shall prove to be inevitable, but work steadily and persistently for abolition at the earliest possible moment; while in the latter we assume immediate success to be impossible, and deliberately adopt a course which would make it so.

Single Taxers have met many discouragements, but not more than Henry George anticipated in "Progress and Poverty;" and when we look at the state of public opinion to-day, not only in this country but in England, Germany, New Zealand and Australia, and compare it with what existed when that immortal book was first published, we have great cause for encouragement. It is no time to conclude that our efforts have been in vain.

Let us take courage, then, and go forward, resolved to continue the crusade till the promised "land" is won and all men are at last free.

EDWARD D. BURLEIGH.

By SAMUEL MILLIKEN.

I disapprove in toto Mr. Aitken's proposal to preach a partial or complete compensation to landlords. I am not one of those who are incensed by his statement that our radical programme arouses opposition "at first from every man of *common* honesty." Let it be so—the fact remains, nevertheless, that "common" honesty is not honesty, but like "common" morality only such approximation thereto as amounts to a denial of the thing itself. It is always the "common" honesty which defends vested wrongs. The oppressor has always relied on the "common" honesty of the masses too ignorant to think below the surface. Truly, our social hell is paved with good intentions.

Nor can I agree with Mr. Aitken's approval of the Socialist doctrine, "From every man according to his ability, to each according to his needs," as just though impracticable. It may be high counsel of individual perfection; but that which is just cannot rightly be imposed by force. And when enforced upon the unwilling then this Socialist doctrine is the same as that practised by that practical economist, Mr. Richard Turpin, of Hounslow Heath, who despoiled travelers "according to their ability." I submit that a higher expression of justice is this: "From every man according to benefits rendered." Mr. Aitken rejects the Socialist doctrine because he does not consider it practicable. I reject it because I consider the enforcement of it unfair. I am not impugning Mr. Aitken's intentions. I think he did not see clearly.

Like most of us, I should gladly accept and occupy any outposts surrendered by the enemy, but I should not minimize or soften one whit the logical declaration of principles. To preach "compensation" is to discredit ourselves, is to acknowledge justice in landlordism. Enthusiasm may be aroused by a principle, but not by a percentage.

I think, too, that Mr. Aitken is over sanguine. He believes doubtless that slavery would have yielded to a suggestion of compensation to slaveholding oppressors (not to slaves). But history shows that that great crime developed from an apologetic spirit, which became first complacent, then aggressive, and finally contemptuous and tyrannic. The South held the colonization societies in amused contempt. Garrison it hated as Ahab hated Elijah. The monster had become a "divine institution," and any one who questioned it was anathema—compensation or no compensation.

Mr. Aitken's proposal is born of impatience. But I think it is better to do work aright than to use questionable methods or questionable materials. "Compromise! that great serpent ever twining about the tree of life!"

The Kingdom of Heaven cannot be enacted on earth even by compensation to the dispossessed Devil.



A cyclone or blizzard has many of the attributes of a protective tariff. It is a barrier to the free interchange of commodities. It produces scarcity and enhances prices. It profits a few at the expense of the many. It is a benefit to the dealer in milk or coal or meat or other necessities of daily use, provided he is caught with a good stock on hand. The cab company does not grieve over the troubles of the street-railway company. It has all it can do to gather in the harvest which enforced custom has so suddenly created.

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON,

FAIRHOPE CRITICISED,

Editor Single Tax Review:

Having lived in Fairhope, Alabama, in its "pioneer" days and been personally acquainted with its chief promoters, I have watched with interest the increasing publicity Single Taxers have recently been giving the colony, and wondered when some one would enter a protest; for it did not seem possible that the ignored facts regarding it should forever remain obscured. From my personal knowledge of the promoters and controllers of the Fairhope corporation, and my experience with them, I am the more easily inclined to believe that Prescott A. Parker might have put his case against them even more strongly than he did in the Winter Number of the *Single Tax Review*.

Replying to him, E. B. Gaston says, regarding "the administration of colony affairs by members of the colony corporation," that "it is an absolutely necessary condition . . . to ensure the administration of that land on Single Tax principles;" that "it must be controlled by Single Taxers." He says: "We came . . . to demonstrate the virtues of a well-defined policy. That policy has been steadfastly adhered to . . . and every proper effort has been made to acquaint all comers with that policy." Again he says: "Even if it were deemed advisable to commit hari-kari, by admitting non-Single Taxers to full voice in the administration, no one has ever shown a way by which it can be justly done." And, finally: "It is a remarkable man indeed whose actions are not consciously or unconsciously affected by his personal interests."

Seeing that the Fairhope management has been appealing to Single Taxers at large for the financial assistance, and utilizing them, their organizations and periodicals, for considerable free advertising, and posing as Single Tax demonstrators, it would seem that the Fairhope corporation managers can, in simple fairness, prove the sincerity of their claims by nothing short of giving the Single Tax public the names of the resident members of their *corporation*, stating how long each has been a Single Taxer. It is one thing to *say* that the colony *should* be "controlled by Single Taxers," and quite another *to prove that it is*.

When I lived at Fairhope, J. H. Springer, Henry C. C. Schakel, and George Pollay were also resident Single Tax members of the corporation. James Bellangee had not then arrived. John W. Ettel and Chas. Schalkenbach, two well known Single Taxers, lived on land near the colony. Ettel applied for membership and was refused admission. Can the zealous guardians of Single Tax principles within the corporation tell us why? Every Single Taxer on the ground, whom I knew, voted to admit him. At the same time the Mershons, brothers-in-law of E. B. Gaston, were members of the corporation, and boldly informed us that they came to Fairhope with the distinct understanding that they were not to be bothered about *principles* at all; that they knew practically nothing—and cared less—about the Single Tax; that they came there for purely family and business reasons. E. B. Gaston himself told me that his own ambition was to get away from the push and rush of the world, and have a cow and horse and garden, and be able to take life easy and comfortably.

In the effort which Single Taxers on the ground made to establish a democratic form of government—governed by town meetings instead of a representative (of corporation owners) "council," they were outvoted by the Gaston-Mershon families aided by the other non-Single Tax members, the non-resident members' sole source of information being through E. B. Gaston. Up

to that time none but corporation members were allowed residence in the colony. If, by admitting non-Single Taxers "to full participation in determining the policy of the colony or *electing the officers* to execute it," "there would not be any Single Tax colony," why were non-Single Tax members of the corporation so numerous as to be able to refuse admission to such a well known and unquestioned a Single Taxer as John W. Ettel? No one knows better than Gaston that Mrs. Sykes, Messrs. Coleman, Stimpson, and other resident members of the corporation (as well as his own family relatives), did not even claim to be Single Taxers at that time. And is it not a little strange that every Single Taxer who was in Fairhope at that time (1895) left, not only the colony, but much of their property and earnings besides? If that "well-defined policy," which "has been steadfastly adhered to," and of which "every proper (?) effort has been made to acquaint all *comers*," is the Single Tax as understood by followers of Henry George, why did the corporation refuse Ettel membership? or why did it so apply that "policy" as to make it to the interest of every Single Taxer who lived in the colony in 1895 to leave as soon as an opportunity offered, even at a sore financial sacrifice? If "no one has ever shown a way by which "non-Single Taxers" "could be justly" admitted "to full voice in the administration" of the colony affairs, will some one show the way by which the non-Single Taxers controlling the Fairhope corporation came to be admitted? Surely there must have been some *other*, and more effective test of qualification for membership in the corporation than that of being a Single Taxer, when the applications of well known Single Taxers could be rejected, by confessedly non-Single Tax members.

Before Single Taxers at large allow themselves to be sidetracked by E. B. Gaston's inferences as to the motives actuating Prescott A. Parker, let them take the precaution to obtain a full and unreserved history of the colony, especially that unwritten history of its pioneer days. If the details have slipped the memory of Gaston and other promoters of the colony, some of these details may be found in that issue of the Fairhope Courier which J. H. Springer edited—and the type for which I set up—and which Gaston did his best to suppress; or, if the present address of Messrs. Springer, Schackel and Pollay can be obtained, they can supply many important items regarding the methods of the colony management at that time. Let no Single Taxer think that the details of the past history of the colony have nothing to do with the application of Single Tax principles there; for they have everything to do with it, seeing that it was wholly a matter of principle which the resident Single Taxers were contending for when they were outvoted by the Gaston faction, which latter was a distinctly non-Single Tax element, an element which remains in control to this day. It would be no concern of Single Taxers at large how Gaston ran his little colony if he did not thrust it upon their attention as an illustration of Henry George's teachings, and appeal to them for patronage and support.

And now that some Single Taxers have been misled into serious attempts to imitate Fairhope, it is the more important that those who do not want the Single Tax doctrine to become a just subject of ridicule should be cautious how they commit, not only themselves, but the cause they advocate, to any colony experiment; especially in view of the innumerable illustrations extant of the difficulties and disappointments inevitable to all such experiments. Many things can be done in an out of the way place like Fairhope without attracting the attention of the general public, which, if done near such cities as New York or Philadelphia, would at once become matter of public comment, so that it might be as well for Single Taxers to make haste slowly until they are quite sure that what is applied under the label of "the Henry George Single Tax" does not turn out to be something altogether different. They should not be too easily influenced by what is called "success." That is a favorite word, just

now, with all kind of grafters, and needs more accurate definition than interested land owners are apt to give it. Perhaps eastern Single Taxers are excusable for a tendency to accept at its face value what they read or hear from real estate boom sources, but those who have lived in the land booming west should be sufficiently familiar with the tone and character of boom literature to be careful to seek for the glossed-over facts which are sure to underlie those flowery statements. Experienced real estate men are not inclined to over-state the unattractive features, and it is worth noting that the Fairhope corporation is not without its quota of men of that quality.

I have always understood that what Henry George meant by the Single Tax was that every person should pay as much for the privilege of holding land out of use as for putting it to its best use. When E. B. Gaston was appealing to a Philadelphia audience for more funds he remarked that the Fairhope corporation, *like any other landlord*, charged its tenants all the rent it could; but he did not add that, also like other landlords, its proprietors had no rent to pay on the land it held out of use.

It is conceivable that a real estate corporation might be organized which would agree to pay all the State, County, and local taxes levied against its tenants and its own land and property, and charge the whole up to the tenants in the form of rent. This might be *a* Single Tax, just as a tax on incomes might be *a* Single Tax, but that it would be *the* Single Tax which Henry George proclaimed is impossible.

Let E. B. Gaston tell the Single Taxers at large, to whom he is appealing so energetically for more funds, whether members of the Fairhope corporation pay any rent (or tax) for the corporation lands which are not in use; and if not, whether anyone who begins using such land is required to pay rent so long as there remains land along side unused which pays no rent; whether the State and County taxes assessed against the unused land owned by the Fairhope corporation are paid by tenants of the unused land, and if not, by whom are they paid.

Does any Single Taxer believe that Henry George conceived it likely that, under the Single Tax, there could be vacant lots of *valuable* land interspersed between used land? Could it be possible that, under any application of *the* Single Tax, valuable lots of unused and untaxed land could exist in the midst of used and taxed lots? What difference does it make to a man renting land of a corporation whether he pays the taxes levied against the corporation's unused land in the form of rent for the location he uses or in the form of a tax on his house? Would not the former be more apt to fasten on him the tax which should be paid by the owners of the idle land?

Do the Single Taxers at large think that the spirit of the Single Tax, as proclaimed by Henry George, could be recognized in a community of people, the majority of whom were totally disfranchised as to local public affairs, and where all such local affairs were conducted by a close corporation which owned the land on which the majority were mere tenants?

I think that my wife and I have had as thorough and varied an experience in propaganda work as any two other Single Taxers, and we wish to register most emphatically our opposition to the opinion of John De Witt Warner, that "five years of practical illustration," such as is possible by any conceivable colony, "would advance the cause more than fifty years of any conceivable propaganda by discussion about it." A *thorough* "propaganda by discussion" is an absolute prerequisite to any "practical illustration" of anything sufficiently radical to approximate really equitable conditions.

This is a very appropriate time for Single Taxers at large to sift this Single Tax colony business to its dregs, before many more of them are induced to try to imitate Fairhope's pretensions. The prominence given in the Single Tax

Review, of late, to the suggestions of Fairhope experiments near New York and Philadelphia, seem to call for the closest of scrutiny into the *principles* going by the name of the Single Tax.

Do Single Taxers at large understand that the payment of a rent in lieu of all other *direct* taxes—whether that rent be excessive or not, and regardless of the disposition of that rent fund—constitutes *the* Single Tax as conceived by Henry George? Do they think it possible to have *the* Single Tax where there are *any indirect* taxes? Are there any Single Taxers of the Henry George brand who think that it would be possible for any *valuable* land under the Single Tax to remain untaxed? Do they think that the settler on “the margin of cultivation”—that is, on the one side of whom is population and on the other is vacant (and therefore valueless) land—would have any taxes to pay so long as the lack of demand for land to use was shown in the idle condition of the land adjoining—just beyond “the margin?”

Does any one believe that tenancy on Fairhope corporation land brings such great benefits as to make land just inside the imaginary line which separates the corporation land from the land of outsiders' worth a great many dollars per acre so long as the outsiders' land—on the other side of the imaginary line—is worth \$1.25, or less, per acre?

W. E. BROKAW,

STATION A, PASADENA, Cal.



REPLY BY MR. GASTON.

I have no desire to engage in any controversy with Mr. Brokaw over myself or my wife's relations, and am so busy working for the Single Tax, as I understand it, that I have little time for argument with those who look at it differently.

If my work in connection with Fairhope, and the columns of the Fairhope *Courier*, are not satisfying evidence of my zeal for and understanding of Single Tax principles, I can rest quite content with my own approval.

As to my brothers-in-law—everyone who knows Fairhope knows of the important part they have played in its development. They are good enough Single Taxers and Fairhoppers to have invested every dollar they own here. It has always been, and is a matter of some pride and gratification to me, that I have been able to enlist so much support for Fairhope from my wife's relations. Petroleum V. Nasby was so patriotic in 1861 to '05 that he was “willing to sacrifice all his wife's relations,” and I was so much in earnest about Fairhope that I would have sacrificed all my wife's relations, and my own as well, upon its altar. I am glad, however, that it has in no sense proved a sacrifice to them.

Of the Single Taxers whom Mr. Brokaw mentions as having been here when he was, Springer, Schakel, Pollay, Ettel and Schakelbach, I know the whereabouts only of Schakel and Ettel, and am very glad to give their addresses, so that anyone who writes to them regarding those early days of Fairhope may do so. Henry C. C. Schakel may be reached at 1021 Union Street, Indianapolis, Ind. Fairhope has no better friend to-day than he. John W. Ettel is now at White Springs, Fla. The most cordial relations exist between him and myself to-day, in spite of the fact that I felt constrained to vote against him ten years ago.

"That issue of the *Courier* which J. H. Springer edited, and the type for which I set up," to which Mr. Brokaw refers, convinced many distant Single Taxers that the Springer-Brokaw party were on the wrong side from a Single Tax standpoint. Such an one was Prof. J. H. Loomis, then president of the Chicago Single Tax Club, now at Glen Ellyn, Ills., to whom Mr. Springer sent a copy, only to have it prove a boomerang.

Certainly Single Taxers will not understand that "the payment of a rent in lieu of other direct taxes—whether that rent be excessive or not and regardless of the disposition of that rent fund—'constitutes the Single Tax as conceived by Henry George.'" Those who consider the matter fairly, however, do see, that the collection of the rental value of land, the payment therefrom of state and county taxes on the land and on the improvements and personal property thereon, and the expenditure of the remainder for the local public benefit (which is the Fairhope plan), constitutes the nearest approach to the Single Tax possible under existing laws, which is all that is claimed for it. That anyone should have to pay rent for land in Fairhope, while similar land remains unleased, is one of the difficulties of attempting to apply the Single Tax under existing conditions, and must necessarily exist while the colony is striving to secure and hold land to provide for future population.

ERNEST B. GASTON.

Fairhope, Ala.



*WHAT ONE SINGLE TAX CONGRESSMAN CAN DO!

(For the Review.)

By HON. ROBERT BAKER.

What One Single Tax Congressman Can Do! The task set me by the editor of the REVIEW is about as difficult a task as one man could well set another. To perform it satisfactorily, *i.e.*, satisfactorily to the readers of this magazine, one must needs be endowed with a rare combination of qualities, *aye*, with the rarest of qualities, for the task requires the ability to set one's own acts forth in their proper perspective, free on the one hand from any excess or over-statement due to proximity of view, while on the other, avoiding an undue modesty which would ignore or gloss over matters of importance in which the chronicler played the principal part.

Conscious of my inability to steer such a course as will present all essential elements, while avoiding the appearance of egotism, I undertake the task solely because the editor of the REVIEW insists that my experience as a member of the 58th Congress is of interest to Single Taxers, and because of his further insistence that no one else has that intimate knowledge which is required to present some of the interesting incidents of my checkered career in the House of Representatives.

* This article from the pen of Congressman Robert Baker is written at the request of the editor of the REVIEW. It must be apparent to our friends everywhere that no Single Taxer in Congress has ever done as much as the energetic member from Brooklyn. If this has not always been done with perfect tact, it has at least been undertaken with swift appreciation of the importance of the work in hand, with sharp and ready wit, and with ever vigilant and fearless purpose. What has looked like self-advertising in Mr. Baker's methods has been in reality his most effective method of gaining the public ear. He has not been blind to dramatic effects, and he has drawn attention to useful examples of conduct in a Congressman—examples which are so much better than precepts.—THE EDITOR.

Appreciating the difficulty of eliminating the personal equation and of obtaining a proper perspective of the relative importance of acts in which one has played a leading part, yet, I think, there can be no doubt that the one act which had the greatest influence was the return of the B. & O. pass. In this, and in some other matters quickness of decision and rapidity of action were the factors which insured that conspicuity which was its chief merit, and without which it would have availed nothing. Having for years been a propagandist, I naturally looked at it from the standpoint of its educational possibilities and its usefulness in demonstrating the universality of the intimate relations which the railroads always attempt and usually succeed in establishing between themselves and members of Congress.

Never having been a victim of the delusion that I should be able to secure the enactment of legislation in the direction of the Single Tax, nor even that I should be able to prevent the passage of bills violative of its principles (although subsequent events proved I was able to do this on one occasion, at least), I was not handicapped by the fear that I might sacrifice influence unless I was "safe, sane and conservative" in my political actions. This is not to say that I had no anticipation of the ridicule and abuse any public action on such a matter would provoke, but the educational advantages to follow publicity were great enough to offset its distasteful features.

My brief Congressional experience has confirmed this view, in fact it has convinced me that the fact of a member having a comprehension of the Single Tax would not of itself insure anything more than a perfunctory attention from other members. Of course, with the eloquence and force of a Bryan, or the elegance of diction of a Garrison, one could command both attention and respect. But such men are rare, and we have to deal with average men, men with an unusual grasp of economic questions, it is true, but in other respects average men, and therefore not likely to impress themselves upon a body containing scores of bright men who are almost unknown, or who, at least, exert a minimum of influence in Congress. For, eliminating its willingness to be entertained at almost any time, Congress is essentially matter-of-fact, and academic or polemical discussions must be of a high order to command attention.

What one Single Tax Congressman can do is not therefore an easy question to answer. In the last analysis, I think, it is true that what one Single Taxer in Congress could accomplish would be largely a matter of motive and temperament. By motive, I do not mean his devotion to the Single Tax cause; that is assumed when I speak of a "Single Tax" Congressman. What I mean is, the underlying motive of his conduct, his policy, if you will. That is, whether he desires to accomplish something, however little; then, whether he is looking to a future influence in the party; or whether he is indifferent to results present or prospective, being solely interested in utilizing opportunities as they arise regardless of their effect upon himself, but always with a view to their present educational possibilities.

Temperament, again, is a not unimportant factor. Even some Single Taxers shrink from the unusual, not to mention the bizarre. To such, opportunities might come, which by reason of the environment, the associations, or the setting, would not be availed of because to attempt the unusual or unique method would be temperamentally distasteful.

My brief experience convinces me of the truth of what I have for years maintained, that there is no effort that Single Taxers can put forth so certain to be productive of good results, so certain to advance the movement as the sending of Henry George men to Congress wherever and whenever possible. The extent of the results will, of course, vary according to the differences in individuals, in their capacity, their industry, and in their unflagging devotion to the ideals of the master, but in any event and in every case, I am certain

good results will follow. If there were no other reason we must remember that in our attempts to spread the gospel, to make converts to the faith, we have to deal with human nature.

To illustrate. Even the most casual observer of "politics as they are" must recognize that the demand for men as public speakers and the space accorded them by newspapers, is not mainly a matter of intelligence, ability, wealth or social position, but is almost entirely a matter of political prominence, and particularly of their recent political activities or successes. Let a man be elected a governor, senator or congressman, and immediately he is in demand as a public speaker. All of us can call to mind the names of men who were in the full glare of the sunlight but a few years ago who are now never heard of, because they occupy no longer high office; they have lost their drawing power, and are therefore no longer in demand at banquets, nor their utterances accorded space in the newspapers. The opportunity which was afforded me to present a few Single Tax truths to 150 banquetting newspaper men in Philadelphia a year ago would not have come if I had not been more or less in the public eye. What influence, if any, those remarks had no one will ever know, but to those who believe that no seed is entirely lost, even though sown in such apparently stony ground as among Philadelphia newspaper men and journalistic defenders of monopoly, we may be sure that the seed was not wholly lost. Some among those then present will yet be preaching the gospel of righteousness in taxation. It is worth noting that a few months later the *Philadelphia Inquirer*—whose proprietor sat opposite me at that banquet board—published a striking cartoon depicting the folly of taxing buildings.

Nor should we ignore the influence of "authority" upon the mind of the average man. The ablest Single Tax lecture from one in private life is not likely to attract the attention given to the utterances of another of far less ability who occupies a more or less conspicuous public position, even when, as in my own case, that conspicuity is not chiefly because of my subscribing to Henry George's philosophy. For it must be understood that while I frequently gave utterance to Single Tax truths, injecting them where probably in the minds of other members they had no bearing upon or relation to the subject in hand, as for instance, the treatment of the Indians, the opening of public lands for settlement, or the question of the unemployed along the wharves of Cincinnati—yet in no case, so far as I know, were those matters mentioned in the newspapers, except in the case of the Rosebud Reservation bill, and then only because of the parliamentary tactics I adopted to defeat the bill. Nevertheless, the prominence given me as to other matters was of direct service to the Single Tax cause, as the newspapers frequently spoke of me as the "Single Tax" Congressman, thus keeping before their readers the fact that Henry George's principles were represented in Congress. Towards the end of the first session, and more particularly during the last session, members frequently enquired what the Single Tax was, among others a prominent member of the Ways and Means Committee, a Republican, asking that I write out a summary of it. This member has since the adjournment written me his thanks for "the first clear conception that I have had of the nature of the Single Tax." But if the Single Tax had never been mentioned by me directly, the educational work that I was able to do along collateral lines has fully repaid the efforts that Brooklyn friends put forth to secure my election. This I think I may say with pardonable pride in the consciousness of having done my best.

It is, of course, difficult to judge of the value of one's own work, but the fact that the one man who it was admitted was not afraid to express his convictions on any issue was a Single Taxer, could not but compel a respect for those principles. The further fact that this "Single Taxer" was able to treat every subject discussed in a way that was to them novel, if not illumin-

ating; that he was able to show, what no one attempted to deny, that such widely different questions as the prevalence of slums in Washington; the rush for land at "land openings"; the claim for reimbursement for a part interest in a lot taken as part of the site of the San Francisco mint fifty years ago; the emigration of farmers from the Northwest to Manitoba; the existence of the Steel Trust; railroad rebates and discriminations, and a dozen other matters, were all due to land monopoly, and that land monopoly was the fruit of unjust taxation, all resulted in the "Single Taxer" acquiring a reputation for profundity which would have been amusing to every exponent of the faith. But beyond this the insistence in season and out of season of the relation of the fundamental truths promulgated by Henry George to all governmental questions, the insistence to both sides of the chamber that their present methods, or lack of method, was the cause of the many evils generally recognized and deplored, but as to which neither party offered any remedy, all this had its influence which will not easily be eradicated.

Nor must we overlook the influence which the Washington correspondents exert. In a thousand and one ways the readers of their papers are effected by the coloring given to the news of the day by these men. If they had done nothing else than ring the changes in their dispatches upon the words "anti-pass" and "no-pass," they would nevertheless have done a great educational work, as they were thus, unconsciously, of course, forever keeping the pass evil before the people. As the constant dripping of water ultimately wears away the stone, so these men were doing a work which has already yielded an abundant harvest in the inaugural messages of Folk of Missouri and Hanly of Indiana, and which is probably destined to intensify the feeling of hostility to railroad domination.

To be able to point out in a body where all alike were insisting that river and harbor improvements was the one matter that everybody could cheerfully support, as they were of benefit to the "whole people," that here again not the people, but a limited number, were the ultimate beneficiaries of these expenditures, was also of educational value. The idea was apparently a revelation, each and all having been imbued with the idea that here was a matter in which the benefits were widely diffused. Of course, it is not to be supposed that my insistence that landowners only were the beneficiaries of such expenditures carried such conviction as to lead any to vote against the appropriation; some, I know, were impressed by the argument. In such a body as Congress, composed as it is of men of more than average ability, a large number being leaders in their localities, a much smaller proportion of converts is to be expected than outside, but to influence any in the smallest degree, to break down some of their prejudices on these questions of taxation, is progress, real progress, for it is likely to be the cause of much mental perturbation, and in some cases, let us hope, of ultimate complete conversion.

There is one thing a Single Tax Congressman could do which I did not do, or at least but to a limited extent, and that is to prevent the passage of many, if not all, special privilege bills, bills for the building of bridges across navigable streams, dams for water powers, etc. Practically all such legislation is enacted under the "unanimous consent" rule, i.e., they get recognition under that rule, and one objection prevents their consideration. What would happen if a Single Taxer should always remain in his seat—for that would be necessary to accomplish this—and object to every bill of this nature that was called up, I do not know, but presumably the rules would be altered so that such measures could be considered without "unanimous consent for their present consideration," for it is inconceivable that the whole House would permit one crank to forever block such legislation. But I took the ground that while I reserved the right to object in the case of particularly vicious measures,

I could not expect the House to adopt my view that no such legislation should be enacted, and I did not care to make invidious distinctions except in the case of bills that seemed to be unusually objectionable.

There was one measure that I succeeded in defeating which has given me more satisfaction than perhaps any other one thing I did or tried to do. An attempt was made by Mr. Gardner, of Michigan, to secure consideration for his bill to detail retired officers of the Army and Navy to act as military instructors in public schools. The bill had already passed the Senate, and but for my objection, would certainly have become a law. The Democratic leader enquired if the bill carried an appropriation, and on being informed to the contrary, he demonstrated his ardent opposition to the extension of militarism by announcing that "I have no objection." Fortunately I was on the floor at the moment, and by interposing an objection, prevented its consideration and secured its defeat, as it was then late in the session and its sponsor was unable to again get recognition from the Speaker (which has to be arranged for in advance), and I refused to withdraw my objection to its consideration at any time.

I might add that nowhere and under no circumstances is it more true than in Congress that "eternal vigilance is the price of liberty." That is, to successfully oppose any measure requiring previous unanimous consent to its consideration, it is necessary to be on the floor at all times and to be ever on the alert to note any attempt that may be made to bring up bills to which objection should be urged.

The more suspicious the bill the more questionable are likely to be the methods adopted to rush it through. These take the form at times of bogus messages from the Senator of your State, or the chairman of some important committee, to come to their committee room as they have an important matter to discuss, or, the telephone is utilized to get members from the floor for a minute or two. Any of these, or similar methods, succeed if they induce the temporary absence of the member known to be opposed to the little project it is hoped to pass. The telephone dodge was tried on me on one occasion, but I refused to respond to the call, so that the particular measure it was thus hoped to rush through was not called up. In saying that one must be on the floor at all times I do not mean that he must be there every moment of the five or five and a half hours that the session usually lasts. Sometimes it is safe to be absent for two or three hours, as for instance when an appropriation bill is being considered in Committee of the Whole, but it frequently happens that for whole days it is not safe to be away for a minute, as the order of business may undergo a change while your back is turned, and it then becomes possible to get consideration for a bill which five minutes before apparently had no chance of being reached that day.

All this naturally suggests what a number of Single Taxers could do in Congress. With five, six or more of the faith elected, it would be possible for them to arrange that one, at least, should always be on the floor. It would then be possible for one or more of the others to conduct an investigation into suspicious measures. Although almost every member has some pet bill which he desires to pass, it was surprising to find that my objections, when made, were the subject of more favorable than unfavorable comment, more than one member saying "By Jove, I wish there were more members who weren't afraid to hold these bills up!" Some of them even intimated that they would have retained more of their self-respect if they had not got themselves into a position where they dare not object.

To what extent this was in the minds of members during the last two days of the session when at least fifty republicans personally expressed their regret that I was not to be back in the 59th, I do not know, but it was nevertheless gratifying to feel that my course of determined hostility to matters and meas-

ures which violated my principles, no matter from which side of the House they were proposed, had apparently created respect rather than dislike. Not less than a score were quite warm in their assertion, expressed of course, in different language, that "While I do not agree with all you have said here, yet there are some things (or many things) in which I agree with you, and think you are dead right!"

But I take it that my experiences are only valuable if they suggest what is possible for other Single Taxers to do in Congress, and these incidents are only mentioned to prove that one can be an economic Ishmaelite there without sacrificing the personally pleasant relations with members, which is one of the chief attractions of Congress to so many. A new member, and particularly one of the minority, can hope to do nothing except of an educational nature. As your Single Taxer is primarily a propagandist he is not handicapped to the extent that nearly all new members are, for it is needless to say that few new members go to Congress with original ideas, and if they have a hobby they find it convenient to drop it.

With the practical certainty that the democrats will not be in a hopeless minority in the 60th Congress, and with the possibility that they may even control that body, it is of great importance for Single Taxers to consider how many and who of their number they can get nominated by the democrats in districts offering a possibility of election, I say possibility and not probability advisedly. For, in the first place, districts that on the result of last year's election are now regarded as certainly republican will elect democrats next year, and an election in such a district will have a deeper significance to the leaders of the party in Congress than would be attached to the election of a Single Taxer in a democratic district.

With only one democrat in the 59th Congress from Ohio, two from Indiana, one from Illinois, one from Pennsylvania, and with none from Delaware, Michigan, Iowa, Minnesota, Nebraska and California, there ought to be possibilities of democratic nominations for Single Taxers where they are in these several localities.

If but one or two of our faith are elected and the democrats control the House, then their influence is not likely to be much greater than was my own in the recent Congress, for new men command little attention and exert but small influence. But should there be six, seven, or ten in the 60th Congress, then we might reasonably hope that they would exert an influence out of all proportion to their numbers. Even four or five would carry considerable weight if Congress is close, their votes being necessary to organize the House, and they would be able to do much to shape the policies of the party. With the certainty that some of those from the South who are the oldest in point of service will, by virtue of the important chairmanships which they will demand, dominate the party's policies unless there is a compact, it is of the highest importance that our friends everywhere should carefully study the political conditions in their own locality to see whether it is not possible to bring about Single Tax nominations by the democrats.

Under the custom which prevails in both parties of giving the important chairmanships to those who are the oldest in service almost regardless of qualifications, the plutocrats will throw all their influence to strengthen those men so as to discredit the party before the country. We should be treated to the spectacle of a democratic Congress elected to undo the class legislation of forty years of republican rule temporizing with and even palliating these evils, because controlled by the Bourbons of the South. On the other hand elect a dozen or a score of Single Taxers, each first of all devoted to fundamental democracy, men who will stand boldly, unflinching for our principles, regard-

less of the possible effect upon their political future, and they will not only give courage to the progressive element of the party, but they may be able to checkmate and nullify the attempt of the reactionaries to deliver the organization into the hands of the plutocrats.

The vote shown in Massachusetts, Rhode Island, Wisconsin, Minnesota, Colorado and Missouri last Fall, clearly demonstrates increasing radicalism and power of discrimination. The elections in Chicago and in Kansas, Kan., (where an oldtime Single Taxer, W. W. Rose, was chosen Mayor) also indicate the rising tide. To give this growing radicalism force and direction in Congress we must do what the radical democrats have done in those two cities, put Single Taxers forward as democratic candidates.

We must, of course, continue our propaganda work, but let us emulate the plutocrats, who months, sometimes years in advance pick the men who at the right moment are to be brought forward as candidates. Let our friends throughout the country do this and they will be surprised to wake up after the Congressional elections of 1906 and discover that the Single Tax philosophy has at last become a positive if not controlling force in Congress.



GEO. BERNARD SHAW'S TRIBUTE TO THE WORK OF HENRY GEORGE.

Henry George has one thing to answer for that has proved more serious than he thought when he was doing it—without knowing it.

One evening in the early eighties I found myself—I forget how and I cannot imagine why—in the Memorial Hall, Farringdon Street, London, listening to an American finishing a speech on the Land Question. I knew he was an American because he pronounced “necessarily”—a favorite word of his—with the accent on the third syllable instead of the first; because he was deliberately and intentionally oratorical, which is not customary among shy people like the English; because he spoke of Liberty, Justice, Truth, Natural Law, and other strange eighteenth century superstitions; and because he explained with great simplicity and sincerity the views of The Creator, who had gone completely out of fashion in London in the previous decade and had not been heard of since. I noticed also that he was a born orator, and that he had small, plump, pretty hands.

Now at that time I was a young man not much past 25, of a very revolutionary and contradictory temperament, full of Darwin and Tyndall, of Shelley and De Quincy, of Michael Angelo and Beethoven, and never having in my life studied social questions from the economic point of view, except that I had once, in my boyhood, read a pamphlet by John Stuart Mill on the Land Question. The result of my hearing that speech, and buying from one of the stewards of the meeting a copy of *Progress and Poverty* (Heaven only knows where I got that sixpence), was that I plunged into a course of economic study, and at a very early stage of it became a Socialist and spoke from that very platform on the same great subject, and from hundreds of others as well, sometimes addressing distinguished assemblies in a formal manner, sometimes standing on a borrowed chair at a street corner, or simply on a curbstone. And I, too, had my oratorical successes; for I can still recall with some vanity a wet afternoon (Sunday, of course,) on Clapham Common, when I collected as much as sixteen and sixpence in my hat after my lecture, for The Cause.

And that the work was not all gas, let the tracts and pamphlets of the Fabian Society attest.

When I was thus swept into the Great Socialist revival of 1883, I found that five-sixths of those who were swept in with me had been converted by Henry George. This fact would have been more widely acknowledged had it not been that it was not possible for us to stop where Henry George had stopped. America, in spite of all its horrors of rampant Capitalism and industrial oppression, was, nevertheless, still a place for the individualist and the hustler. Every American who came over to London was amazed at the apathy, the cynical acceptance of poverty and servitude as inevitable, the cunning shuffling along with as little work as possible, that seemed to the visitor to explain our poverty, and moved him to say, "Serve us right!" If he had no money, he joyfully started hustling himself, and was only slowly starved and skinned into realizing that the net had been drawn close in England, the opportunities so exhaustively monopolized, the crowd so dense, that his hustling was only a means of sweating himself for the benefit of the owners of England, and that the English workman, with his wonderfully cultivated art of sparing himself and extracting a bit of ransom here and a bit of charity there, had the true science of the situation. Henry George had no idea of this. He saw only the monstrous absurdity of the private appropriation of rent; and he believed that if you took that burden off the poor man's back, he could help himself out as easily as a pioneer on a pre-empted clearing. But the moment he took an Englishman to that point, the Englishman saw at once that the remedy was not so simple as that, and that the argument carried us much further, even to the point of total industrial reconstruction. Thus, George actually felt bound to attack the Socialism he himself had created; and the moment the antagonism was declared, and to be a Henry Georgite meant to be an anti-Socialist, some of the Socialists whom he had converted became ashamed of their origin, and concealed it; while others, including myself, had to fight hard against the Single Tax propaganda.

But I am glad to say that I never denied or belittled our debt to Henry George. If we outgrew Progress and Poverty in many respects, so did he himself too; and it is, perhaps, just as well that he did not know too much when he made his great campaign here; for the complexity of the problem would have overwhelmed him if he had realized it, or, if it had not, it would have rendered him unintelligible. Nobody has ever got away, or ever will get away, from the truths that were the centre of his propaganda; his errors anybody can get away from. Some of us regretted that he was an American and therefore necessarily about fifty years out of date in his economics and sociology from the point of view of an older country; but only an American could have seen in a single lifetime the growth of the whole tragedy of civilization from the primitive forest clearing. An Englishman grows up to think that the ugliness of Manchester and the slums of Liverpool have existed since the beginning of the world. George knew that such things grow up like mushrooms, and can be cleared away easily enough when people come to understand what they are looking at and mean business. His genius enabled him to understand what he looked at better than most men; but he was undoubtedly helped by what had happened within his own experience in San Francisco as he could never have been helped had he been born in Lancashire.

What George did not teach you, you are being taught now by your Trusts and Combines, as to which I need only say that if you would take them over as National property as cheerfully as you took over the copyrights of all my early books, you would find them excellent institutions, quite in the path of progressive evolution, and by no means to be discouraged or left unregulated as if they were nobody's business but their own. It is a great pity that you

all take America for granted because you were born in it. I, who have never crossed the Atlantic, and have taken nothing American for granted, find I know ten times as much about your country as you do yourselves; and my ambition is to repay my debt to Henry George by coming over some day and trying to do for your young men what Henry George did nearly quarter of a century ago for me.

G. BERNARD SHAW.

LONDON, ENG.

[Mr. G. Bernard Shaw, probably the foremost wit and certainly one of the foremost playwrights in the English speaking world, is also a well known Fabian socialist. The foregoing letter addressed to the Progress and Poverty Dinner in this city on Jan. 24th exhibits at once the defects and shortcomings of his philosophy of life and his political economy. Liberty, Justice, and Natural Law have no place in his creed; they are to him what he calls them, superstitions, shibboleths that stand for nothing in his theories of social adjustments. He would probably regard as a mere idle meaningless statement the contention that there is a natural order in the industrial world, that the law of competition is beneficent, and gives only to those who earn; and that co-operation under freedom from state control, when the path is finally cleared of obstruction, will give all the benefits, without the disadvantages of socialism. All these notions he imperiously rejects.

But how curious it is that men to whom these really profounder aspects of the greater economic problem do not appear, should accuse inferentially, if not always in set terms, those who do see them, of superficiality, of not going "far enough." Yet what can be more superficial than the made-to-order arrangement of society, with its ignoring of so many of the laws of economics? Is not socialism the more obvious, therefore the more superficial, therefore, too, the least profoundly rational solution of the great economic problem? Does not the untrained, the unphilosophic and childlike mind naturally revert to the State, as

"The infant crying in the night
And with no language but a cry,"

reaches out instinctively for help. But what of the man full grown, to whom years have brought the philosopher mind? Realizing that he is endowed with faculties the exercise of which depends upon his individual initiative, will not profounder reflection bring also a realization that there is a natural order of industry independent of artificial, man-made regulation? Will he not see that the law of competition, the law of co-operation are not mere meaningless terms, but dependent in their operation upon the same fundamental causes that determine the regularity and order of the material universe everywhere? Will he not then advance a step further, and discover the line that marks off those things naturally and properly subjects for state regulation, and those which may be left free of such control to the individual members of the community? Is not this view, because requiring far more prolonged analysis and keener scrutiny, and because it is not the earlier, but always the later aspect presenting itself, wrested as it were from philosophic travail, the profounder one, and socialism the more purely superficial?

In this light Mr. Shaw's letter with its curious though not ungenerous egotism becomes amusing. Does he imagine that those who accept the teaching of Henry George have not travelled the ground over which he magnanimously proffers his leadership?

"He saw only the monstrous absurdity of the private appropriation of

rent." Did Henry George see only this? Did he not also see the results that would follow its *public* appropriation? And does Mr. Bernard Shaw see it? And if he did, would he not cease to characterize as "eighteenth century superstitions" the watchwords of Liberty, Justice and Natural Law? To those eighteenth century philosophers of France, Rousseau, Voltaire, and their English disciples, spite of much exaggeration, civilization owes a debt greater than to the laborious German architects of artificial societies, with their theories of men as automata, and the State as the omnipotent scene shifter, theories from which the later school of English Fabian Socialists to which Mr. Shaw belongs have borrowed in diluted solutions.—THE EDITOR.]



CONCERNING HON. WM. F. DRAPER'S ARTICLE IN THE "OUTLOOK" ON TARIFF REVISION.

(For the Review.)

BY J. A. DEMUTH.

"Antiquity cannot sanctify that which is wrong in reason and false in principle."
—Galileo.

Because one speaks as one having authority is not a sufficient reason why his doctrines should be received without question, especially if one is propounding an economic theory which is not above reasonable suspicion of having been fathered by aims for personal profit.

Under such circumstances its weight is naturally discounted, and those who rise up to call its truth in question may at least be accorded reasonable grounds for doing so.

Thus it is that when Hon. William Draper responds to the question: "Should the Tariff be Revised?" we are free to express the opinion that his personal advantages are father to his conclusions.

When he is directly benefitted by the present high tariff it is human nature, and certainly *protected* human nature, that Mr. Draper should use his best arguments in his efforts to convince the masses, who enjoy only the indirect benefits of being taxed, that the present high tariff should stand. We have heard much various and varied arguments in favor of protection—its cardinal virtue being always the bulwark of American labor—"our wage-earners"—that we are not surprised when Mr. Draper tells us in one and the same breath that "our foreign trade has increased by leaps and bounds under the present tariff without injuring any of our producers" and that "To *increase* it further by a *reduction* of the tariff would mean that industries that do not now possess the home market would be placed at still greater disadvantage for the benefit of those that possess the home field and desire a larger foreign outlet. I wish these fortunate ones all success in obtaining it, if they can do so under fair conditions; but it is not fair to destroy other industries for that purpose."

In the next paragraph we are told that "our home market is immensely more valuable than any increased foreign market would be under absolute free trade." I have been experiencing some difficulty in harmonizing these statements. It is plain that the present high tariff has caused the foreign trade to increase by leaps and bounds. We know that. We know positively that we can sell sewing machines, agricultural implements, steel rails and numer

ous manufactured commodities in foreign markets at much lower prices than they can be sold at in our home market. But if this condition is the result of our present tariff, how could a *reduction* of the *cause* of this condition still further augment it? Then here is this virtual admission by our ex-ambassador that notwithstanding the multiplicity of protected industries, many of them enjoying not only the home market but also foreign markets, there are still industries among us which do not possess the home market. Why?

Having increased our tariff so that the foreign market has, for some industries, increased by leaps and bounds, we must not increase it further by *lowering* the tariff if we do not wish to be unjust to industries that do not now possess even the home market, and thus place these unfortunates at a still greater disadvantage. Then notice that our ex-ambassador, whose heart is touched by the perilous condition threatening our industries which cannot even find a home market, unblushingly expresses the wish that these fortunate ones may succeed in obtaining it. (What, increase in foreign trade, or tariff reduction, or both?) if they can do so under fair conditions; "but it is not fair to destroy other industries for that purpose." What other industries—those which do not now enjoy a home market? Then in the next clause we are assured that our home market is more to be cherished than any increased foreign market that may be secured by absolute free trade.

Then free trade *would* secure foreign trade? Also, a *high tariff* has resulted in foreign trade increasing by leaps and bounds. Which is tantamount to an admission that we are bound to have foreign trade, willy-nilly, whether we have absolute free trade or our present high tariff! Is this not true? Has not our ex-ambassador said it? Then, later on in this extremely lucid dissertation, Mr. Draper tells us, in effect, to cheer up, that—"The clamor, such as it is, is really not for a *general* revision, but for a reduction in certain schedules; and might be easier to consider and act upon if there was agreement on the schedules to be reduced." Yea, verily.

Concerning trusts, he says: "As to the combinations and so-called trusts, none of them whose products have tariff protection control the American market, and none is likely to do so." He declares: "I am not a 'trust-buster.'" Has anyone accused him of being one?

He further believes "that neither corporations nor individuals should be permitted to work injury rather than good to the body politic." Still he finds a slight difficulty in bringing about a reduction of the tariff on even "certain schedules," owing to a lack of agreement as to which schedules should be reduced! He admits that "When a new tariff is made, there is a clash of interests, and whatever is adopted is a compromise—and will be, as long as human nature is human nature."

Now, if I am correct in my understanding of the foregoing, the above arguments stand for the following:

1st. The foreign trade, by reason of our present tariff, has increased by leaps and bounds.

2d. A reduction of our present tariff would increase our foreign trade.

3d. Free trade would increase our foreign trade, but would injure our home markets. That is to say: we could secure a profit on goods sent abroad, while at the same time foreign interests could secure a profit on goods sent into the United States.

4th. The clamor is not for a general reduction, but for certain schedules.

5th. The revision of certain schedules could be accomplished if those directly interested in any certain schedules are willing to have their assured profits wiped out.

6th. None of the so-called trusts or combinations control the American market, and are not likely to do so. Which means that the power of the An-

thracite lords and the Oil lords and the Steel lords and other lords is purely visionary. In short, there are no trusts—and the protective tariff is really of no advantage to them because they do not even control the American market!

All of which clearly demonstrates again that a wrong principle, logically extended, cannot fail to end in chaotic conditions, so far, at least, as equity is concerned.

Measures of expediency, as the protective tariff, are inevitably the sum of efforts for personal advantage. That is to say: unless legislative measures are considered on the basis of their moral quality, they must be considered on the basis of their expediency; and whether a measure is voted as expedient or not depends on whether the majority of voters see, or think they see, in it an advantage for themselves or their party. A measure adopted because of its expediency is, therefor, a measure for either the majority, the specially privileged, or the cunning—or for either or all combined. It stands on one hand as spoils for the majority, the cunning or the strong, and on the other as an indication of the duplicity of the masses.



LAND SPECULATION IN NEW YORK.

A recent Editorial in the New York *Sun* points out certain phases of land speculation in this city as a result of the opening of the subway. It says that "speculation in real estate is less of an incidental pursuit followed by men of means engaged primarily in other lines of business than it was. It has become a distinct profession, with a huge volume of capital at its command." This "permits exploitation of bigger areas of land and enables professional operators to discount values further in the future." "At the beginning of the present speculation big tracts of land were bought up by certain corporations and syndicates," and these "resold their purchases in subdivisions to smaller speculative interests."

This editorial goes on to say that typical lot quotations in the Bronx rose from \$1,500 to \$5,000; in the upper Lenox Avenue district from \$6,500 to \$10,000; on Washington Heights from \$7,500 to \$15,000. These values are based on the rents anticipated, those in the Bronx being placed at \$5 a room a month.

This significant editorial thus concludes: "The enormous value added to outlying land by new transportation facilities has already been appropriated by the real estate speculator and his ally who handles the savings of the community deposited with financial institutions and life insurance companies."

So it happens that the savings of the community are used to make more efficient the system by which such earnings are depleted. It also proves how the present system must result in the concentration of such ownership in fewer and fewer hands. Land speculation is no longer a game at which the poor or even the moderately rich can play.

The New York *Sun* urges that Prof. Goldwin Smith should write a book on proposed economic reforms, and says: "The world would be richer and wiser for such a message from his pen." Let us see. Was it not Goldwin Smith who once told us that poverty could not be due to private property in land, since "there is poverty in Venice, which has no land at all?" This conclusion is certainly "rich" enough. By all means let Prof. Smith write such a book.

HASTE, MANANA.

(For the Review)

The Single Taxer is the "Hobo" of the political world. Begs for a place to make his political bed. Saws wood for a "Handout" and is told to keep still. Holds the offspring of political parties on his knees while under an overpowering impulse to throw the howling brat out of the window, and he "Polices camp" afterwards. If the barn catches fire he is cussed for carrying dangerous political matches into the hay loft. He is dogged off the premises, and is thankful when outlawed political dogs lick his sores. He acquires the servitude of the political menial. Clings to the gunnells amidst flying grit or rides on top in a gale of red hot cinders and sleeps in an ash pit to keep warm. Lucky if he escapes the political "Cops." Grows old, worn in body and mind. The somnambulist of a mighty dream. A soldier who will fight to the death for the vision he sees. His efforts fretted away by leaders who look for "The line of least resistance" until the army dies of old age. His weapons rotten and rusted, like Rip Van Winkle's old smooth-bore. Sinks into childhood with the truths he held dear, fading with the light of the dying day. He lives again in the days of early manhood and mumbles the economic falsehoods of his unconverted years. Napoleon said:

"There are no bad regiments, there are only bad colonels."

N. A. VYNE,



"Human nature cannot be changed by statutory laws." Thus goes the old saying, which every editorial defender of things as they are is fond of quoting. But the abolition of a few statutory laws will give human nature a chance to develop. The law of the emancipation proclamation abolishing the statutory institution of slavery allowed the negro to go free. It did not change his nature, but it made a free man out of a chattel. The banishment of piracy from the high seas did not change the human nature of the seafaring folk, but it made sea travelling a good deal more safe and pleasant. The Single Tax would not change the nature of landlord, or rent payer, or wage earner, but it would substitute a system of equity for one that encourages dishonesty, unfairness and greed. It would allow human nature to be something nearer to what the Creator designed it to be. Men would be more honest, more generous, more considerate, because they *could be*, and not merely so imperfectly and partially honest, and deficiently generous and considerate as prevailing statutory laws compel them to be.



Correspondence from Germany reports the failure of a new tax imposed for several years past on department stores—a special tax on each department. As usual, the persons taxed did not pay it at all. This time it was the manufacturers, who paid the tax in order to introduce their goods in the department stores. So the small dealers who secured the imposition of the tax find that it is of really no benefit to them. Indeed, it is probably an indirect injury, since it is said that the manufacturers have used it as an argument for lower wages to their employees. Lower wages would mean decreased purchases from smaller dealers and department stores alike.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An Illustrated Quarterly Magazine of
Single Tax Progress

Edited and Published by

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 11 Frankfort St.
New York.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: — In the United
States, Canada and Mexico, \$1.00 per
year. Payable in advance.

Entered at the Postoffice, New York, as Second
Class Matter.

SPRING NUMBER, 1905.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

To all those whose subscriptions have expired—and the bulk of them expire with this issue—postal card notices are mailed. We have made this special offer. With every renewal of subscription, accompanied by remittance of \$1.00 for a new subscriber, we will send a cloth bound copy of *Progress and Poverty*, *Social Problems*, or *Protection or Free Trade*. These are Doubleday Page Editions, and are published for \$1.00. It ought to be within the power of every one of our good friends to get at least *one* subscriber to accompany his own remittance.

We have adopted this means to increase the circulation of the REVIEW, and to overcome, if possible, the general apathy. The REVIEW should be loyally supported by every friend of the movement.

The old offer of ten subscriptions for \$5 still holds good. Help to place a few more public libraries on our subscription list.

Will friends of the REVIEW bear in mind that if they need any books they can help by ordering of us. Do not place your orders with booksellers—we will supply as cheaply any book you want.

We also wish to call attention to the announcement of the publication of the new and recently enlarged edition of Webster's International Dictionary, published by G. & C. Merriam, Springfield, Mass. In writing kindly mention the REVIEW.

Part 2nd of Miss Colbron's essay, "Radicalism in Literature," announced for this issue, is unavoidably crowded out.

Our next number will contain more of the

inside news of Fairhope from E. Q. Norton and others. Extra copies of the Summer number in quantities may be had for ten cents each, and our friends are requested to send in their orders so that we may provide for an increased edition. This issue should be widely circulated, for both sides will be given a hearing. Single Taxers everywhere who know anything of Fairhope are requested to send in their communications, for the REVIEW has set itself to the work of putting to rest this most unfortunate controversy. The danger to the colony, and incidentally to the greater world wide movement, of which the colony has been widely advertised as a practical if miniature illustration, is not in publicity, but in concealment. Let all the facts be known.

PRESENT STATUS OF THE MOVEMENT.

There is much that is unsatisfactory in the present status of the movement. Centres once active as fields of agitation have lapsed into quietude. Names once familiar are no longer seen in public prints, and some who were active as propagandists or letter writers, or who were often seen at various resorts where Single Taxers frequent, are no longer to be observed.

No doubt there are more Single Taxers than there ever were. But this is not to be disguised—there are fewer *active* Single Taxers than ever before. Nor is there anything like the old enthusiasm.

Why disguise these facts? Why hug to ourselves the delusion that if the cause is not moving here it is yet making progress elsewhere?—"all fields look green at a distance." Why not confess, even if we are obliged to let the public overhear us, that we are at present almost absolutely at a halt on the march; that we are encamped in the face of the enemy, without leaders and without a plan of campaign.

It is little wonder that earnest workers like Edward T. Weeks and others urge the formation of an independent political party to arouse the hosts from their lethargy. To this there are objections that seem to us almost insurmountable. Yet, even this might be welcomed in exchange for the "do nothing" policy. But it strikes us that there is a middle road, a way in which those who differ as to the wisdom of political action and those who approve of it might be brought together.

Clearly, our weakness is lack of organization. What are the Single Taxers of philosophic anarchistic tendencies thinking of? How do they imagine the Single Tax is to be brought about? By merely saying, even if said repeatedly and continuously, that it is a good thing? What politicians fear is not theories, but votes. What is the good of convincing an individual if we leave him helpless with his convictions, powerless to enforce them or to influence the law making powers? Oh, but he will go away and

with others form a party in good time. But will they? Will they not follow our example, and wait for others whom they in turn convert to do the same thing? And at this rate how long will it take to accomplish anything permanent?

What has already been accomplished has been done through organization. Witness our earnest Toronto friends and the \$700 exemption act; the good work done by the Tax Reform Association; the educational work of the Massachusetts League. Everywhere some power of organization was behind the work.

Look back to the old days. Pick up a copy of the old National Single Taxer and see the list of organizations in nearly every important city of the United States. Then reflect that that paper, issued weekly, had a paid-up subscription list sufficient to keep it going and pay the self-sacrificing editor and publisher, and his no less devoted wife, some compensation for their labors. No other reform paper, certainly no other Single Tax publication, was ever brought so near financial success. That long list of clubs printed in the back pages helps to tell the story. It was the power of organization, no less than the indefatigable labors of George P. Hampton and his wife that was making the organ of the movement a force to be reckoned with.

With organization much could be done that is now neglected. With organization Congressman Baker might have been saved to us. Such work among Single Taxers as was necessary had to be done through his own committee from Brooklyn. How much the work of Frederick H. Monroe and his lecture bureau could be simplified with the forces of organization ready at his hand. How these forces could be bent toward localities where legislative opportunities opened, or where the forces that oppose us were seeming to yield. How much in many ways could be done.

To elect Single Taxers to office will effect as little in the future as in the past. They are not elected as Single Taxers, but as Democrats or Populists. There are but few Robert Bakers, and the opportunities of electing Congressmen are fewer still. There are even now—and we speak advisedly upon this matter—many Single Taxers in Congress. But they will keep silent as long as the Single Taxers remain unorganized, and therefore without influence or potentiality. Not the election of Single Taxers to office, but the persuading of those now in office that there is a power they must reckon with, is the important thing to do. This can be done through organization.

What can be done without organization we are doing. But politically this is but little, and educationally it is far less than it would be with the influence of massed forces everywhere adding a potentiality and numerical influence to an economic teaching by lecture bureau, forum, or public prints.

AFFAIRS AT FAIRHOPE.

We offer no apology for printing articles in criticism of Fairhope, coming as they do from writers who are good Single Taxers. The REVIEW is a Single Taxers' publication and not the organ of Fairhope or any other isolated or special experiment on professedly Single Tax lines. Both sides shall be heard until this unhappy controversy is disposed of.

The charges of unfairness, of alleged defects in the very plan of organization, even of maladministration, coming as they do from different quarters, are not, we regret to say, met and disposed of in the report of the committee appointed at the conference and which appears on another page.

There is nothing in the report that leads one to believe that any real investigation was made, or that the protest of objecting renters was considered, or that the testimony of any one representing the other side was taken.

It is conceivable that the membership plan as Fairhope grows in numbers and importance will be found impracticable. That the only alternative, the admission of all the renters to a voice in determining the appraisal of land values and their manner of disbursement in public improvements, would result in the perversion of the original aims and objects of the colony—though insisted upon and apparently sincerely believed in by Mr. Gaston and others—seems by no means conclusive under certain legal forms of trusteeship which the laws of some States, and no doubt those of Alabama, provide for.

But these are matters for future consideration. If it be urged that a full participation of all renters of Fairhope in the appraisal and distribution of rentals may result in perverting the original purpose of the colony, which is to provide a working example in miniature of the practical operation of Single Tax principles, it can very well be retorted that a self-perpetuating membership (and accusations grow that good Single Taxes are and have been rejected on no other ground than they oppose certain features of the administration) may result in the same perversion of the primary objects of the colony. Is or is not the membership plan fatal to the continued success of the colony?

We make no allusion to the regrettable personalities which have characterized much of this controversy. Mr. Brokaw's article printed on another page would have been stronger without them. We believe in the sincerity of both sides, and we no more believe that any large numbers of the renters desire to wreck the colony (for this certainly would not profit them) than that the forty-five governing members (who if report be true are by no means all Single Taxers) desire to arbitrarily govern the remainder of the population.

We print on another page the protest of

the renters. There is but one statement, to which if we understand it correctly, exception may be filed. That is the following statement:

"The grand principle of the Single Tax does not depend upon the collection of the full rental value of the land, etc." It may be that this is an unconscious slip. The principle of the Single Tax, however, is the collection of the full rental value of the land. But in practice it may be found expedient to leave to landowners a small percentage of such value to facilitate its collection by providing a basis of assessment, determined by the small selling price that land would then have. Mr. George contended that it would not be possible to take more than ninety per cent. of land value. It is however true, as this paragraph from the renters protest goes on to state, that the Single Tax does "depend upon the judicious use of the rentals collected." If the rentals taken in Fairhope are something more than the land value, as is alleged, because of the reductions of assessed rentals in sixty cases, then improvement values are indirectly taxed. But if taxes take considerably less than the rental value then improvements in Fairhope must remain inadequate to the demands of a growing town.

It is clear that these are questions that only those on the ground can determine. In accordance with a recent concession of the voting members renters now have a voice in the disbursement of rentals. This is really an important concession, but it is a curious fact that few of the renters seem to regard the concession seriously, holding that this cannot really be done without a change of the constitution. But we are at this writing without data enabling us to say whether this is so or not.

Fairhope's troubles are of interest far beyond Fairhope. Therefore an investigation by an important committee whose findings will have weight with the Single Tax world, and whose decision must be accepted as a solution of the problem, seems to us imperative. We know now that all is not as it should be at Fairhope, and although it is quite true that success or failure of the colony means but little to the world-wide Single Tax movement, yet for its own sake and for such colony imitators as may come after, and perhaps, too, because it has been exploited in the public press as a Single Tax experiment, a strong effort should be made to set at rest the problem of its government, to satisfy the claimants of both sides of the controversy, if that be possible, and to determine how the Single Tax features of the colony may be preserved under a more democratic administration than seems to prevail.

To this end we suggest the organization of a committee to sift Fairhope's affairs to the bottom, and to be composed of members drawn from such men as Judge Samuel Seabury, Lawson Purdy, Hon. James G. Maguire, Hon. Robert Baker. We suggest

these men because of their legal, or judicial or legislative training. In the findings of such a committee absolute confidence could be reposed.

ROOSEVELT ON CAPTAIN "BUCKY" O'NEIL.

The following is a brief account from the pen of Theodore Roosevelt, of Captain O'Neill, once Sheriff, then Mayor of Prescott, Arizona, and later Captain of the Rough Riders, killed at San Juan Hill, but whose name will be held by Single Taxers in grateful remembrance because of his efforts to establish the Single Tax in Prescott. Captain O'Neil understood our principles, recognized their far-reaching import, and revered the name of Henry George. The editor of the REVIEW had the pleasure of meeting him in New York City before the Spanish-American War, when O'Neil, at that time Mayor of Prescott, was on his way to the Klondyke. It was the era of the Klondyke gold fever, and O'Neil, to whom the lure of adventure was forever beckoning, had turned his footsteps in the direction of the Alaskan gold fields. We recall him as a man at least six feet in height, with a face singularly handsome because of its combined strength and gentleness.

The President's account of his Captain of the Rough Riders is interesting as well as sympathetic. In passing, it is worth mentioning that Nicholas Vyne, of Emporia, Kansas, from whose pen a short article appears in this number, was a Sergeant of the Rough Riders, and knew O'Neil—though not of O'Neil's company—but did not know him as a Single Taxer:

"Most of the men had simple souls. They could relate facts, but they said very little about what they dimly felt. Bucky O'Neill, however, the iron-nerved, iron-willed fighter from Arizona, the Sheriff whose name was a by-word of terror to every wrongdoer, white or red; the gambler who with unmoved face would stake and lose every dollar he had in the world—he, alone among his comrades, was a visionary, an articulate emotionalist.

"He was very quiet about it, never talking unless he was sure of his listener; but at night, when we leaned on the railing to look at the Southern Cross, he was less apt to tell tales of his hard and stormy past than he was to speak of the mysteries which lie behind courage, and fear, and love, behind animal hatred and animal lust for the pleasures that have tangible shape.

"He had keenly enjoyed life, and he could breast its turbulent torrent as few men could; he was a practical man who knew how to wrest personal success from adverse forces, among money-makers, politicians and desperadoes alike; yet, down at bottom, what seemed to interest him most was the philosophy of life itself, of our un-

derstanding of it, and of the limitations set to that understanding. But he was as far as possible from being a mere dreamer of dreams.

"A staunchly loyal and generous friend, he was also exceedingly ambitious on his own account. If by risking his life, no matter how great the risk, he could gain high military distinction, he was bent on gaining it. He had taken so many chances when death lay on the hazard that he felt the odds were now against him; but said he, 'Who would not risk his life for a star?' Had he lived, and had the war lasted, he would surely have won the eagle, if not the star."

J. H. WHITLEY, M. P.,

PRESIDENT OF THE ENGLISH LEAGUE FOR THE
TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

(See Frontispiece.)

Mr. J. H. Whitley, M. P., was born at Halifax, Yorkshire, February, 1866. His father was a wealthy and influential citizen, a staunch liberal in politics, and a man who in his public and private life was devoted to the service of others. Mr. J. H. Whitley is a worthy son of such a father. In his early days his mind was greatly influenced by the writings of Carlyle and Ruskin, and as a boy at Clifton College he, after reading *Progress and Poverty*, undertook to champion the cause of the Single Tax in a public debate in the college. After leaving college he at once threw himself into social and philanthropic work. He founded a Boys' Camp Committee, through whose agency over 8,000 factory boys have had a week's holiday at the seaside under canvas. In connection with this he founded a Boys' Gymnasium, which to-day holds the premier position for gymnastics in England, running a close second to the champion Scottish team. He also was largely instrumental in organizing in Halifax recreation evening classes in connection with the Board schools. These classes are now recognized as probably the most successful of any similar classes in the country.

In these and many other ways he made his life useful to those about him. As a very young man he entered the Town Council, and his conspicuous abilities very soon won him the respect of his colleagues.

His popularity increased so fast that he was pressed in 1895 to stand as a candidate for Parliament in the Liberal interest when the first opportunity occurred. This invitation, however, he did not see his way to accept, but when in 1900 he was again asked to undertake the responsibility he felt it his duty not to refuse.

Many years of municipal work and private philanthropy had taught him the utter inadequacy of social, municipal and philanthropic effort to cope with social disease as long as the root cause of this disease—

Land Monopoly—remained untouched, and he therefore considered that his zeal for reform would find a wider field and larger opportunity for attacking this root evil at Westminster rather than in local politics.

With this before him he was willing to make the sacrifice of time, money, leisure and home life which this decision involved, but he will eventually, if he has not done so already, find the rich reward of the knowledge that his life has been spent in making the possibility of life happier, better and nobler for others. One great source of strength in his public work is the help and sympathy of his gifted wife.

The election of Mr. Whitley last year to the position of President of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values (formerly The English Land Restoration League) is an acknowledgment of his worth as a Single Taxer. He represented the Halifax Town Council at the Municipal Conferences on the Taxation of Land Values, and at the Conference held in London, October, 1902, was requisitioned to move the leading resolution. At the close of the proceedings he was elected a member of the Special Committee appointed by the Conference to draft a bill for the Taxation of Land Values for local purposes, for presentation to Parliament. The bill introduced by Mr. C. P. Trevelyan, M. P., last session, the second reading of which was carried by a majority of 67, including 36 supporters of the Government, was promoted by this Municipal Conference Committee, and it is an open secret that the drafting of this bill was the work mainly of Mr. Whitley. The merits of the bill have been thoroughly discussed, and whatever may be its fate in the present session of Parliament it has certainly been the cause everywhere of much useful discussion on the practical legislative proposals of the movement for the Taxation of Land Values.

Mr. Whitley takes a keen interest in the important work of educating the public mind on the question. He brings his ripe experience to bear on the various business proposals brought before the League by its ever active officers and members. People instinctively feel in listening to Mr. Whitley, whether on the platform or in personal conversation, that he knows his subject well and that he is thoroughly devoted to the movement. His ability is equalled only by his sincerity, which is readily accepted by all who have the pleasure of his association.

In a very ignorant, or very sinister but also very well written article written in *Everybody's*, for April, entitled "Hooligan," the writer in what is a subtly concealed plea for Chamberlainism, says: "In York with only 75,000 inhabitants, official investigation shows that six per cent. of the population live in most unsanitary condition." Really? Only six per cent?

News—Domestic.

CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.—(Special Correspondence.—Ralph Hoyt.)—The good cause of reform along Single Tax lines is not making headway as rapidly in Southern California as we desire; yet in several respects we recognize indications of progress even where it was not looked for.

It is well known everywhere that Los Angeles is a "boom city," so called, and that selling real estate here is the principal business, the year round. Such scrambling for bargains, such exaggerations and misrepresentations, such pulling and hauling among rival real estate sharks, such lying and deceiving, can scarcely be equaled anywhere outside of Pandemonium. Yet in spite of these strenuous conditions there is a current of genuine progress in economic principles among such people as regard equal rights for all as paramount to everything in the nature of speculation in bounties which the Creator provided for all mankind without partiality. In one way and another my communications and paragraphs of Single Tax flavor get into the newspapers, one of which has for its president a well known Single Taxer, who was once an active debater in our club meetings.

Single Tax literature in various forms is now much more in demand here than it has previously been. Besides these facts the "Boom City" now has the presence of the wonderful Rev. B. Fay Mills, who though not an avowed Single Taxer, is doing a world of good with his matchless sermons and addresses, Sundays and week days. Without using the words Single Tax, Mr. Mills pours hot shot into monopolistic rule, in every form, and pleads eloquently for freedom of access to the resources of Nature. His audiences are now so large that standing room is at a premium at every one of his addresses, and many persons are turned away without having been able to even get their heads inside of the doorway. The place of holding his meetings has been changed from one public hall to another and larger ones several times, till now the biggest theatre in town has been leased for his Sunday gatherings. Among his enrolled membership in the Fellowship are the venerable L. Prang from Boston, Clarence A. Miller, the well known Single Taxer, and one of the most able attorneys on this coast, and a host of other liberal thinkers, who, if not already Single Taxers are pointing their faces in the proper direction.

Of course the Socialists here are wide-awake, and of course many of them continue to declare that while the Single Tax is "good as far as it goes" it does not go as far as THEY propose to go, and therefore they will do their little best to misrepresent it and coax easy going non-thinkers into their fold. But men who probe Socialism to its core have no difficulty in puncturing the bubble and exposing its absolute

fallacy. The average Socialist rejoices over the big vote polled for Debs at the last November election, and declares that four years hence there will be double the number of such voters. They are welcome to all the comfort they can derive from such incidents. They fail to realize the fact that a very large percentage of such votes were cast because of the dissatisfaction among many thousands of Democrats who were opposed to the head of the Democratic ticket, and some of its most prominent managers. That those same voters really want Socialism so as to turn the tide into a Socialist national victory is a ridiculous conclusion.

From San Francisco and vicinity I learn that our cause is gaining ground steadily and smoothly. Judge James G. Maguire, Hon. Joseph Leggett, the Cushing Brothers, Frank Lynch, Jas. H. Barry, with his matchless Star, J. K. Moffit, and J. G. Wright, of Berkeley, and the Hodkins Company, of Oakland, and many others thereabouts, are standing up to the line of duty and are sanguine of our ultimate success.

ILLINOIS, CHICAGO.—(Special correspondence.—G. J. Foyer).—Since my last letter to the REVIEW the object of placing the question of Home Rule in taxation upon the referendum petition has been achieved in a degree. A bill was proposed and introduced in the State Legislature for Home Rule in taxation for the first reading. How much farther than this it will advance remains to those interested in pushing it through, but this will no doubt take some time. At present the municipal campaign for Mayor is in progress. The Democratic candidate, who stands for immediate ownership of the street car lines, has about won his fight against the corporations, but the credit is due to the persistent work of the Hearst paper, which has aroused the people to an understanding of the importance of the question. The club continues to meet and discuss the topics of the day. The association will again open its hall to the discussion of the Single Tax in the near future, but in the meantime will carry on their meetings at 508 Schiller Building. Everything looking to reform in Chicago and Illinois at this time is on the upward move, and at any time the real issue may be before the people. This depends largely upon the progress made by the April election in this city.

IDAHO, EMMETT.—(Special Correspondence.—R. B. Wilson).—One clause of the constitution of this State contains the following: "No special privileges or immunities shall ever be granted that may not be altered, revoked or repealed by the Legislature." A fair construction of this clause makes all franchises but licenses, which may be revoked instead of being irrevocable contracts, as they are held to be elsewhere.

Another clause of the constitution con-

tains this provision: "The Legislature may exempt a limited amount of improvements upon land from taxation."

Another clause reads: "The right of eminent domain shall never be abridged or so construed as to prevent the Legislature from taking the property and franchise of incorporated companies and subjecting them to public use, the same as property of individuals."

"Double taxation" is prohibited by statute, and among the exemptions named in the statutes, is the clause: "All dues and credits secured by mortgage, trust, deed or other lien."

Section 1819 of the Political Code reads: "All taxable property must be assessed at its full cash value. Land and improvements thereon must be assessed separately." Unsecured credits are assessed, but unsecured debts may be subtracted.

It is seen that we already have the distinction between personal property, improvements and land values. No use has been made of such distinction that can be construed to have Single Tax tendencies. The distinction was probably made so that the improvements on homesteads could be taxed. But it really makes good fighting ground for us when the battle shall be on.

KANSAS, MOUND CITY.—(Special Correspondence.—W. H. T. Wakefield.)—That a Kansas legislature, with a Republican majority, should have enacted legislation to protect the citizens of the State from extortion by foreign corporations is due to the power of public opinion built up while the Fusionists—Populists and Democrats—were in control, or partly so, from 1889 to 1898. Public opinion, when strong enough, acts independently of party lines and traditions, often compelling party leaders to abandon their own policies and adopt that of their opponents, as it did in this case.

Fusionists were defeated in 1900 by the efforts of the public service corporations and the vast campaign fund of the Republicans, and one of the first acts of the Republican Legislature was to pass an election law to prevent Fusion and to render voting any but a straight ticket practically impossible, over forty thousand losing their ballots in attempting to do so at the ensuing election, thereby giving Republicans ten thousand majority in the count, though beaten thirty thousand at the polls if the intent of the voters had been considered.

In the legislative session of 1897-8 the Fusionists enacted many excellent laws which Republicans have never dared repeal, though refusing to enforce those regulating public service corporations. One of these was the Favalley Anti-Trust law, drawn by Hugh Favalley, an able Democratic lawyer, who has "seen the cat" and was a member of the State Senate. This law is pronounced by attorneys the most direct, practical and easily and surely enforceable statute ever framed for this pur-

pose. But one prosecution was ever brought under it, and this was appealed to the U. S. Supreme Court several years ago, and a decision affirming the law's constitutionality was given recently. It is this statute, rather than any recent legislation, that is worrying the exploiters of the people.

The Kansas crude oil is of superior quality, or about equal to the best Pennsylvania, and the Standard Oil Company paid the highest prices for it while the field was being developed by private enterprise. When the supply was found to be large, the Standard Company built a pipe line from the oil fields to Kansas City, where it erected a large refinery, having a smaller one at Neodesha, in the heart of the oil fields. There was also a small independent refinery owned by a Mr. Weber at Peru, in the oil belt.

The pipe line is but 140 miles long from the south end of the Kansas oil field to the refinery near Kansas City. It runs over a nearly level prairie, requires but little pumping, most of the slope being in the direction the oil flows.

Up to the time of completing the pipe line crude oil at the well was worth \$1.86 per barrel, and the freight rate to Kansas City was \$24 per car, reckoning the gallon to weigh four pounds, the real weight being a little less. Immediately after completion of the pipe line the freight per car was raised to \$45 and the weight per gallon computed at seven pounds, so that little more than half the number of gallons was carried for double the cost.

At the same time the price paid by the Standard Company was reduced a few cents each day or two until it had dwindled to less than half the original rate.

There was a brisk demand for fuel and gas oil in all the cities and much had been shipped by rail under the old rate at a profit. Of course, none could be shipped under the new rate, and the Standard Company was the only buyer, its new rates barely covering cost of production in the best wells.

Of the four railroads from Kansas City to the oil field the Standard Company owns the Missouri, Kansas & Texas, has a large, if not controlling, interest in the Santa Fe, and a close alliance with the Missouri Pacific—a Gould line—and the Frisco system. It is asserted on good authority that the Standard pays these roads a percentage on all the oil run through its pipe lines.

Weber's independent refinery at Peru had been doing a profitable business under the old freight rates on its refined oil, though the Standard sold refined oil in its vicinity for one-third its price elsewhere. Weber had a rate of \$25 per car to Emporia until the Standard entered the field. Then the rate was raised from \$25 to \$78, and in the same proportion to other points, and Weber had to close down.

Then trouble began. Most of the wells had been developed and storage tanks built by stock companies, the stock being widely

distributed among many small holders. Most companies and operators were in debt and losing money, so must do something, or sell to the Standard Oil Company for the bare cost of their derricks and tanks. Lawyers were hired, public meetings held, resolutions passed and committees appointed to see the Legislature. The excitement was intense when it was found the Governor, the Speaker of the House (a railroad contractor) and most of the members were against doing anything. So a committee of 200 went to Topeka with blood in their eye and the mails were swamped with letters and petitions to the legislators from all parts of the State. The newspapers of all parties demanded action in no uncertain tone, until it became clear that refusal to act would wipe the party out of existence at the next election. The result was the passage of a maximum rate bill for oil that enabled the two independent refineries to resume business: the anti-discrimination law prohibiting selling at lower rates in one part of the State than in another, after equalizing freight rates, and finally the State refinery law. The latter appropriates \$400,000 to establish a branch of the State penitentiary and a refinery in the oil fields, the money to be raised by sale of bonds. The constitutionality of these bonds will be disputed in the State Supreme Court, and nothing done until this is decided.

It is doubtful if all these measures could have been passed had not the Standard Company made the mistake of refusing to buy any oil in Kansas just at the critical time. Kansans don't like to be coerced or bulldozed, and this was construed as a threat against the State.

Suits have been instituted to oust the Standard and the Santa Fe road from the State, both having violated the laws and their charters, but it is doubtful if the State authorities are prosecuting them in good faith.

Whatever else may result, it is certain that a great impetus has been given radical thought and ideas in Kansas and party lines much weakened.

MASSACHUSETTS, WOLLASTON.—(Special Correspondence.—Eliza Stowe Twitchell.)—There is a little to report here regarding the progress of the Single Tax cause. Our League still exists, and every member stands loyally ready to "lend a hand" whenever and wherever a place can be found to do effective work.

The committee on the distribution of literature, under the direction of Mr. Pike, has done some good work this winter, and a number of meetings have been held where good Single Tax speakers have set forth the gospel of freedom to small audiences.

Our President, Mr. C. B. Fillebrown, left in January for a trip to the Mediterranean, to spend the rest of the winter in Southern Italy. He has but recently returned, and now will, no doubt, continue his work of

discovering agreements among various teachers and thinkers where seemingly only differences exist. He is encouraged in this work, now that so many professors of political economy are in agreement with him regarding the nature and definition of ground rent, and he is now seeking to find a like agreement regarding the nature and definition of capital.

This work for the Single Tax may be indirect, but it is important that some one outside the shadow of our colleges, should be able to bring about a more uniform agreement among the teachers of our youths within these classic shades, regarding the nature and definition of these two important factors in the production of wealth. This, though a short step, may hold far-reaching possibilities.

To my mind, one of the most encouraging signs of the times is the general out-spoken tone of the press against monopoly, especially against the giving away of public franchise; also the general discontent of the people over the growing power of the Trusts.

And now comes Rev. Washington Gladden's attack on the business methods of the Standard Oil. This attack, following so closely as it does upon the hot shots fired at this monopoly, by Thomas W. Lawson, must have some effect in arousing the conscience of the nation: must awaken the indifferent to some realization of the growing power of monopoly, which commands the exclusive use of vast public privileges; which seeks to control the law-making power of government, and to hush the voices of those who are preaching the gospel of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man.

The Church asks, "Am I my brother's keeper?" and when that small word "brother" refers to a great millionaire, the answer seems "No." The same answer is solemnly given when the word brother refers to one of our industrial slaves; but when that word is used to indicate some poor, benighted heathen in a foreign land, the answer is, "Yes, and by the grace of God, will do all in our power to enlighten him to a knowledge of his own common birthright. We will teach him to believe in God."

Would to God the Church itself might realize all that is implied in a *belief in God*, and all the sacred relationships growing out of such a belief. Here is found the meaning of life, for which Tolstoy sought in vain from scholar and priest. Here is found also the purpose of life, as seen in nature and in all human progress.

PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA.—(Special Correspondence.—W. L. Ross.)—The Sunday evening meetings of the Henry George Club are still running. They have been quite successful and many new faces are to be seen among the audiences.

The Women's Henry George League is

doing good work, and is putting new life into the movement here. On the evening of March 31st its members gave a dinner at the rooms of the Independence Club which was largely attended. An excellent programme was rendered—music, recitations and speech making. Mrs. Burleigh outlined the work of the League and announced the annual convention, which is to be held here in June.

Mr. R. F. Powell, whose very successful work in the cultivation of vacant lot gardens has attracted much attention to the importance of giving labor access to the soil, has recently secured from the Pennsylvania Railroad Company the use of large tracts of their vacant land for farm gardens. Early in March when H. Rider Haggard was here, a lecture was arranged for his benefit at the residence of Mr. F. B. Kirkbride, one of the directors of the Vacant Lots Cultivation Society. Mr. Powell explained his farm garden work and Mr. Joseph Fels, who has done so much for the Single Tax in a modest and quiet way, spoke also. He spoke of the importance of the land question, and said he was interested in the vacant lot gardens only because it called attention to this great question.

WEST VIRGINIA.—(Special Correspondence.—W. I. Boreman.)—In this State the labor question is becoming prominent, and complicated with it is the so-called race question. Being a large coal producing community the struggle for a chance to work means hatred for the poor African blooded American. The old slavery question lives in the shape of a fear of negro domination at the polls and the agitation for a restriction of the franchise by a registration that will cut off the colored brother from any political voice, is popular with a certain element all too strong in the Democratic party. What the radical element of this party needs is a more aggressive attitude and less tolerance of such ideas within the party, but with the struggle for subsistence and when the masses see train loads of poor darkies poured into the State to break strikes, it is hard to predict the outcome.

The Single Taxers are many in this part of West Virginia, while the Socialists are strong in the Wheeling panhandle. Constant circulation of radical literature by both sets of agitators and educators has made a good deal of independent voting on local questions.

But the South, and this State particularly, is Protectionist. The Whig element in the Democratic party is all protectionist, and all the old slave-holding offspring is little better. Probably a tariff for revenue with incidental protection might best express it, though there are many who call themselves "free traders."

All this is far from gratifying to the Single Taxer except it may show him that it

takes time and educational work to produce results. The South has inherited the old land laws and opinions about the privilege to vote and hold office from the class who made laws in slavery days, and many years must pass and new conditions arise before the influences of these old institutions and habits of thought die out.

WISCONSIN, OSHKOSH.—(Special Correspondence.—John Harrington.)—Rev. Herbert S. Bigelow, of Cincinnati, visited Oshkosh by invitation of the Candlelight Club on February 21st. The club is made up of the prominent business and professional men of the city, who meet, partake of a seven o'clock dinner, and listen to papers and addresses on leading topics, and discuss the same over their cigars until 10 o'clock. Mr. Bigelow's address was on "Free Soil and Free Men," and was a straight Single Tax argument; and while the writer is the only Single Taxer in the club, the address was so charming, and the logic so unanswerable, that as one member expressed it, "Single Tax grew five years in a night."

Mr. Bigelow reached the city early enough in the morning to accept an invitation to address the students of the State Normal School located here. The address, while but thirty minutes in delivery, was pronounced one of the best ever heard in the school. I am informed that the study of Henry George's works has received an impetus such as has not been known in the Normal School in the past.

The beauty of Mr. Bigelow's address is that it stimulates an interest in and kindly sympathy for his cause, and a desire for further information, rather than the controversial and belligerent spirit of opposition.

Progress in the Single Tax movement may be considerable without being observed as such by any except the true disciples. One phase of such progress is the growth of the civic conscience. This is manifest throughout the country under different names in different States. In this State it is called "La Folletteism."

Among the accomplished measures in this direction is a thorough-going primary election law, abolishing caucuses and conventions, and providing for the nomination by direct vote of all State, Congressional, legislative, county and city officers, except judicial and school officers. While we have no experience yet with this law, it is hoped and believed that it will result in the selection of officials who are the real choice of the people, and not merely the selection of manipulated caucuses and conventions, managed by corporate interests.

The ad valorem taxation of railroads also has been accomplished. Bills are introduced in the present legislature providing for the ad valorem taxation of street railways and other public service properties, instead of the present taxation in the form of a license fee based upon gross income. Other reforms are contemplated which have nothing

directly to do with Single Tax, but which show a recognition by the public of socially created values. An income tax amendment to the State constitution has just been adopted by the legislature, which must be submitted later to the voters. While we have not much sympathy with this measure, it nevertheless shows dissatisfaction with present taxation, and a search for something better. In Milwaukee the teachers have taken up the matter of local taxation, in an effort to discover some means of finding money enough to pay adequate wages to teachers, and to supply needed accommodations and appliances. A bill is also pending before the State legislature looking to the recall of faithless officials by petition, and the immediate election of a successor of such official.

The election of Governor La Follette to the United States Senate immediately after his re-election as Governor for a third term has shocked and rather paralyzed the old machine politicians. It was argued that in good faith to the people he should remain to complete his term as governor. But he proved his good faith by retaining the governorship until the legislature shall have finished its work and adjourned. It is not likely that he will go to Washington until next December. A humorous feature of the situation is that the cry of "bad faith" was made by the newspapers and people who fought his election, while those who supported him for governor were the ones who urged his election as senator.

The most important bill before the legislature at this session is the railroad rate commission bill. It is being fought hard by the railroad lobby, but it will be passed; and it is likely to be a thorough-going and effective measure. The most that the lobby now hope to do is to weaken its effect by amendments. When this bill becomes a law the Governor will feel that his promises to Wisconsin will have been fulfilled, and he will be ready to enter upon the larger field of national affairs, where such men are much needed.

Mr. W. J. Bryan, the Democratic leader, delivered his lecture, "The Value of an Ideal" in this city to a crowded house on the 10th instant. Among the best things he said, referring to the Wisconsin situation, and the fact that the "half-breed" (La-Follette) republicans are accused of "stealing democratic thunder," was that he believed that a party should keep its thunder out on the front porch where everybody could get all that was wanted.

In 1903 Premier Seddon claimed that his country had then enjoyed twelve years of continued prosperity, and last year he announced that it had no paupers. What other statesman can claim as much for his country?—JOSEPH LEGGETT in *San Francisco Star*.

News—Foreign.

TORONTO.

A rude awakening has come to those who fondly imagined that because our system of government is representative it is also democratic. At the new year's election last the electors of this city instructed the city council to ask the Provincial legislature for power to exempt houses to the extent of \$700 of their assessed value. This was an attempt on the part of the people to free themselves from a disastrous house-famine from which they are suffering, but the aldermen who were elected at the same time the vote was taken have refused on a vote of twelve to seven to carry out the instructions. Those in the council who are opposed to the measure evinced the utmost disregard for public opinion, declaring contemptuously that the electors were ignorant of the merits of the question and did not know what they wanted. The exemption itself and the principles of popular government were ably defended by Alderman Dr. Noble, but he stood unsupported except by the silent votes of six of his fellow aldermen, while the land speculator class, led by Controller Spence, made a violent onslaught in defense of their privileges.

To the general public the black eye to the Single Tax association is looked on as a crushing defeat, but as a matter of fact it but momentarily checks the progress of what has been a triumphal march. Ere the King's crown shall fall there are crowns to be broken. Had the civic opponents of the measure been wise they would have obeyed the instructions of the people and allowed the Legislature the unpleasant task of turning down the Single Taxers. The exemption advocates would have been almost powerless at the Parliament buildings, but they are dangerous in the City Hall. As affairs now stand our enemies in the City Council are marked, and they are the wrong side of the fence, while another election is only nine months away. The association is adopting Bre'r Fox's tactics just now; it is lying low, but it is gathering funds for one of the liveliest aldermanic campaigns Toronto has ever witnessed. It is to be a war to the knife in which the members of the association are confident of being successful in cutting off the heads of practically every candidate who has proved himself a traitor to the electors.

With this accomplished the City Council may be in a position to grant the tax reformers something considerably in excess of a simple request to the Legislature.

ARTHUR W. ROEBUCK.

SCOTLAND, GLASGOW.

During the past year the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values have held under their own auspices over 100 open air

meetings, besides assisting in the promotion of many meetings to discuss the land question and the remedy, organized by other bodies. Our speakers are busy now with many similar indoor events, and the office keeps busy distributing as much explanatory literature as we can provide. Along with the Edinburgh League for the Taxation of Land Values, we are promoting a conference on the question to be held in Edinburgh in April. This gathering will be comprised of delegates from rating bodies, co-operative societies, trades unions, etc., etc. I will send news of this for the summer number of the REVIEW.

JOHN PAUL.

WEST AUSTRALIA, PERTH.

I notice your great election is over, and that the strenuous Imperialist still retains the occupancy of the White House. Which of the two main aspirants won was not of much consequence to you, I suppose, from a practical point of view, for with you the Single Tax is not yet in the political arena. Parker did not appear to be too anxious to go straight at the trusts by means of the tariff. Apparently your great field of usefulness lies in education, and the evidence seems satisfactory that the leaven is slowly but surely spreading in all directions. With us matters are not so cheerful. Our ministry (Labor Socialist) sent a bill to the Legislative council providing that it should be optional with municipalities whether they raise their local rates on Land Values or according to the ancient system. The house of landlords, seeing the labor people were lacking in backbone, and were not likely to insist on the clause, promptly hacked it out, and when the bill was returned to the lower chamber it was quietly dropped in toto. But throughout the country here is a growing note of dissatisfaction with the Ministry for the way they have trifled with the most important plank of their platform, and within another year they will either have to mend their ways or make way for Democrats. That plank is: "The taxation of land values without exemption." The granting of the power to municipal bodies was a golden opportunity for them to substitute a just and beneficial tax for an unjust and injurious one. Now, the position is that customs duties are in the hands of the Federal Parliament, which consists of about equally Labor-Socialists on one hand and Free Trade and Protectionists on the other, who have dropped the fiscal issue to become solid anti-Socialists. The Labor party proposes to ignore the fiscal issue as immaterial, but has strong leanings towards that popular offspring of Socialism and ignorance, "Protection," so there is no hope in this quarter for years to come. In the States municipal bill just murdered, roads boards (country districts), are using the system, and we are advocating

a general tax without exemptions to replace a portion of the ruinously heavy railway rates, and let me assure you there are warm times ahead.

JOS. G. GRIFFITHS.

FAIRHOPE'S TROUBLES.*

Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have been requested by so many Single Taxers to write them regarding Fairhope, that it will be impossible for me to reply to any of them personally and will do so through your valuable journal, with your permission, in your next issue. It is impossible to do so in time for this issue, owing to an overwhelming load of work already on hand. In the proposed article I will seek to give information and bring out points that should have been developed at the late conference at Fairhope. It seemed to the writer at the time, as it doubtless must have to others, that it was the one thing for which a conference was called. Single Taxers all over the world waited for further details as to the colony; its actual operation and methods; just to what extent it could approach the Single Tax principle and as to whether or not the plan could be in any way applied elsewhere; or if it justified the claims made for it by some of its promoters. I shall give the facts in any article I may write, and leave your readers to draw their own conclusions. The Conference, instead of enlightening the world on these points, was led into a series of meetings, from which the outside world got little or no information as to the workings of Fairhope. I hope to be able to give you a number of specific cases of renters; their tax assessments, values of property, amount of land rents paid, both town and suburban, personal property assessments, comparative values of the different locations, outgo and income of representative persons, in relation to the colony, how assessments are made and how fixed, who are benefitted by the colony plan and why, what are the comparative values of land in the colony and lands adjoining, also the advantages to one renting colony land, as compared with renting lands outside—in fact will seek to show things as they are, from which it will be possible for your readers to form their own opinions as to whether or not "good theories are being made to work." In closing let me say, Fairhope will be a success, but only after it adopts democratic principles.

E. Q. NORTON.

*In printing these communications and newspaper clippings regarding Fairhope it is necessary to say that however much the colony on the shore of Mobile Bay has been advertised as a Single Tax experiment, its success would not furnish a demonstration of the Single Tax, nor its failure disprove it. The colony has many admirable features,

but the fact that its affairs are administered as a close corporation, that such corporation exercises all the functions of a landlord, even to the extent of refunding the State and County taxes to the richest of the community, which involves in some instances the payment of a bonus to certain individuals for residence within the colony limits—all these considerations, and some others, take it out of the domain of Single Tax, and make it a co-operative experiment of some interest as a semi-socialistic, semi-Single Tax colony governed along autocratic lines.—*Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.*

RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT FAIRHOPE CONFERENCE.

We, a Committee on Resolutions of those present at the Single Tax Conference at Fairhope, Ala., report that in our judgment the Fairhope Colony has already demonstrated that to pay all public expenses from rental value of the land alone is a practical business proposition, and results, in so far as it can be put in practice under existing laws, in stopping speculation in land, where applied, and in increasing business prosperity. Nevertheless we recognize that without changes in Legislation which should be made, the only application of Single Tax principles that can be had, is the payment by the community from rental value of the land, of all direct taxes, and the expenditure of the balance for public improvement.

RESOLVED SECOND: That we believe that Direct Legislation is a valuable adjunct to Fairhope policy.

RESOLVED THIRD: That we suggest that Single Taxers every where should introduce the Single Tax into politics by asking candidates for office to pledge themselves to support Single Tax measures.

(This committee was in no sense a committee of investigation. But it reported nevertheless and consisted of Bolton Hall, D. M. R. Levenson, Thos. Hunt, Wm. Ryan, Arch. Crosbie, J. Bellangee, F. L. Brown and E. B. Gaston).

Objection was made by Mayor Lockwood (resident) to having any Fairhoppers on the committee, thinking it preferable that it be chosen wholly from among the visitors, but Dr. Levenson and others thought it would be a "very lame committee indeed, which did not include a representation of those who were doing so great a practical work at Fairhope."

A CRISIS IN FAIRHOPE.

(Editorial from Baldwin, Ala., *Times*.)

It would appear that Fairhope has reached a crisis in its career as the only Single Tax Colony on the globe, and it behooves the corporation, through its executive officers, to make such changes in the method of government as will be satisfactory to the

majority of people interested therein, in order to best conserve the interest of all concerned.

We would like to see this done if for no other reason than the good of the county in general. The people of Fairhope are, in the main, intelligent and public-spirited, and we can ill afford to spare any of them as residents of Baldwin county.

THE MOBILE DAILY HERALD UP-HOLDS GASTON.

(Editorial.)

In another column may be found a letter from Mr. E. B. Gaston, editor of the *Fairhope Courier* and Secretary of the Single Tax Association, which founded the Fairhope colony and still controls it. Mr. Gaston points out what he regards as injustice done his association by statements in a recent number of *The Herald* and presents the association's side of the matter in a characteristically simple but direct and convincing style. With the differences between the individual members of the Fairhope association and between the association and its lessees, *The Herald* has nothing to do. There have been differences from the beginning and will be to the end—but they should be settled within the ranks of the colony and an outside paper has no interest in them beyond what value they possess as news. But upon one point *The Herald* feels constrained to speak. No plan for assessment of rents devised or approved by E. B. Gaston is apt to prove unreasonable, unjust or burdensome. If ever a man worked faithfully for what he believed to be the best interest of his fellow man, worked without pay and without hope of pay—he is that man. The rents may have been increased from '50 to 400 per cent.' as claimed, but if Gaston approved the increase there must have been good reason for it. An increase of 400 per cent. sounds very large. A few years ago the writer rented a town lot containing half an acre in the center of Fairhope for \$1.50 per annum. An increase of 400 per cent. would not have hurt him.

MEMORIAL OF PROTESTING FAIRHOPE TENANTS.

ADOPTED AT MASS MEETING JANUARY 14, 1905.

We, the tenants of your corporation, also your neighbors and friends, respectfully present the following for your consideration: We understand that the Fairhope Colony was established that the rental value of its lands might be used in lieu of moneys raised annually by taxation.

We believe—

"That the intention of the parties is the marrow of the contract."

That taxes should only be collected to provide for the necessities, welfare and prosperity of a community.

When collected and expended for any other purpose the community becomes a landlord in the most objectionable sense of the word.

That the community that raises most liberally and to a much greater extent, the one that expends the most judiciously, is (other things equal) the most desirable place to live in.

That when these needs and desires have been determined the assessment of taxes becomes a matter of simple arithmetic.

That the needs and desires of a community can best be determined by the whole people.

That no satisfactory method of separating the wise and virtuous from the unwise and unscrupulous has ever been discovered.

That the rental value of land depends, to some extent, upon its natural location, but to a much greater extent in towns and cities, to its location in a community.

That if a community becomes desirable to live in, its values will go up and adjoining values will go down; reverse conditions produce reverse results; the values in either case must be inverse to each other.

That the experience of those places where government by the people has been tried, prove that the people's desires keep pace with the rental value of land, if indeed they are not the cause of it.

That any system of taxation that cannot be safely trusted to the whole people is not worthy of consideration.

If the people who have made their homes in a community and put their all into it are not fit to be trusted with its management, who is?

We believe that citizenship is a duty and not a privilege, and conveys responsibility, and we believe it unsafe to make further improvements in a community that is governed by any less than ALL its people.

We ask you to consider these matters and take such action at an early date as will definitely determine the future policy of the Fairhope Single Tax Association.

"The grand principle of the Single Tax does not depend upon the collection of the full rental value of the land, any landlord can do that, but it does depend upon the abolition of all other taxes and the judicious use of all rentals collected. The benefits of the Single Tax can never be secured under a profligate government."

(Statement accompanying pamphlet containing Renters Protest. See editorial on another page, in which this statement is qualified in accordance with the orthodox Single Tax philosophy.)

See special offer on back page of cover.

THE MOBILE DAILY ITEM TAKES THE SIDE OF THE RENTERS.

(From the *Item's* Special Correspondent.)

Lancing a boil is hard at the time, but the recovery is much quicker than from any other treatment. Peace and harmony are coming fast to the little colony by the sea.

The people of Fairhope have located here because it is known as a Single Tax colony; they believe in the principle, and they are patriots. If all had a vote, they would vote for the good of all. There are a few that fear that if all were given a voice that it would end the Single Tax. It certainly would end the aristocratic power, but not the principle, which is as dear to the heart of every patriot as to the heart of the royalist. Any cause is weak that depends upon the support of one person. No one wants to become a member of this colony to break it up, and yet there are others who honestly believe this, and feel that they must fight against democracy for fear there will be no colony to fight for. Let us try to believe others as honest as ourselves, care more for the happiness of others than for our own; thus only will harmony come.

THE CHANGES NEEDED TO MAKE FAIRHOPE A SUCCESS.

Editorial from Daphne (Ala.) *Standard*,
E. Q. Norton, Editor.

That an erroneous impression regarding Fairhope prevails very largely among those at a distance, who are interested in Fairhope, is apparent by the many comments made upon the situation; almost all of them understanding the question under debate to be between the limited and unlimited Single Taxers, i. e., "Shall Fairhope take, in taxation, a part of the rental value of its lands, or shall it take the full rental value?" It should be understood by everyone that the above issue is not involved, in the differences of opinion at Fairhope. As near as *The Standard* can ascertain, there are not a dozen residents of Fairhope who do not favor the plan of raising local or direct taxes from the land values alone, and that it would be perfectly safe to-day or any day to submit such a question to a popular vote there and abide by the results. *The Standard* states this in most unequivocal language, and more than this, it states in its opinion, such a proposition, if submitted to the citizens of the city of Mobile would be adopted by a large majority. *The Standard* therefore is of the opinion that there is not the slightest fear that Fairhope's policy of taxing land values would not be sustained if left to a popular vote there. If the people of Fairhope, knowing most about its efforts to approximate Single Tax principles, can not be trusted to have a voice in determining

its policy, then they are not satisfied either with the Single Tax, or with Fairhope's application of those principles; in either case it is pertinent to ask, why a form of government should be forced upon any people? To secure the rights of life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed." This being as true now as it was when enunciated by the thirteen States of America, in Congress, July 4th, 1776, it follows that those who, by their presence, create land values, should be the ones and the only ones to determine as to the amount of such values and as to the expenditure of monies raised from all assessments made by them upon such values. With these preliminary considerations we will state what, in our opinion, are the changes needed in Fairhope that its success may be assured.

First, with the constitutional clause that all who become renters and voters, pledge and bind themselves to maintain in the colony, the principle of paying the local or direct taxes, out of the land values, then to such renters give an equal voice in the determination of the land values, as they have lately been given a voice in determining as to the expenditures of monies so raised.

Second, since it can not now be satisfactorily determined as to just what are the real rental value of Fairhope lands, some renters thinking them too high, the most practical and democratic method would be to determine at a meeting of all renters, how much revenue the colony would require for the coming year. This should include all proper municipal expenses of schools, roads, and all other public services which can be better done by the municipality, for the citizens, than can be done by individuals, as well as those things which are in their nature public necessities, or require a franchise for their operation. Such of these municipal advantages as the renters judge they can afford and are willing to be taxed for, should be included in the budget and their probable cost estimated. To this total sum may be added such amount as would equal the total amount of taxes assessed by the state and county against the personal property and improvements of the renters, the year last passed, and this grand total to determine the amount of revenue required to run the municipality through the current year and be raised by an assessment against the corporation lands, and in equitable proportion to the varying advantages of the different lots. The comparative value of the lots could be readily agreed upon, though it might still be impossible to agree as to just what the full annual rental might be. Then as "other taxes were abolished," "the taxation of land values or rent must necessarily be increased," and thus the way be opened to take by taxation the annual rental value of the land, "as near as may be" and to such a method of gradually arriving at what such value might be, there could be no valid objection made

on the part of any renters.

Fairhope Corporation is a land-lord and under its charter it obligates itself to pay out of such rents as it may charge for the use of the lands, whatever taxes the state and county assess on the personal property and improvements of its renters and in thus returning to its renters, the money an ordinary landlord would retain, it is taking its own land values, but until all renters have a voice in determining what that value may be, the plan is undemocratic and unjust.

EDITORIAL FROM THE DAPHNE, ALA., STANDARD,

March 24th, 1905.

If Henry George was correct in saying that the way to establish the Single Tax "was to abolish other taxes," then Fairhope can not rightly claim to have the Single Tax in operation, since Fairhope has all the taxes in common with the rest of the State, and in addition to these has some not common to the rest of the State.

In seeking to put the Single Tax in operation in Fairhope, its founders and friends have begun at the wrong end. The former secretary stated at the conference that "the essential feature of the Single Tax was the taking of the land values," and it is the attempt to take all of the land values that has brought on its present difficulty. Their method of securing the Single Tax is directly contrary to that of Mr. George in "Progress and Poverty," book VIII, chapter 11, in which he shows "How equal rights to the land may be asserted and secured" by increasing the tax upon land values, "just as we abolish other taxes," and he says, "We may put the proposition into practical form by proposing— to abolish all taxation save that upon land values." Herein is given a statement not only as to what should be done, but how it may be done; that is, "the taxation of rent or land values must be increased as we abolish other taxes." The Fairhope plan has not abolished any other taxes whatsoever, Federal, State, County or local. The plan of Fairhope Corporation crediting or paying back to renters of its lands whatever money the renters are, under our present State law, compelled to pay to the tax collector on their personal property and improvements, is an evasion which leaves the renter out just as much money, since the Corporation must raise from its land rents a more than sufficient sum of money from which it can pay to the State and County the taxes assessed (by the State and County) upon its land values and improvements, together with those assessed upon the improvements and personal property of its renters, which leaves the renters hardly where they were, financially, before the Fairhope system was adopted, because this system takes from its renters more than enough to pay the State and County taxes, the surplus being used for "public purposes."

THE STEAMER FAIRHOPE.

MR. PARKER RETURNS TO THE CHARGE.

Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW :

"Those who do not approve of the policy have all the rest of the world to choose from," says Mr. Gaston in his reply to my letter in January REVIEW. This expression is probably more commonly quoted in Fairhope than any other, but I never saw it before when it had its best clothes on; in its every day clothes it looks like this: "If you don't like it, get out."

Four years ago we built a boat; the dimensions of the boat were determined by Mr. Gaston who sent to Chicago for a builder, although we had in Fairhope one of the best boat builders in the South. When the frame was up the builder was discharged by Mr. Gaston, and our townsman was hired to complete the job, which he did in a workmanlike manner, but the model was not of the best in the beginning, and the building committee made a change which nearly ruined the boat. Her hull is so narrow that the upper deck could never be used, the boat being top heavy. This, of course, makes the boat but one-half the capacity that was intended. To cap the climax, a pipe boiler was installed, tons of ballast was dumped in her hold and rolling chocks put on to keep her keel down. The boiler was burnt out three times in the first seven weeks and then we anchored her out in the bay and stopped to think it over. Up to this time I had been a member of the building committee and have no recollection of ever having voted with either of the other two, but at this stage I resigned, and have had no trouble since; at least, when I look back upon those times I feel as though I dropped the burdens of this life right there. The committee sent to Delaware for a new engineer who rebuilt the boiler at an expense of several hundred dollars, and she was again started; the boiler still gave trouble, and it was decided to have a new one. A new one was purchased, and of course it was the same kind as the other, which proved conclusively that pipe boilers are just the thing. This boiler has been burnt out periodically, and had a bad spell four weeks ago, when the boiler was again rebuilt at an expense of about \$600.00, it is claimed, and the boat was tied or towed by a tug for four weeks. The last *Courier* states that the boat had resumed her trips, etc. She made just one trip and came home under tow, her boiler having collapsed entirely. We have been able to get the totals, they are receipts, \$9,260.18; expenditures, \$8,032.18; owed \$561.86; surplus, \$664.14. These figures are for one year. The monthly expense of operation is not over \$400.00, which leaves \$316.00 per month with which to repair the boiler. "Eighteen months ago the loyal people of Fairhope were contributing monthly to a fund" to

support a pipe boiler, but last year the boat was able to support it.

As I sit at my window I can see the boat that cost us so much, riding at anchor, abandoned and disgraced, an example of the most stupid stupidity and of the most stubborn obstinacy that can be imagined. But if you don't like it, get out!

It must not be inferred because of what I have written that I am in any way opposed to Single Tax colonies. I could write much that would be to its (Fairhope's) credit, but as is quite common in beginnings it is unnecessarily complicated, and its promoters have tried to anticipate many troubles that have failed to materialize.

This is February 8th. It is blowing a gale and raining heavily, and as I look out on the bay at the tossing boat, that in three and one half years has had two boilers, and I don't know how many wheels and thirteen engineers and which might have paid for itself, but hasn't paid a dollar, I wonder how any one can ever trust us again. But these things have been a lesson to some of us, and we are much better able to manage to-day because of them. We know the people and the country and its possibilities, and events have proved conclusively that our estimate of the business that could be done by the Steamer Fairhope was conservative. I hope matters will be settled amicably, for we are in a position to do much good.

P. A. PARKER.

IN DEFENSE OF FAIRHOPE'S MANAGERS.

(Letter from R. F. Powell to a Friend in Philadelphia.)

I draw the conclusion that you object to Fairhope being called a Single Tax Colony because all the people on the land are not allowed to vote and take part in its management. Permit me to say that if this is your idea you ought, in justice to yourself as a good Single Taxer, to thoroughly investigate the question on the ground either in person or through some thoroughly reliable Single Taxer before you come to such a conclusion. I have been carefully studying the plan and personally observing the Colony work for four years, much of the time on the ground, and I am thoroughly convinced that there is not another group of Single Taxers of equal number and financial resources in America that is doing such yeomen service for the great cause as is this little band of workers on the Eastern Shore of Mobile Bay. This conclusion is not one that has been hastily formed nor was I in the least biased at the beginning in the Colony's favor. In fact, when I paid them the first visit it was on a purely business matter, and I must confess I was considerably prejudiced against their plan.

In the first place they are not "prevent-

ing the fullest and freest exercise of popular suffrage," nor are they "conducting a benevolent despotism." I fully agree with you that there is no such thing as a benevolent despotism, but under present social conditions we must all, whether we will it or not, be either a slave or a slave owner, or a free man who has purchased his freedom. We are all born into either the estate of that of slave owner or a slave, and to rid ourselves of this condition at once, through legislation, is impossible. It may come that way in time, but for the present we must purchase our way out either by buying land and making it free or by freeing the land we own already, thereby freeing ourselves or the men we own through owning the land.

The people at Fairhope who are freeing land as fast as it is in their power to do so, are freeing it in the only way that it is possible to free it under present laws. They are not a municipality, County or State. The elected officers of the Colony are not municipal officers in any sense of that term nor are they in any sense forcing their views or policy upon any one except in the same sense that you force your views upon others when you publish them to the world. And to say that "we are walking on very thin ice in reposing on Fairhope's reputation or in permitting it to be used so extensively as a demonstration of the Single Tax," is no stronger criticism of the Colony's plan and work than it would be for one to say that Mr. George, being a human being liable to mistakes, has made no stronger call to righteousness than other good-intentioned men have made.

No one who knows the men who conceived the Fairhope idea and put it into operation can doubt their honest, sincere belief in the Single Tax philosophy, nor can he surpass their zeal in the great cause. To criticise their plan of work is to criticise every Single Taxer's work from one end of the world to the other, for we must all work in this cause along the lines which to us individually or collectively seem best. If we do not we are mere imitators, camp followers, not workers. I don't suppose that you or any one else ever hoped to attain the heights to which we so ardently aspire at one leap. We can reach that summit only after a laborious climb.

CALLING FOR FINANCIAL STATEMENTS.

ADDITIONAL RESOLUTIONS ADOPTED AT RENTERS MASS MEETING AND WHICH FIFTY-THREE OF THE TENANTS SIGNED.

We also believe that exact detailed financial statements should be made of all moneys received and expended from all sources and for whatever purpose by this corporation, also that we are entitled to know the exact status of all transactions

relating to or with individuals that affect this corporation or association and which may have caused the expenditure of moneys or may have or is liable to create an indebtedness or obligation in the future.

We therefore protest to you against paying the assessments as made by you for the year 1905, and before taking further steps to protect our interests against what we believe to be the unjust and unwarranted raise in rentals you have made, we respectfully ask that these rentals be reduced to a more equitable basis that would represent the actual value of these lands, without any speculative value attached thereto.

THE REAL CRIMINAL.

(For the REVIEW.)

In a letter to a friend commenting on a newspaper article of his entitled "Impressions of a Jurymen," the present writer expressed her Single Tax principles as follows:

I like your standing up for the doing of a juror's duty. The laws are too easy in letting people off from it. It should not be possible for any able-bodied man to get out of it, except in the case of fatal illness of his family, or something absolutely hazardous to his fortunes.

I cannot agree so well with your view of "the blackened soul" of the convict. I think the principal difference between society out of prison and in is simply and mostly that of respectability and disrespectability. There is an immense amount of respectable crime in the world, and our "happy homes" at Christmas festivals are not overhappy. They are burdened with many cares and sorrows, which are largely an effect of respectable criminality. Our economic conditions and our prisons are breeders of disreputable crimes, and it is we, ourselves, who are the real criminals, in letting such conditions last. The economic system of to-day murders men's characters, steals the fruit of their labors, drives them to immorality and drunkenness, and then our penal system takes up the matter and still further deadens the soul of the victim, not of the aggressor, which would be bad enough. If there is any "blackened soul" and "seared conscience" it is ours, that we calmly take what little comfort can be got out of the disorder, and call ourselves innocent.

But the real fact is, in my mind, that there is no "blackened soul." The race has been growing from savage toward enlightened, and has not yet reached much more than a half-civilized state. We are all more ignorant than guilty, just as the disreputable criminal is; and we and he will get rid of our ignorance at the same time. When we, the respectable sinners, learn the way out of our sins, we shall find the disreputable following close upon our heels.

JANE DEARBORN MILLS.

TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

On January 3 two lectures were given in Philadelphia. Both were before labor organizations. The first on the subject, *How to Prevent Strikes* was before the Elevator Constructors, and was well received. The idea that unions can use all the force they possess to attain their ends was emphasized. It was pointed out that monopolists refuse to sell below a given price, and this was held to be of like nature to the strike. They often refuse to sell at all unless patrons will do all business in their line with the particular concern, and this was held to be equivalent to the boycott. In addition they use every possible influence to secure the enactment of favorable legislation, or to prevent the enactment of unfavorable laws. Why should unions not in like manner use their power? By this method alone is it possible to bring about that scarcity of labor that will make strikes a matter of history only. Members of unions generally cannot toil unless they can get some one to hire them. They cannot get food or clothes unless they toil. Their food and clothes therefore depend on the will of another man. So long as such condition obtains, the employer will at uncertain periods drive them to strike. Their only remedy is to make it possible to live without the aid of employers. This can be done only by bringing within their reach the raw materials of production—in short, the land. If such result is secured so that many will employ themselves there will ensue scarcity of men seeking employment. This condition will give control of wage rates into the hands of those who do the work—make men masters of their own fortunes. There was a general expression of good will by the members, and the president was especially complimentary.

A member of another union was present, and insisted that the speaker should go at once to his society; as he desired his comrades to hear that argument. The second meeting turned out to be an improvement on the first. A "smoker" was in progress, and a little rivalry developed between the refreshments and the talk; but the talk won. A number of visiting labor men were present, and all agreed that organized labor must widen its work. It is not urged that labor "go into politics" in the sense of forming a new party; but it is held needful that laboring men must notice the direction of political movements and favor action beneficial to themselves—at the same time vigorously opposing legislation tending to create or maintain monopoly or privilege. It is well to emphasize that word "privilege." It means private law—law giving advantage to private parties. The toilers' only chance is in public law—law that is equally for all. Equality *versus* privilege.

Sources of Public Corruption was discussed on the 5th before the Lyceum of St.

Paul church. The pastor was evidently very kindly disposed toward anyone who was intent on making the world better, or in old fashioned phrase "justify the ways of God to men," but evidently he did not imagine any political proposal could be the means of a great advance toward those "ways." He and the members of the Lyceum were plainly surprised at the conservative position taken by the speaker, and it was this attitude that first secured their close attention. When it was shown that industry is largely automatic in adjustment, but not wholly so, and that failure to note this fact is the cause of most of our public corruption, the pastor as well as the members became more attentive. The necessity for laws to establish the police power, land tenure and highways was indicated, and the inevitable monopoly that must result from private control of any or all of them. The fact that the police power is properly in the hands of the public is readily admitted, and the evil results of a reverse condition will not be denied. Private control of highways and of ground rent must result in a continual struggle to secure these advantages, and this strife will be pushed to the limit of human power—involving of course corrupt practices. At the close our good pastor strove, though in the most good natured way to break the force of the argument, but the Lyceum was not with him. He was wholly unfamiliar with either side of the case, and when his attention was called to the laws of Moses as given in Leviticus he did not fail to see a certain likeness to the proposals advanced by the speaker. It is curious that few educated men have really made a serious study of political economy. The same mental effort in this direction that is given to chess by students of the game would achieve wonders.

A small meeting was held at Media, a suburb of Philadelphia, and after a presentation of Single Tax ideas a number of questions were asked—one old gentleman, who was indicated as among the wealthy residents, said we had proposed some pretty hard nuts for him to crack, and he volunteered further that he intended to look into that Single Tax business. He had evidently caught a glimpse of the "cat."

An evening with the Henry George Club was much enjoyed, for with most of the audience already in the fold the source of responsibility was appreciably diminished; also a gentleman who was friendly succeeded in making nearly as many "breaks" as a full-fledged professor of economic science. He seemed to think we gave to land a too important place in our classification, and ventured the opinion that several things of which he knew could be derived otherwise than from land. In short certain chemicals would be extracted from gases. Without stopping to explain that gases are land, he

was asked where his operator would stand, but thought he could put him in a balloon. As he took this position with every evidence of victory secured, it was a little amusing to be compelled to explain to a scientist the force that sustains a balloon. Most all popular explanations are wrong, so students get into the habit of thinking nothing true. In short, skepticism is so prevalent that even moralists are not at all sure. Standard Oil will no doubt next attack the multiplication tables. Their former policy of "addition, division and silence" is perhaps more politic.

An address on the French Revolution was made the following day before the Liberal League. The address is intended to show that governmental control of industry, whether by an aristocracy or by a republic, is of necessity a failure. The king and his flunkies taxed industry to death. Turgot would have saved the state had he been allowed to do so. The Jacobins regulated industry with diminishing success so long as their attempts were sincere. Personal ambition finally controlled—then failure was immediate. The Girondists would substitute freedom for central control, but were prevented. Many socialists attended the meetings of the League, but did not discover anything in the lecture that was adverse to socialism. The address might for this reason be considered a failure, but was complimented as one of the best given before the League. Socialists are all right, however; they polled 20,000 votes in Chicago, but were not able, even then, to defeat Dunne.

Another talk was made in the evening before the Men's League of Emanuel Baptist Church. The young men present became much interested in the discussion, and many questions made the evening a very pleasant one. The attendance was small, but the tendency to investigate public questions more fully than heretofore was made manifest.

St. Anne Literary Institute was visited on the following evening, and a most interesting occasion it proved. Young ladies attended and entertained the company with music, but the great majority of the large audience was composed of young men. The gathering was friendly and ready to be convinced of the truth of Single Tax economics, but was not ready to swallow any idea without reason. St. Anne Literary Institute is a Catholic society, and not a great deal of socialistic thought is to be found there; indeed, the sentiment that each man rightfully should own what his own labor produces found practically universal endorsement. From this point the doctrines of Henry George usually find ready acceptance and this evening proved no exception. St. Anne Literary Institute is one of the groups that will aid in the redemption of Philadelphia. It is coming.

The Current Topics Club holds its sessions in the Y. M. C. A. rooms, and on the evening of February 11, we discussed the Sources of Public Corruption. A lunch was the first order of business. Public corruption is a weighty subject in Philadelphia, and a lunch is one form of stimulus calculated to aid an attack. An opportunity for good work was afforded by the fact that many business and professional men attended. As a whole the audience was much above the average, and not predisposed to favor vigorous change of public policy. It was inclined to be fair, however, and that is all Single Taxers ask. The fact that evils exist did not meet with denial. That is half the battle. As to remedies, one rather impetuous young man thought that we would have difficulty in securing public officials who would be trustworthy. This afforded opportunity to point out the benefits to be secured by adopting the referendum. No reply was advanced against this measure. If the people are to rule, they must have some agency by which to exert their power. The referendum, in fact, is nothing more than an appeal from a decision of the chair. Where would parliamentary law end without this provision. Many congratulations were extended at the close of the meeting.

Gethsemane chapel was visited on the following night, and a very pleasant evening spent in talking to an audience composed largely of children, though there were also some of a larger growth. The leader of the chapel was much interested, and asked a number of questions which he said were for his own enlightenment. He seemed, however, to have a notion that it is necessary to condemn any proposal that involves invasion of vested interests. He is not the only one—Rockefeller is with him.

Public corruption was the subject on the following evening at the Central Congregational Church. The members of this church are evidently of the so-called conservative classes, but they are aware of the fact that there is something rotten in the State of Pennsylvania. They don't know just what it is. They probably would not admit any specific charge, but the general charge of public wrong-doing they subscribe to with commendable zeal. The pastor, who is a virile man, said there are three men in Philadelphia who are more powerful than the seven hundred pastors of the city with their seven hundred congregations behind them. This pastor like many another is much more inclined to move in the direction of the city hall than is his congregation. They in large degree realize conditions as does he, but they lack his energy. This was shown by the fact that several men with hair as white as snow stopped the speaker after the meeting, and shaking hands whispered, "True, every word of it." These old men were undoubtedly aware of

the fact that they had themselves denounced "social disturbers" in the very recent past, and were fully aware of the social ostracism enforced in polite circles against those who "rebel." So they whispered. What a splendid thing is free speech in America. However, it is always darkest just before the dawn—and political slavery will not continue forever even in Philadelphia. Regeneration forces are at work. That work is being guided by devoted men who seek no personal gain. Pennsylvania's democracy is more intensely pleased over Parker's defeat than are democrats throughout the rest of the union. There are exceptions. Mr. Baer, the gentleman who holds the anthracite deposits direct from the Almighty, was not pleased. He contributed "generously" to Parker's expenses, and awoke from his trance with as much chagrin as did the place-hunting candidate for mayor in Chicago. The example of Chicago will undoubtedly be a stimulus to other cities throughout the country. It is to be hoped that the lesson will not be wholly lost on the good town of brotherly love. What a nick-name for that "corrupt and contented" group of human beings. Why, in the name of right reason, do men supposed to be self respecting continue to obey the orders of a lot of political bushrangers? It seems that they are afraid to trust one another. But we well know that as good fruit has within it the seed of life, so evil has within it the seed of death. The Pennsylvania condition is an impossible one. Local self government there as elsewhere is the remedy. Abolish the poll tax for any and all purposes, but especially as a condition of voting. Establish the referendum. Give the people local self government. If such step be taken the people of Philadelphia will suddenly discover all the virtues usually attributed to American societies.

A short address was made on the following evening before the Pressmen's union. Considerable society work engaged the attention of the members, with the result that the hour was late when the Single Tax speaker was admitted, but a very cordial greeting awaited him and also a cordial invitation was extended to come again; close attention was given to the address, and it was quite readily seen that pressmen, with other organized workmen, are awaking to the necessity of extending their field of operation.

Theosophists are usually credited with a very great affinity to things transcendental, but one evening was given by a society of this order to the Single Tax. It was not a large meeting, but most of the theosophists present seemed very earnest in their desire to understand the subject, and asked questions indicating a sincere attitude of mind. The greatest difficulty, here as elsewhere,

was to overcome the notion that we have a difficult matter to deal with. Industry has, in truth, but one rule—avoid the maintenance of private monopoly, then let things alone. Permit the individual to develop without artificial protection or direction. Let him continue in the possession of all that nature offers. Keep out of his sunlight.

A number of the pastors of Philadelphia have combined to hold meetings in the Grand Opera House. Some of them are more or less conversant with social matters, while others are still in the narrow field of half a century ago. They are all anxious to help the working man, and therefore make quite an effort to secure his attendance at their Sunday afternoon meetings. Workmen have attended, but some of them had a message for the pastors, and asked permission to occupy the platform for our meeting. Wise pastors among those interested were pleased. The request showed interest on the part of the men they were trying to interest, but some of the clergymen were evidently not too well pleased—they were desperately afraid of what they feared would be a false note. However it was a request difficult to refuse, and the Single Tax speaker was selected to present the worker's case. The audience was large, and mostly of the class not recognized as workmen. Very close attention was paid to an argument that was felt to be more or less antagonistic to the line of work usually presented at these meetings. A few left—seemingly displeased, but the great majority were gratified. Whether it was because of indorsement of the position taken, or because they were glad it was no worse, would be difficult of determination. The pastors professed much satisfaction—very likely at having successfully passed a dangerous shoal. The attempt of course, was to state the truth without giving offense. As representative workmen and representative clergymen both declared themselves satisfied, the speaker could do no less. Curious that full grown men fear to face a proposal, in a manly manner, on its merits alone.

At Wilmington, Delaware, a large meeting was held in the opera house. The subject was the referendum, or, properly, direct legislation. The mayor introduced the speaker, and in the audience were many of the so-called best people. There is much public sentiment in favor of the referendum—not only among reformers, but also among those who usually do not give great heed to matters of this nature. The leading papers give favorable comments on the work being done in the furtherance of this cause. It was suggested that, in case of dead-lock in the legislature on the matter of the United States senatorship, the referendum might be appealed to with much benefit to political morality.

The idea caught the favorable consideration of the audience.

Baltimore is a democratic city. There are two democratic clubs—not wholly in accord. One is controlled by the gentlemen who hold possession of the city government. The other by those who would like to. Both societies are alive, and know how to receive and entertain guests with true southern hospitality. The first club is called the Concord. They are all agreed to continue to hold the City Hall—and to take good care of it. Daniel Loden, police magistrate of Western District of Baltimore City, is president, and although unavoidably absent at the beginning of the meeting, he was the personification of hospitality when he arrived later. The address seemed to please the members of the club to such a degree that the president volunteered the suggestion that at a future time we would have a meeting that would show what Baltimore democrats could do for their friends.

At the Crescent club a friendly attitude was at once established because this society calls itself a free trade organization. John D. Blake is president; Benj. Schrieres is vice-president; J. Frank Morrison is general manager and has the art of making every individual feel that he is especially welcome. A cordial greeting was extended to the speaker, and after the lecture the cordiality increased—emphasized by refreshments. Single Tax—or anti-monopoly— notions were seemingly in accord with the prevailing sentiments of both clubs. There ought not to be a great deal of trouble in getting the membership of these two societies to work harmoniously—especially since the last presidential election (or defeat) for now it is fairly evident that there is room in this country for but one variety of democrat. The Chicago city election serves to emphasize this truth.

The Federation of Labor in Baltimore was also visited, and a good hearing secured. Edw. Hirsch is president of the Federation, and is active and trustworthy in all matters given into his keeping. The assembled delegates were evidently much interested in all questions that concerned the welfare of workmen, and manifested a keen appreciation of the vicious influence exerted by crooked taxation. The address was almost enthusiastically received, and many questions showed not only interest, but knowledge of the subject as well. The people of Baltimore are waking—smoked out, maybe, or cleansed as with fire. Monopoly in private hands is getting many body blows these days.

Two addresses were made at Lancaster, Pa., though but one was scheduled. The teacher of economics. Prof. Anslem V. Heister, heard the first talk and asked the speaker to occupy the hour before his class on the following morning. The pupils

were seemingly much pleased. Note books were on hand, but few were used, as the matter was so plain that no aid to memory was needed. The dismal science faded and a pleasing vision took its place. Questions were asked by the students which indicated a vivid appreciation of an unusual view of the subject.

At the first meeting, held in the Unitarian church, were pastors of different denominations and at least one member of the city council. The audience was made up of cultivated men and women, B. T. Shaub, a substantial business man, acting as chairman. Questions were forthcoming, all in good humor, save for our councilman. He developed a degree of opposition, but only served to make the case for the Single Tax stronger than before. The audience was certainly in favor of a fair discussion. They wished to know just what the Single Tax is. It is always a good plan to know all things before forming a definite opinion. The local paper gave a very favorable report. Lancaster is called quite conservative. The Single Tax is the most conservative proposal before the people. That is why we were well received in Lancaster.

The French Revolution was discussed on February 1, in Cleveland, Ohio, before the Woodlawn Avenue Presbyterian church. Pictures of bloody strife were not presented, for which several gave the speaker thanks. The great, or even fundamental influence of taxation in that great struggle was shown, and the explanation was closely followed. Other matters than the gratification of personal ambition are sometimes of interest.

The West High School was visited on the next morning, and some of the absurdities of present forms of taxation were presented to the people. Young people understand these matters better than "children of a larger growth." It is increasingly difficult for "the man to still the questionings of the child." If some one thinks a tax on land value can be shifted, ask a boy to whom the owner of vacant land will shift his tax. The boy will answer readily enough—though Edward Atkinson cannot.

In the evening the students at Oberlin College were addressed. Several of the faculty also attended, and a very enjoyable meeting it proved to be, for the pupils were quick to see each point and perhaps recognized a deviation from some previous instruction. Questions were answered to the seeming satisfaction of the pupils, but it was observed that not all of the professors were wholly in accord with our view.

Still another school in Cleveland was addressed. H. H. Cully is principal. He is a very kindly gentleman, and nearly as free from prejudice as we could wish. He confessed to having held to narrow views some

years ago, and told of his great astonishment when he came to realize that men whom he opposed were actuated by the same impulses that controlled himself. He learned that a certain lack of information on his own part was the whole difficulty. The pupils were, as pupils usually are, quick to perceive, and were not more surprised than their teachers at the simplicity of political economy.

A talk was made before the inmates of the Workhouse, as the city prison is named. A right good evening it proved to be. They were of course suspicious of an "outsider"—most exclusive societies are. But when we explained that no watermelon ever had exactly the right taste—unless it was gathered by moonlight, the initiation was well under way. Close attention was given to the argument and discriminating applause proved it was understood. No fine-haired distinctions were needed here. If the major proposition was sound, the rest followed as a matter of course. Try to convey the suggestion contained in the "law of diminishing returns" to these men, and they would reply "The guy's nutty."

On the same evening an address was made before the International Union of Steam Engineers on How to Prevent Strikes. Some of the members seemed to have an idea that labor is something employed; therefore a little time was spent in developing the true relation of labor. It was finally made clear that laborers work because of their own needs, and not because others want their services. Organized labor is awakening to the real task before it. The stronger men in the ranks are stubbornly grappling with their one enemy—ignorance. The chairman complimented the speaker and invited him to visit the society on his next tour through Cleveland.

On the following day a talk on the French Revolution was given before a women's club, and a debate on socialism participated in at the room of the Broadway Y. M. C. A. The ladies were quick to apprehend, and generous in applause. They were also generous in the matter of refreshments—it was tea, but on the authority of the hostess, was not pink. An invitation to call again will be accepted on the first opportunity. The socialist is hardly well enough informed to participate in public discussion. He was wholly uninformed as to the Single Tax position—and of course was at some disadvantage. It is, almost always, a bad plan to oppose what you don't know—it may be loaded.

An address on Single Tax and the Tariff at the Case School of Applied Science, was very enjoyable—and the professors thought profitable. The school is large and the pupils are as bright as new tacks.

The Doctrines of Henry George was the

subject before All Souls Universalist Church. The membership is liberal and kindly. This is all that Single Tax men ask for, and pastor and members expressed themselves as very favorably disposed toward the ends for which we strive.

The French Revolution was given before a quite different society, members and friends of the Second Presbyterian Church. The feeling here is aristocratic. The democratic view of the great revolution is not to their liking. The aristocrat is much the same wherever found.

The Spencer Business College was also visited. The faculty as well as the pupils attended, and were both cordial and attentive.

In the evening another debate on S. T. vs. Anything was held at the Central Y. M. C. A. The advocate of the opposition did not know the difference between land nationalization and Single Tax—but he does now. The evening was one of sport.

Public Ownership of Public Utilities was the subject before the Federation of Labor on February 8. Many socialists are members, but are not without opposition. One socialist seemed anxious for forceful revolution, but most of them thought the time inopportune—too many policemen around.

Several meetings were held at Akron, Ohio, and were well attended by a fine class of her citizens. Many questions were asked at each meeting—none of them being of an objectionable character. Many of the audience were evidently inclined to look on the Single Tax with favor, but hesitate to avow their sentiments—or may be, do not as yet feel well enough equipped to sustain the argument. There is certainly what may be called a healthy tone in Akron.

At the capital, Columbus, the board of trade was addressed—the president presiding. The lecture was favorably received and many questions asked. One lawyer had much opposition until he learned that, not land, but land value, was to be taxed. He immediately said, "That's altogether different."

The State University Chapel was visited—Prof. Thompson, the president, in charge. The pupils were a repetition of other bodies of students—bright, quick, demonstrative. The professor is a strong man, and is doing much good work. He is careful, but in no sense narrow. The meeting was a success for Single Tax purposes.

Meetings were held in two churches and one in the court house. At one meeting a prominent business man asked for a specific statement of ground rent and public expense. If they did not keep pace exactly,

the Single Tax would give either too much on too little revenue. He was told to do as we had already done, ask the census bureau to give us the information. If the income turned out, as it doubtless would, to be greater than present income, we could keep the streets cleaner, and might build better public buildings in Columbus. Even he would not deny that they were needed.

A most excellent meeting was held in Rev. Washington Gladden's church, and the doctor was a highly pleased listener. After the lecture he wanted to know about public utilities and seemed entirely satisfied with the position taken on this question.

A lecture was given at Zanesville before a good audience. Two lectures at Newark—one before the high school. Both were gratifying, though the first was small. The weather was extremely cold during the time meetings were held at Columbus, Zanesville and Newark, and no doubt reduced attendance considerably.

At Hamilton several meetings were held. Robert Burns was presented, also Thomas Carlyle. Besides these, economic subjects proper were discussed. All the meetings were attended by well-read people, and many questions showed a growing interest in matters industrial. A talk was made before the labor organization, and it was well received. The boys here do not seem to be as conversant with economics as labor organizations are in the larger cities. But they paid the closest attention. They are well organized, and will feel the movement as it develops from the centers.

An address was made at the college in Oxford, a few miles north of Hamilton. It turned out to be a very pleasant meeting—most of the faculty were present, but as it occurred on February 22, many of the students were taking a holiday. Still a good company were present, and many questions were put to the speaker. At a future time we hope for another opportunity to meet the students in chapel.

At Cincinnati a Washington birthday celebration was held at Vine Street church. A banquet was followed by a number of addresses. Louis W. Scott was toast-master, and a series of earnest talks followed. One lady was emphatically of the opinion that the women could not make a worse job of managing this world than have the men—and the applause seemed to indicate that those present agreed.

The carpenter's Labor Council—J. H. Meyers, chairman—was visited, and a very interesting meeting resulted. The attendance was small, but questions kept the audience to a late hour. One socialist could not be satisfied because his assertions were not accepted in lieu of facts—there are others.

On the evening of February 24th a debate was held with Walter Thomas Mills on Socialism versus Single Tax at the Music Hall—said to be the largest hall in the city. About 3,000 people attended. The Single Tax men were well satisfied as to the result. The speeches were taken in short hand, and if we are ever able to straighten out the report, it is to be printed in pamphlet form. The debate was commented upon by the daily press. The plutocratic papers sought as usual to convey the impression that Single Taxers and Socialists are much alike. People are learning the difference, and the papers will be forced to give a fairer review.

An address at the Woman's Club—Mrs. Lawrence Maxwell, president, was made, and afforded quite a little discussion. Questions were numerous. Mrs. Maxwell was very cordial to the speaker, but probably not to his views.

At Vine Street Church on Sunday morning Common Rights was the subject. In the afternoon the Turner's Association was visited, and a very pleasant meeting resulted. Several Socialists asked questions in the most kindly manner. They were honestly looking for the exact points of disagreement.

On Monday the Taxpayers' Association was addressed, and a lively tilt occurred with a gentleman who advocated an income tax. He was not able to hold his ground, though he tried to do so by misstatements regarding local conditions. Other men present were able to correct him.

The Jewish Educational was the next society. Dr. Bogen is chairman. This society is composed of more or less uncultivated members of the Jewish race, but they are intent on acquiring the knowledge they lack. Close attention was paid to the address. Questions followed and some criticisms from those of Socialistic tendencies.

The class in political economy at Cincinnati University was visited on the invitation of Prof. Hicks, on the morning of Wednesday, and some modern economics elucidated. The class enjoyed the talk, and the professor expressed himself as also pleased.

In the afternoon the Ladies Alliance of Dr. Thayer's church was addressed and many of the ladies were much gratified. Others did not appear to enjoy the day so much. The speaker had an idea that the fun arose from the fact that some of the ladies were known to be of plutocratic tendencies. It was a good meeting just the same.

In the evening a talk was made at the Swedenborgian church, L. P. Mercer, pas-

tor. The subject was public utilities, and after explaining the nature of these, it was pointed out that if the monopoly feature were extracted from them, the benefit would go to landowners. We will lose in ground rent all we gain from curtailing monopoly charges. Mr. Mercer shook hands, and said that that remark was worth all the rest of the talk. He might be interpreted variously.

JAMES R. BROWN.

James R. Brown, whose portrait appears elsewhere in the *Review* and whose class in Political Economy has been one of the effective educational methods adopted by the Manhattan Single Tax Club during the winter, is perhaps one of the strongest debaters in the movement. He is a very "Hammer of Thor" with some unfortunate socialist as his opponent.

Mr. Brown has volunteered his services to the Henry George Lecture Association under the direction of Mr. Frederick H. Monroe, as lecturer for New York and vicinity. In addition to the paid lecturers whose expenses must be met by contributions, Mr. Monroe will avail himself of local lecturers in fields where speakers will give their time without cost. The only expense incurred for local lecturers will be in printing and circularizing, but Mr. Monroe estimates that \$500.00 will be needed to effectually organize each local lecture district.

Mr. Brown is a valuable addition to the forces which Mr. Monroe is so effectively organizing for agitation.

WORK OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEAGUE.

The Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Single Tax League sent circulars, such as were referred to in the January number of the *Review*, to principals of high schools throughout the State enclosing the series of questions for debate which were given in the January number. The Committee had answers from thirty-four accepting its offer, from six who declined for sufficient reasons and from only one who refused, and accordingly sent the literature to those who were willing to receive it, and before the end of the current school season will write to those to whom literature was furnished to learn the results. The Committee was greatly encouraged by the responses received and will plan early in the coming Fall to renew the work and to furnish much more literature than it was able to furnish at the time when the circulars were sent in January. It is hoped that the responses will be such that ultimately there may be requests and opportunities for speakers to address audiences on the Single Tax.

JAMES R. CARRET, Sec.

DEATH OF GEORGE ADAMS.

Again, as is sadly customary with the passing of the quarter, we are obliged to chronicle the death of a faithful worker. This time it is George Adams, of Greeley, Colorado, whose death occurred March 12th. The grim conqueror found him with the temple of the spirit broken down, but the spirit itself unvanquished.

Mr. Adams was an old man—he had long passed the allotted three score and ten. But for years, and indeed only a few days before his death, his letters were frequent and welcome visitors. Occasionally there was a note of discouragement in the brave old fighter's epistles, but for the most part it was one of confidence in the ultimate triumph of the cause. Perhaps the chief regret of this kindly and sympathetic nature was his own enfeebled condition which left him small strength for the struggle. As late as a year ago, he wrote almost quaintly: "My time is about done here." Time is indeed done for him; let us hope that immortality has begun.

Mr. Adams was one of those present at the Cooper Union Conference now nearly twenty years passed, and of this he once wrote: "It is a continuous pleasure to me to think of those times when we were able to meet those whose memories are still very dear to us."

Brave, faithful, kindly soul! How helpful were his ministrations one example among many shall suffice, and this may be gathered from an extract from a recent letter to the *REVIEW* by Raymond B. Piper, of Greeley, one of Mr. Adams' converts to whom he left his economic library, bidding him carry on the work where he had laid it down. Mr. Piper writes: "To me he has been a savior, in that he raised the dark veil of skepticism from my eyes, and caused me to look upon nature and revelation as I had never looked before."

COMMUNICATION.

Editor of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW :

Some recent events have indicated a need for some degree of limitation of private land ownership.

The Federal Government desiring to erect a light-house, presumably for the public good, made overtures to the owner of one of the beautiful islands upon our coast; demand was made for compensation as some five acres were needed. After many years of delay and contention decision was made that on payment of seventy-five thousand dollars the light house might be built, the reservation being five acres.

Effort was made to demand one hundred thousand but the lesser sum prevailed. The entire island was assessed at sixty thousand dollars for taxation. So the papers state. Inasmuch as the entire appropriation for the building and ground

was only twenty thousand, the work is to be postponed. So private interest supercedes public needs.

A lot in Atlanta recently sold for ninety-seven thousand dollars, it was needed for building purposes; fifty years ago five thousand and would have been full value.

The public creates a value, the private individual absorbs the profit. It is by lessons like these that the truth is impressed upon the mind of the average tax payer.

Some enterprising capitalist in your section should come south and establish a colony on our beautiful cosy land; it would be an ideal Italy with none of its drawbacks.

Thoughtful men now realize that wars are costly, wasteful, wicked, and looking to the cause find that the failure to equitably adjust the land question is the controlling and influencing cause. The slaughter now going on in the East may be traced to this and no other influence. Thousands of years ago men were wiser than now. In the sacred history this story is told. "So Joshua took the whole land according to all that the Lord said unto Moses and Joshua and gave it for an inheritance unto Israel according unto their division by their tribes. And the land rested from war," Joshua XI: 23d.

Possibly there may arise in our day a Ruler wise and strong enough to cause "the land to rest from war."

If so he will owe his inspiration to the author of "Progress and Poverty."

WILLIAM RILEY BOYD.
Atlanta, Georgia.

WOMEN'S NATIONAL SINGLE TAX CONFERENCE.

The Fifth Annual convention of the Womens' National Single Tax League will be held in Philadelphia, Pa., on the 15th, 16th and 17th of June, 1905, on the invitation of the Women's Henry George League of that city.

Sessions will be held afternoon and evening on Thursday and Friday, and the election of officers will be held on Saturday morning.

Well known Single Taxers, both men and women, will make addresses, and delegates are expected from many clubs in the State.

Women who believe in the Single Tax may become members of the National League by forwarding their name, address and one dollar to Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe, 150 A Street, N. E. Washington, D. C., the National Treasurer.

For information as to entertainment, address Mrs. E. B. Montgomery, 2253 N. Camac St., Philadelphia, Pa.

The League was organized in Washington, D. C., and has held annual conventions in New York City, New Haven, Conn., St. Louis, Mo., and this is the first meeting held in Philadelphia.

BOOK REVIEWS.

ANOTHER BOOK FROM PASTOR WAGNER.*

This little book is another message from the apostle of the Simple Life, and one paragraph we venture to quote: "*One thing is necessary, that man make a good use of his life.*" Life is the highest gift we have; it must not be wasted for mere smoke (?) it ought to serve the purpose which was in the mind of the Lord of Life when he gave it to us. In order to realize that purpose life needs to be a normal one. A normal life is a simplified life disencumbered of useless baggage and working a maximum of beauty, justice, confidence in God and human bounty—a maximum of happiness with a minimum of embarrassments. Wherein simplicity fails, overgrowing weed invades the garden of life; the unnecessary, the wrong and the false take the place of the necessary, the important, the authentic."

Pastor Wagner and the Simple Life are the reigning "fads," if it be not irreverent to speak of sincere convictions in this style. We imagine that Christian Science—ignoring its professions of physical cures by faith—is teaching the same thing in much more profound and subtle ways. There is something amusing in the simple faith of Pastor Wagner in the Simple Life. This life is not possible in the civilization of today. Thoreau to practice it had to flee from civilization. And so Pastor Wagner, with his plan for a return to what is really the essence of primitive Christianity, is curiously oblivious to so much that nullifies his teachings—or, at all events, makes it largely purposeless.

J. D. M.

JOHN FARRELL.

A memorial volume containing a collection of the poems of John Farrell has been published by the friends of the late poet at Sydney. The longest poem in the book, "My Sundowner," gives its name to the collection, and there is a memoir with notes by Bertram Stevens. Five hundred copies have been printed and two hundred have been sold at one guinea a volume. It is a large 8 vo., and the frontispiece is a handsome portrait of the poet and Single Taxer who won fame by his stirring songs and his earnest advocacy of our cause in Australia.

It is not too much to say that John Farrell's poetry indicates the high water mark of Australian poetry. The following on Charles Gordon is an example of a certain

* My Appeal to America, by Charles Wagner, author of the Simple Life. Small, 12mo., 61 pp. Price, 50 cents. McClure, Phillips & Co., New York. Proceeds from the sale of this work will be contributed to the fund now being raised to buy land for a church of which Mr. Wagner will be the pastor.

style of the poet, though Farrell's harp was one of many strings :

"Brave Christian soldiers who on hostile walls
Won mortal glory, envied by thy peers ;
Then found thy duty through unnoticed years
Down in the gloom of gaols and hospitals !

"What need hast thou of our poor prayers
who wast
In thy high self-denial half divine ;
Whose name as a clear beacon light will shine
Above the name of Kings, till Time has past.

"So lie, while through the world the requiems roll,
By the dark Nile, and have for monument
A story of brave deeds and high intent—
A name round which love makes an aureole !"

An even stronger and more vigorous touch is present in "Australia to England," from which we quote :

"Your way has been to pluck the blade
Too readily, and train the guns.
We here, apart and unafraid
Of envious foes, are but your sons.
We stretched a heedless hand to smutch
Our spotless flag with Murder's blight—
For one less sacriligious touch
God's vengeance blasted Uzza white !

"You vaunted most of forts and fleets,
And courage proved in battle feasts,
The courage of the beast that eats
His torn and quivering fellow beasts;
Your pride of deadliest armament—
What is it but the self-same dint
Of joy with which the Caveman bent
To shape a bloodier axe of flint !

All of this poem is indeed well worth quoting, but we have not the space.

John Farrell was a brave and great soul. He began as a protectionist, being editor of a local paper of protection leanings. But the reading of Progress and Poverty in 1884 changed the course of Farrell's life. It was perhaps true that Mr. Farrell did not immediately perceive the connection between the truths expounded in Progress and Poverty and the philosophy of free trade. But he came finally to see it, and in 1887 published in the Sidney Daily Telegraph a powerful attack on Protection which he wittily defined as "a scheme of salvation by destruction."

When in 1890 Henry George arrived in Sydney, Mr. Farrell was among the first to meet him, he and other Single Taxers securing rooms at hotels near the wharf, some sleeping, most of them watching for some sign on the horizon of the *Mariposa* that bore the beloved leader to Australian shores.

On the morning of the 8th of January, 1903, John Farrell laid down his life work, and with his going passed as indomitable and fearless a spirit as ever breathed. To him the movement in Australia owes much, and upon the poetry of his time and land he has left a notable impress. J. D. M.

PERSONALS.

Mr. J. C. Porterfield, of Houston, Texas, was recently in this city on a visit, and made calls on a number of Single Taxers in the vicinity.

Hon. W. H. Rose, recently elected mayor of Kansas City, Kansas, is an old Single Taxer, and was one of those who took a prominent part in the Ohio campaign of two years ago.

Mayor-elect Dunne of Chicago is a Single Taxer, and has been a member of the Henry George Association of Chicago for many years, and his recent victory on a public ownership ticket in that city is to be hailed as in some measure the apprehension by the people of the truths regarding public utilities which the association has helped to popularize.

Rev. Herbert Bigelow lectured in Duluth, Minn., on February 28th.

Frank H. Howe, of Columbus, Ohio, lectured on the Single Tax a short time ago before the Political Economy class of the Ohio State University.

Mr. J. B. Vining, Secretary of Charities and Correction, of Cleveland, Ohio, has an article in the *Commons* of Chicago, describing "Boyville," a novel refuge for the homeless and delinquent boys of the city, where they may come in touch with the country hillside and the green of summer. Mr. Vining thus writes in concluding :

"No more interesting sight can be seen than the gathering of these lads on a Sunday morning in the summer, beneath one of the large maple trees, where singing and Sunday service are held, and no more appreciative audience could be addressed than these so-called bad boys. A glint of sunshine, a bright cloud, the song of a bird, the bleating of a sheep, the lowing of the herds—all join in making music and a picture which is food to the souls of these troubled lads. In the winter time, the coasting on the hillside, skating on the ponds, the game of "fox and geese," together with the work and study of the day, so unite in making happy hearts and sound bodies that within fifteen minutes after the lights are out in the dormitory every lad is sound asleep."

Mr. Fred Skirrow, 59 Fell Lane, Keighley, Yorkshire, England, wants a copy of No. 1,

Vol. 1 of the REVIEW to complete his set and will give copies of the following, two or three, if necessary in exchange: Nos. 8 or 4, of Vol. 1, 8 or 4 of Vol. 2, Nos. 1, 2, 8 or 4 of Vol. 8, and No. 1 of Vol. 4.

In a recent issue of the Toronto Globe Mr. W. A. Douglass has a letter on Declining Methodism. We quote the following paragraphs:

"The Pharisee went to church with the greatest regularity, he said his prayers even in the market places and on the corners of the streets, he gave tithes and even paid taxes on his little garden stuff, and then he robbed widows' houses.

"When we learn how to stop the robbing of the widow's home, then we will have a true revival of religion. God will not be mocked. We cannot serve God and Mammon. Fine churches, seraphic music, eloquent preaching, these are an abomination to God if they are not sanctified by the spirit of obedience. 'I will have obedience, and not sacrifice, saith the Lord.'"

Mr. F. W. Burke, of Wellington, New Zealand, writes us as follows:—"Four years ago I left New Zealand. It is a good country for a mechanic or laborer, and it is also my conviction that it is the most promising field on the globe for the Single Tax propaganda. The rating of land values has been adopted in many districts and is spreading steadily. The harvest is here ripe for reaping. Why not concentrate on New Zealand?"

Mr. Herbert A. Clarke, for many years a personal friend of the editor of the Review, and now the publisher of the only Afro-American daily in the Indian Territory at Muskogee, in a recent letter to us, announces himself a convert to the Single Tax. Mr. Clarke has qualities that have already made him one of the leaders of his race, and his influence is bound to grow with his growth. He is a Republican in politics.

Ex-Governor Garvin has an article on Corrupt Practices in Elections in the April number of *Tom Watson's Magazine*.

Geo. L. Rusby addressed the Mens' Club of the Holy Innocents Church in Hoboken on Thursday evening, March 30th on "The Problem that Confronts Our Young Men."

Hopkin Williams of the Manhattan S. T. Club has just returned from a trip to Scotland, where he met that old and staunch friend of the movement, Edward McHugh whom all Single Taxers learned to love when he was in this country. Mr. Williams reports McHugh as being in good health and full of hope for the progress of the great cause in his native land, Scotland, and in all of Great Britain.

CALL TO SINGLE TAXERS OF NEW JERSEY FOR ORGANIZATION.

A Conference of New Jersey Single Taxers was held in Newark, December 10, 1904, five counties being represented by those present. It was resolved to form a permanent State organization, George L. Rusby, of Nutley, being elected temporary chairman and Dr. M. T. Gaffney, 211 Plane Street, Newark, Secretary and Treasurer.

The following resolutions were unanimously adopted:

Resolved, That this organization be called the New Jersey Single Tax League, and that it invite to its membership all citizens of New Jersey who are desirous of unqualifiedly announcing themselves in favor of the following declaration:

Land, including all natural sources of wealth, is the heritage of all the people. Therefore its full rental value, including the value of all public franchises, should be taxed into the public treasury for public purposes. We favor the gradual abolition of all other taxes, including the taxation of improvements upon land, and the ultimate adoption of this principle, which would not only provide sufficient funds for all public expenses, but would make it unprofitable to hold land out of use for speculative purposes. The hand of monopoly would thus relax its grasp, leaving unbounded opportunities for both capital and labor to profitably employ themselves.

The first work in hand is to secure an enrollment of all New Jersey citizens, both men and women, who favor the above proposition and who can therefore be classed as Single Taxers. Social questions, especially the taxation question, are being discussed with rapidly increasing interest and it is undoubtedly true that by working in harmony and co-operation, the Single Taxers of New Jersey can do much toward directing this interest into practical channels. There are many possible fields of work for such an organization, among them this: the combined influence of our state membership or the membership of any given county, could be cast in support of such political candidates as would indicate a disposition to work for genuine tax reform.

Your personal and active assistance is requested in securing this state enrollment as a necessarily first step. Copies of this letter with attached enrollment blank can be secured without cost from the Secretary. Please see that they are distributed among all of your Single Tax acquaintances, with the request that each applicant for membership make himself a committee of one to secure the co-operation of other Single Taxers. Let us make this a thorough canvass and thus pave the way for the success of future plans. As soon as a state enrollment shall have been secured, the list of County Vice-Presidents will be completed (five have already been elected), and the forma-

tion of county organizations can then follow under the leadership of these Vice-Presidents.

M. T. GAFFNEY, M. D., Secretary,
211 Plane Street,
Newark, N. J.

THE SINGLE TAX.

While with the death of Henry George, the most eloquent advocate of what is known as the Single Tax—that is, the tax on land values—was taken away, it is not to be denied that he left behind him in many different communities a large number of enthusiastic disciples. These do not possess the wonderful expository power which Mr. George commanded; but they have a persistency and willingness to sacrifice money and time in the promulgation of their belief, which is at least a guarantee of the thoroughness of their faith. One of these movements is going on in Montreal, and while it runs there as elsewhere counter to the desires of those who represent vested interests, it is not impossible that the arguments made may find a lodgment in the minds of many who are not entirely satisfied with existing industrial conditions; while our neighbors in Canada can change their government methods more easily than we can in this country, because it is not often the case that they are compelled to consider constitutional limitations. The point that the Montreal Single Tax Association is insisting upon at the present time is that public improvements add nothing to the value of goods or labor, but that they do materially raise the values of land. Hence, as these have to be paid for by taxes collect, upon property, they hold that the values of land should pay the bill, and not the individual, by a tax on the property which his labor has created.

—*Boston Herald.*

One of the best known Single Taxers in the Hawaiian Islands is John Emmeluth, who is known to most of our readers. We quote from a lengthy communication of Mr. Emmeluth in the *Evening Bulletin*, of Honolulu.

“Existing laws are a bar to the free development of our resources in that on one hand large areas of arable lands are permitted to be held sequestered by private interests under a nominal tax on uncultivated lands, while the man who makes a crop grow where once there was barrenness—is taxed the limit his crop results will permit—a premium on the idleness of those among the electorate who under more just conditions might rise and assert their manhood in productive works.

“These criticisms are offered, not with a view to or hope of radical action at this time, but rather to point the necessity for

all of us to give our civic problems more profound personal study than we have given them in the past, to work for just legislation on all matters, to demand representation that shall be in harmony with the spirit of the times and in accord with the dictates of prudence and the principles of self-government—to evolve from the spirit of commercialism (to which it seems to me our community has too readily yielded) a higher—more patriotic plane—one more in accord with occidental civilization and prestige.”

“Some people have an idea that land is simply a luxury—something for a rich man to own—and to be given up to pleasure grounds and game preserves. The land is meant to grow food, and more than that, it is meant to grow men and women.” This quotation is from Rider Haggard, who is now in this country. Mr. Haggard is Royal Land Commissioner, or something of the sort, for the British Government. He has the most primitive notions, mingled with twentieth century ideas, which give a queer conglomerate. But every now and then he touches the truth, by inadvertence. Single Taxers have made an effort to draw him in their net. They will find him a queer fish. Even as Land Commissioner he is a natural romancer.

TOM WATSON'S MAGAZINE

Do you favor Public Ownership of Railroads and their operation by the National Government?

Do you believe in Municipal Ownership and Operation of Water Works, Gas and Electric Lighting Plants, Telephones, Street Railways, etc.

Do you want a Scientific Money, every dollar a full legal tender for all debts, both public and private?

Are you suffering loss of property and health and happiness because of Trust extortions?

If so, read what Mr. Watson has to say on these and kindred subjects every month in TOM WATSON'S MAGAZINE. It has, in addition to Mr. Watson's brilliant editorials, the best short stories, poems, novelettes, special articles, etc., that American authors can write; 128 pages of good reading for all members of the family.

Send three two-cent stamps for a sample copy of TOM WATSON'S MAGAZINE, or send a dollar for a year's subscription and receive the March and April numbers free. Address:

Tom Watson's Magazine

Department A

121 West 42nd Street

New York, N. Y.