

THE
**SINGLE TAX
REVIEW**

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



WINTER NUMBER

January 15th, 1905. Vol. 4, No. 3

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.

A RETROSPECT AND A PROPHECY	<i>William Lloyd Garrison</i>	1
A "PROFOUND" ECONOMIST	<i>James Love</i>	3
THE CHIEF OBSTACLE TO THE SINGLE TAX	<i>Peter Aitken</i>	12
FAIRHOPE CRITICISED	<i>Prescott A. Parker</i>	18
REPLY TO MR. PARKER	<i>E. B. Gaston</i>	20
SINGLE TAXERS OF GERMANY IN CONFERENCE	<i>Grace Isabel Colbron</i>	23
"EQUAL TAXATION" IN NEW JERSEY	<i>Geo. L. Rusby</i>	26
RADICALISM IN LITERATURE. PART I.	<i>Grace Isabel Colbron</i>	28
NEW YORK'S PROGRESS IN TAX REFORM	<i>D. B. Van Vleck</i>	31
PUBLISHER'S NOTES. THE REVIEW FOR 1905		33
DEATH OF CLINTON FURBISH		34
PASTORIZA'S LOG CABIN		35
GEO. L. RUSBY		36
WORK OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEAGUE		37
NEWS—DOMESTIC		38-42
NEWS—FOREIGN		42-45
TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE		45-51
PROPOSED NEW YORK SINGLE TAX COLONY		52-53
PROGRESS AND POVERTY DINNER		54-57
BOOK REVIEWS	<i>Adam Smith, Ruskin's Letters</i>	57



THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

A RETROSPECT AND A PROPHECY.

(For the Review.)

By WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

In the closing chapter of "Progress and Poverty," Henry George thus indicated in memorable words his consciousness of the stupendous task mapped out for his life's work: "The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would have been accepted long ago. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be, die for it. This is the power of Truth." Instead of the illusion of speedy success, here was a sad and sober acknowledgment of the prevailing gloom. Through it, however, his eye of faith clearly discerned the star of hope beyond the murk.

We have but to transfer ourselves in imagination to the year 1879, the date when by the publication of this great work was announced the arrival of a new and powerful force in the arena of political economy and American politics. Lacking the University stamp, this California printer, with only the rough education picked up in that poor man's college—the printing office—suddenly appeared as a challenger of established conditions and authorities. Lowell's lines to the abolition printer who defied American slavery fit also Henry George:

"Whatever can be known of earth we know,"
Sneered Europe's wise men, in their snail-shells curled;
"No!" said one man of Genoa, and that No
Out of the dark created this New World."

The professors regarded the book with contempt; the press, at first cordially appreciative of its wonderful force of exposition, its mastery of English speech, on discovering the dangerous teaching underlying the new doctrine, joined in the general disparagement. Privilege quickly scented the danger, as the South discovered the menace of the "Liberator" before the Bostonians and their mayor suspected the dynamic possibility of "the poor unlearned young man" in the printing office attic, "friendless and unseen." It was the day of small things, the opening of a revolution in economic thought and in the methods of attacking special privilege.

Yet, in the early morn of the movement, the thrilling years that gathered to his aid youth and manhood alike, there came an enthusiasm and exaltation that presaged speedy triumph. The Anti-Poverty Society drew audiences that tested the capacity of metropolitan halls. The fresh convert to the new evangel, thrilled by an evening of eloquence and prophecy, knew "that the Lord was higher." And when Cleveland in his first administration precipitated the tariff issue, the corollary of the Single Tax, with what jubilation the

followers of Henry George rushed to his support, dreaming that free trade was coming fast and, after that, the liberation of the land. At the National Single Tax Conference at Cooper Union in 1890, from many lips came the confident prediction that the close of the century would see the triumph of the cause.

The date for accomplishment is overpast. What cheer for the disciples of Henry George? Is the grasp of protection weakened? Let the extremest and most drastic protective tariff in our history answer. Have the Single Tax societies multiplied and gained in political power? It is necessary to say that both in numbers and enthusiasm they have dwindled. Where are the leaders that will compare with the exceptional men who clustered about Henry George fifteen to twenty years ago? Echo answers, "Where?" Truly a discouraging report.

Is, then, the reform a failure and has time proved its fallacies? To this a ringing negation is possible. Its principles have pervaded the world. There is no need to count numbers of Single Tax organisations, to lament the decease of the "Standard," or to repine because no leaders stand out in the bold relief of Henry George and his brilliant associates.

Behold, the press and parties of two hemispheres are, under various phases, busy in its discussion. Sentiments that only the official organs of the Single Tax movement would print are now repeated through hundreds of newspapers and magazines in various continents. It puzzles one to name an active issue in politics, here or abroad, that does not in some measure compel the repetition of arguments and the vindication of principles which brought to the author of "Progress and Poverty" abuse and vilification. Strange to say, most of the writers and speakers who have adopted the very phraseology of George, are unconscious of the source from which their strength is drawn, and would shrink from any identification with his heresies.

What matters the credit if the creed is preached? Sir Edward Grey, Campbell-Bannerman, Asquith, the "Daily News," and every English Liberal leader or organ, have been ordained to continue the propaganda. They all borrow, uncredited, Henry George's thunder: "It is not necessary to be a full-blooded disciple of Henry George," says the London "Speaker," "to believe in the doctrine that these increments (land values) as they are created by the population, should flow, not into the pockets of the landowners, but into the local exchequer." That statement surely covers the purpose of George, notwithstanding the desire of the editor chiefly to credit the doctrine to Mill, Morley and Chamberlain.

In a lesser way, as regards public franchises, agricultural problems, municipal ownership, and housing questions, the issues of the Single Tax crop out in all discussions. In whatever country or section, the heresies of 1879 are on orthodox lips of 1904. Tolstoy announces to the workingmen of Russia: "Personally, I regard Henry George's scheme as the most just, beneficent and above all, practicable of all the schemes with which I am acquainted." And Sir Edward Grey declares that the party which first masters the question of taxing land values, making it its own and shows capacity for dealing with it, defiant of vested interests, will have a great and solid ground upon which to appeal to the country.

Such evidences of the advance of the truth and public enlightenment, since "Progress and Poverty" appeared, exist in every portion of the English speaking world; and in New Zealand the approximate adoption of the theory in practical working, indicate that its advocates need not shrink from the extremest test.

With this assuring retrospect, and, in spite of the seemingly impregnable position of privilege, we cannot distrust the future. The alarm of the dominant classes, the volcanic revelations which have made the popular magazines in-

struments of social revolution, the ferment of labor, the disappearance of distinct party lines, the growth of arbitrary power, the craze of imperialism,—all foreshadow a new social dispensation and a crucial trial for democracy. Old bottles are bursting under the pressure of the new wine of progress, if the symptoms named imply progression.

To those who are appalled by surface indications, despondency is natural; but to the followers of Henry George who have realized from the beginning that "Progress and Poverty" was a disturbing ploughshare, the signs of stubborn opposition add assurance to their hope. "Say not the struggle naught availeth." Only youthful inexperience could expect enthroned privilege tamely to submit to extinction. It is fighting for life with immeasurable resources. The conflict will wax hotter before the elements are heated sufficiently to melt the brazen evil. Nevertheless, an invincible and intelligent force was unloosed by the San Francisco printer, in 1879, which, yet unrealized, is the largest factor in the present contest for civilization. Of the result, however delayed or distant, the faithful cannot doubt.



A "PROFOUND" ECONOMIST.

(For the Review.)

By JAMES LOVE.

I conceive therefore, as to the business of being profound, that it is with writers as with wells—a person with good eyes may see to the bottom of the deepest, provided any water be there; and often when there is nothing in the world at the bottom but dryness and dirt, though it be but a yard and a half under ground, it shall pass, however, for wondrous deep, upon no wiser a reason than because it is wondrous dark.

—DEAN SWIFT.

In the October "Century" I find an article by Professor John Bates Clark of Columbia University: "The Real Dangers of the Trusts. With Some Suggestions as to Remedies." In the editorial introduction the remark: That at this time especially "It will be no less interesting than instructive to read the conclusions as to the real dangers of the system by one who has given the subject *profound* and disinterested examination," seems to me to warrant the opinion that the editor had never read a line, or at least had never attempted to comprehend a line of anything written by Clark. But knowing that from time to time he appears in the economic quarterlies; that he has found publishers for two or three college text books; and that he is a professor in one of our greatest schools; the editor of "The Century" has taken his profundity for granted, and has not given to Clark the profound examination that he fancies Clark has given to the trusts. A faith suggestive of the abiding reliance that Copperfield's aunt had in poor, witless, Mr. Dick: "A man," she said, "who evidently had an idea in his head; and if he could only pen it up into a corner, which was his great difficulty, he would distinguish himself in some extraordinary manner."

Professor Clark was called upon to give his opinion, not as a politician nor as a business man of course, but as an *Economist* to point out the natural laws concerned—laws—physical or ethical—from which to deduce a course of legislative action. By assuming, as he does, that such monopolies arise arbitrarily—by using his unfounded beliefs as a standard of truth—I incline to think that his opinion as to such a course is of no greater value than if he were not an economist and had no collegiate authority. For, like most Economists, he

would rather die than think and can therefore but accept and expound the vulgar opinion of his time.*

To enable us to properly estimate the worth of Professor Clark's opinion it will be well to look into some other writings by him. Five years ago The Macmillan Company, London and New York, published his "Distribution of Wealth: A Theory of Wages, Interest, and Profits," octavo, 445 pp.† In the preface to this he refers to a law which he never makes clear, and in the "Century" paper makes no illusion to. "It is the purpose of this work," he writes: "To show that the distribution of *the income of society* (meaning "wealth" I suppose. But the terms are by no means synonymous,) is controlled by a natural law, and that this law if it worked without friction would give to every *agent* (erroneously used for "Factor" with quite a different meaning) of production the amount of *Wealth* which that agent *creates*. (The correct term is "Produce." God alone creates. And production is *always* a *conjoint* result of the factors and *never* a separate result of any one of them).‡

As a *mild* example of the lucidity of this book I note this: "It is the final productivity of labor as thus measured that fixes wages. The term final implies no order of succession. It signifies that there is a first, a second, and a last unit of labor to be distinguished. By the common method of illustrating the law of value there is a final unit of a kind of commodity consumed by one person. We give to him one article of a kind, then another, and after a while a last one; and we discover that they are less and less useful to him as the series is carried towards completion. The last unit has less of utility than any of the others. By a law that Austrian students have made familiar the value of any article in this series of *goods* (substituted for the term *Wealth*) of one kind is fixed by the utility of the final one. The final utility universally gauges value."§

"Interest" he looks upon as a return for the use of money only: "Five per cent. of itself per annum is something that a building cannot earn, although the money *invested* in the building may." But the *money* is not in nor about the building. It has been *exchanged* for the building and some one else has it.

"Ground-rent," he says: "We will study as the earnings of one kind of Capital-goods || as merely a part of interest." A foot note says: "It will be observed that this is not calling land capital."

*Professor Edward Caird of Glasgow says of opinion not founded upon law: "It is a kind of knowledge derived partly from hearsay and partly from vague experience. It consists of vague and general conceptions of things, got together either by the reports of others or by an experience which has not received any special direction from intelligence."

† The very size of these books is apt to impose on the reader. As Montesquieu remarks: "A prodigious fund of erudition is interspersed not in the system but around it, and the mind is taken up with the appendages and neglects the principal. Besides such a vast multitude of researches hardly permit one to imagine, what is literally the fact, that nothing has been found."

So much of the history, moral philosophy, metaphysics, economics, of the day is dull as ditchwater, that it is no wonder the more thoughtful readers take to books of fiction, which, besides containing more truth, are relieved by plot and wit.

‡ That exact *definition* and *use* of terms is essential to correct conclusions is pointed out by all logicians from Aristotle down. And the substitution of one term for another is dangerous.

§ "Obscurity of style when we treat of thought without bounds, is sometimes the very indication of comprehensive understanding: but obscurity in our analysis of the affairs of life, only proves that we do not comprehend them." MADAM DE STAEL.

|| Cheyenne Canyon, a romantic cleft in the mountains at Colorado Springs, is privately held by two young men who, by charging 25 cents admission to its beauties, derive a large revenue from this legal power to rob the community. This revenue that many people there look upon as plunder, and have endeavored to abolish by statute, Clark looks upon "as the earnings of one kind of capital-goods."

In this book of Clark's "Land" is ignored as a distinct factor in producing wealth and "Rent" as a distinct factor in its "Distribution." The distribution being into wages, interest, and profits. While profits are composed of "Competition for risk," *interest*, and *wages*!

The chief truth—as he conceives it to be—that he has established is his distinction between "Capital" and "Capital-goods." "The most distinctive single fact about what we have termed Capital is the fact of its permanence. It lasts; and it must last, if industry (Labor?) is to be successful. Trench upon it, destroy any of it, and you have suffered a disaster. Destroy all you have of it, and you must begin empty handed to earn a living by labor alone. Yet you must destroy capital-goods in order not to fail. Try to preserve capital goods from destruction" (For instance, try to preserve Cheyenne Canyon from destruction?) "and you bring yourselves the same disaster that you suffer when you allow a bit of capital to be destroyed. Capital is perfectly mobile, but capital-goods are far from being so." "Rent is the aggregate of the lump sums gathered by capital-goods; while interest is the fraction of itself that is earned by the permanent fund of capital." According to Clark, as well as I can make it out, the *value* of a stock of merchandize would be capital, while the merchandize itself would be "Capital-goods." The proprietor would then apparently own two distinct things, (1) The value of the merchandize, (2) the merchandize without value.

Even his fellow economists of the universities—the muffled cats who are never good mousers, and who are ever engaged in similar preposterous hair-splittings—have been baffled by this. Thus Professor Carver, of Harvard, in the Quarterly Journal of Economics for August 1901, declares that every distinction that Clark makes between Capital and Capital-goods can be made with equal clearness between "The herdsman's hundred head and the animals composing it"; or "Between the farmer's hundred bushels and the wheat they contain." While Professor Charles A. Tuttle, in the "Yale Review" for August 1901 (miserably confusing economic terms) writes; "Ground-rent (Rent?) and the rent (Interest?) of artificial instruments (Capital?) are not simply parts of interest. They are distinct products. The landlord gets the rent resulting from superior natural opportunities: (superior land?) the entrepreneur (Capitalist?) gets in the form of profit (Interest?) the rent (Interest?) of artificial opportunities (Capital?)," etc. And thus, while both flatly contradict the major premise of the book; yet, all being birds of a feather, they are lavish in praise of it. The first, saying that: "This theory of capital is startlingly original, and that he will be a rare man who can produce a volume equal to this in lucidity, logical consistency," etc. And the second, that: "As the highest achievement of American economic thought, . . . it is impossible to convey an adequate impression of the originality, brilliancy, and completeness of the author's analyses.*"

In the Political Science Quarterly for Sept. 1901, is an article by Clark parallel to the one in the "Century." It is entitled "Monopolies and the Law" (civil law): "In the making of new laws," he says, "we shall do first what is

* It is amusing to note that "Economists" are seldom disconcerted by such contradictions. They look upon them as "acute concepts," "profound questionings"—all making part of their noble Science of Inconsistencies, to which universal incongruity is the A. B. C. And while they must, it seems to me, necessarily hold the opinions of each other in contempt, their loyalty to caste holds expression in check. Reminding one of Mr. Samuel Pepys' arrested criticism of the royal pair of Stuart reprobates: "Down to Woolwich . . . and away again to the King, and back again with him to the barge, hearing him and the Duke talk, and seeing and observing their manner of discourse. And, God forgive me! though I admire them with all duty possible, yet the more a man considers and observes them, the less he finds of difference between them and other men, though, blessed be God! they are both princes of great nobleness and spirits."

most *undeniably wise*, that is, *give protection to investors.*" Now political economy deals with land owners, laborers, and capitalists,—but who are the "Investors"?—Men invest, that is *exchange* wealth in some form not only for wealth in other forms, but also for patents, for Standard-oil Trust, Sugar Trust, or Rapid Transit stock; for slaves, land; for monopoly in all its forms. Thus in a paper to show us how to curb monopoly, he commences by telling us that monopoly must be protected!

He writes that the parties who have a common interest in curbing monopolies are: "The independent producer, the consumer, the farmer, and the unprotected laborer." But what illogical distinctions! Is not the "Farmer" an independent producer? And why separate him from other producers? And surely the "Consumer" if not also a producer must be either a robber or a parasite. Is not the "Unprotected laborer," too, a producer? To folks outside the Economic Departments of our universities, it might seem that except the monopolists themselves all men whatever have that "Common interest."

He says that the Common-law "Forbids monopoly and *there is no possible danger that this prohibition will ever be abandoned.*" It seems to me that nothing is clearer than that the "Common-law"—merely formulated long continued custom—is everywhere the supporter of monopoly. And that it is the *Moral Law*—which economists affect to hold in contempt—that forbids it with severest punitive sanction. Moral law that cannot possibly be evaded. The effects of its disregard being apparent not only on the depopulated sites of former civilizations but even more clearly in every existing civilization.* He says that the law must disarm the trusts: "Let the statutes have every chance to suppress them." The monopoly problem is hard he thinks, but "Not beyond the power of the people if directed with intelligence." "But if the people were living always in a *heroic mood* and maintaining a *fierce watchfulness* over their affairs the thing would certainly be done in any case." "We are reconciling ourselves to a limited exercise of its power (Monopoly's) for evil, in view of a certain power it has for good."

So by that paper monopoly is to be disarmed:

- (1) By protecting it.
- (2) By the Common-law.
- (3) By letting the statutes have every chance.
- (4) By the people directed with intelligence.
- (5) By the people in a heroic mood maintaining a fierce watchfulness.

(Lastly) We are to be reconciled to a limited exercise of its powers for evil *because of a certain power it has for good.*

Would it not be hard to imagine anything more indeterminate than these bits of professorial moonshine and straddling? What Professor Clark is paid to teach, and does not teach, are the laws of mind—moral laws—upon which political action should rest—moral laws that being disregarded *inevitably* result in private monopolies, and in civil law to enforce them.†

* Political economy treats of the *laws that govern human life in society*, and in tracing out these laws. We find that in the largest and in the smallest community they are the same. We find that what seem at first sight like divergences and exceptions, are but manifestations of the same principles. And we find that everywhere we can trace it, the social law runs into and conforms to the moral law; that in the life of a community, justice infallibly brings its reward and injustice its punishment. But this we cannot see in individual life. If we look merely at individual life we cannot see that the laws of the universe have the slightest relation to good or bad, to right or wrong, to just or unjust. Shall we then say that the law which is manifest in social life is not true of individual life? It is not scientific to say so. We should not say so in reference to anything else. Shall we not rather say this simply proves that we do not see the whole of individual life? HENRY GEORGE.

† The scientific man proper should seek truth for truth's sake—seek laws of nature (moral or physical) without regard to their practical application, which "Require other abilities, other qualities, other tools than his; and therefore I say that the man of science who follows his studies into their practical application is false to his calling. The practical man (the legislator

And now—being in a position to more correctly estimate Professor Clark's powers—we shall find I think that no extended sounding line is needed to fathom his mental depth. But this sounding he never can be induced to notice. For you and I, my dear reader, forming part of the grand popular jury which must render—soon let us hope—a final verdict upon scholastic "Economics" are by the economists held in the same estimation that coroners' juries were by parish beadle Bumble:—"Juries is ineddicated, vulgar, grovelling wretches. . . . They haven't no more philosophy nor political economy about 'em, he said, than that; and he contemptuously snapped his fingers. I despise 'em."

When many producers combine into a "Trust" they obtain an advantage in producing on a larger scale and consequent larger economy. When, because of a tariff wall or some other restriction on trade, such a trust becomes a partial monopoly, as the Sugar Trust; or because of controlling an entire productive field becomes a complete monopoly, as The Anthracite Coal Trust; it is simply a monopoly. And the real subject to be investigated is not "The Trust" but Monopoly—monopoly in all its forms, including the monopoly of monopolies, the Land Monopoly. What permits the Sugar Trust to arbitrarily fix the price of sugar? or the Anthracite Coal Roads to arbitrarily advance the price of coal? or some lot owners in New York City to advance prices to ten or twenty thousand dollars a foot front? From the beginning to the end of his "Century" article Clark assumes that private monopolies do not arise from disregard of natural laws—either physical or moral—but that they are the haphazard results of a moral chaos.—He seems to have little conception of the law that Bible writers constantly allude to as being "Without variableness nor shadow of turning." "The word of the Lord that abideth for ever," or as Christ states it, "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away."—INFLEXIBLE MORAL LAW.—And like his associate Seligman would probably deny its existence; holding that moral law is nothing more than the variable notions that have prevailed at different times as to what *ought* to be the law. These immoral phantasies that prevail in "Economics"; together with the daily newspaper reports of crime, disaster, athletics, and the stock market, are suggestive of what Heber Newton alludes to as a profound truth that we need to ponder: "That an advance in civilization may be a fall in morals." *

in this case) stands ever ready to take up the work where the scientific man leaves it, and to adapt it to the matters of daily life."

LOUIS AGASSIZ.

* That moral law—the Divine Law of justice, right, equity, equalness,—is self evident, seems to have been taken for granted by all writers of the past, just, as in spite of our moral entanglements and denials, it is really so taken by writers of the present. So self evident that in the heat of discussion men everywhere instinctively appeal to it.

Aristotle recognizing that much of the civil law rested upon custom only—custom that had been the slow growth of ages—and was not in accord with moral law, says: "Upon the whole all persons ought to endeavor to follow what is *right* and not what is established." And again "What is *right* cannot be the ruin of a state."—Also Plato, in whose mind ethics and politics were blended, says: "*Just* decisions of government require that no man have what *belongs to others* or be deprived of *his own*." While the Bible on every page assumes the self evidence of moral law. Thus:

"Trust in the Lord with all thine heart,
And lean not upon thine own understanding."

(That is, be guided by self evident principles of justice, equity, equalness. And not by notions of expediency or of self-interest).

"In all thy ways acknowledge Him,"
(Act in accord with moral law)

"And He shall direct thy paths"
(And your course will be clear).

Again: "The law of the Lord is perfect, restoring the soul.

The testimony of the Lord is sure. *making wise* the simple.

The commandment of the Lord is pure, enlightening the eyes.

The fear of the Lord is clear, enduring for ever.

The judgments of the Lord are true and righteous all together."

All evidently recognizing the fixity of moral law and of the necessity of conforming human institutions to it.

As to the Trust Clark says that: "It has learned to locate the danger line—to charge high prices, but not the highest. It is deterred from much extortion which in its own interest it would otherwise practice by competition that does not now exist, but which would soon appear."—Monopolies in production ever aim to secure the highest possible revenue. And they obtain the highest possible prices consistent with highest revenue. In the case of *land* however, a thing not produced, the confident expectation that its value will grow induces owners to hold it, sometimes for years, at prices so high as to wholly forbid sales, or even its temporary use.

Though the people he says must use the government to curb the trusts he also says: "The trusts in turn must try to manipulate the government if they expect to keep the full power of extortion" (a confusing distinction between "The people" and "The government").—"It is *foreordained* that the Trust should be a chief corrupter of national and state politics, as local *corporations* which resemble it are chief corrupters of municipal politics." "They cannot leave politics alone. They must thwart the will of the people if they mean to accomplish their purpose and they must do this through political organization." "*With all the checks they can be put upon it it can have no small measure of monopolistic power, and this involves a great injury to competition, consumers, and laborers* and grave danger to a democratic state.*" And yet after all this and after assuring us that: "There is no mystery as to what the people ought to do," it turns out that nothing can be done by which Monopoly may be ended. And he has nothing to suggest but the regulation of The Trusts! Legislative regulation which he says in complete contradiction to previous statements: "Will take from the *Corporations* (a term not synonymous with Trusts) and the bosses their power for evil and leave to both their normal power for good." Surely after all this, if one did not remember that "Economics" is merely inconsistency formulated, he would be justified in suggesting that Clark and his admiring fellows, instead of being put forward as guides in the political field, would be more properly placed if under treatment in a Home for Retarded Mental Development.

He writes; "All prohibitory legislation that *will not prohibit* will be relatively harmless to the Trusts. But if such legislation *should really prohibit* the result would be disaster and the laws would be repealed." "On the other hand there is every danger (To the Trusts?) from a policy that shall skilfully appeal to the natural force of potential *competition*.† Do this *wisely enough* and you will accomplish the full purpose in view."—No doubt—we all assent to this at once.—But—and this is the pivot on which the whole subject turns—How shall we do this wisely enough? His notion of "wisely enough" is: "We

* Trusts, when monopolies, should be discussed as monopolies—as possessing legal power to rob labor and capital. Modern powers to produce wealth and to produce direct services are enormous and daily growing. The primary factors in this production are the world and men—"Land" and "Labor." In civilization all production is co-operative, and no elaborate statistics are needed to make it clear that the largest body of laborers—they who do the most useful and hardest work—get an altogether inadequate share of the produce. Who gets the lion's share, and why? "This largest of questions," exclaims Carlyle, "the question of work and wages, which we ought, had we heeded Heaven's voice to have begun two generations ago or more, cannot be delayed longer without hearing earth's voice."

† "From a policy that shall appeal to *the natural force of potential competition*."—The italicised words are merely a mystifying way of writing—*Free competition*. What needed to have been said, and what outside of the schools more and more are intent upon saying is: "There is every danger to Monopoly AND HOPE FOR THE HUMAN RACE from a policy which, when fully carried out, shall destroy monopoly in every shape—root and branch—and restore natural, full, free competition among men.—A policy that aims at the final abandonment of taxation bearing upon labor products and upon labor to concentrate it upon land *values*—upon "Rent." Thereby affirming the self-evident intent of nature: That all men of all generations have equal rights to the use of the Earth.

know at least four things to which we must put an end if we are to convert the Trusts into friendly agencies."

(1) We must stop rail-road discrimination.

(2) We must stop the flooding of particular localities with goods at cut-throat prices.

(3) We must stop the plan of selling one kind of goods at cheap rates to crush competitors and force them to sell their plants to the Trusts on the Trusts' own terms.

(4) We must suppress Factors' agreements.

The second and third propositions deny the sacred right of property in "Wealth," require that manufacturers and merchants shall not price their own goods at their own pleasure. And in all of it what is there new? Proposing to *free* competition by adding fetters to competition, are they not merely the ineffectual measures that, from the beginning, have been urged by the press, by chambers of commerce, by independent dealers, and small manufacturers? The four propositions are far from striking one as *profound* or scientific—rather they seem to be mere echoes of current vulgar opinion. Not a word is said about "Protective Tariffs" or other restraints upon trade—above all there is not so much as a hint at the land question.—Simply:

"They are the stuff
Degrees are won by, and their shallow depth
Is hidden by pretence."

But says Clark: "The regulation of monopolies is not possible without a definite victory of the people over political machines backed by consolidated wealth. This is an appalling fact," etc. But what is "The political machine backed by consolidated wealth" more than another way of writing "The people"? The victory then is to be by the people over the people; and in what is the victory to consist?—A victory in an armed contest? Hardly, perhaps—But if not then in what?

He says that the many plans for keeping the old time competition alive "Are bulls against the comet, one and all."—But how about his recent statement as "To the *natural* force of potential competition" that if skilfully applied "and wisely enough . . . will accomplish the full purpose in view"—the "Taking from the *Trusts* their power for evil and leaving them their normal power for good"?

"There are men," he says, "who see the futility of attempting to keep alive the old competition but have no faith in regulation, and these men are drifting to the growing socialistic army. And whatever the future may permit, *governments* (the people?) are too imperfect now to make socialism work."—The alternative to any academic plan is ever "State Socialism" and never "Community of Land"—is never the Single Tax. This scholastic rejection of Progress and Poverty reminds me of Aristotle's story: That Minerva having found a flute capable of filling the world with harmony, yet because it seemed too simple for a god, and would put her out of countenance to play it—threw it away.

"The three or four props of monopolistic power are well known," he writes, "and can easily be removed if the people will act unitedly." But they must be removed for "There is socialism as the ever present alternative." "To suppress the exactions of the Trust corporations *skillful* legislation will be required."—Precisely—But what that skillful legislation shall be is not clear. For there is little agreement among school-men. And while persistently *talking* of economic laws, most of them, like Newcomb (absurd as it is), deny the existence of any such laws that must ever be conformed to under penalty of social trouble. Moral laws, they assert, being merely opinions that anywhere

at any time happen to prevail.—Thus, with no guiding principles (guiding moral *laws*) each professor can urge any course that seems right in his own eyes—one course being as authoritative as another.

He says: "Arrayed against the Trusts is the enormous body of the general public which forms not only *a majority of numbers* but of *intelligence and wealth*."—In recognizing this without also recognizing that there must be some enormous underlying cause for it, Clark's economics brings to mind Carlyle's ejaculation: "Truly, Custom doth make dotards of us all!"—How is it that the *greater* number and greater "*Wealth*" can be *oppressed* by the smaller! Evidently in a state of freedom there could be no such oppression. There must be some human institution that curbs human freedom. What is that institution? He says: "If this majority will only unite and act *as its interests dictate* it will win."—To me this is merely Economic moonshine. "Will only unite"—Unite? On what shall it unite? What moral—what economic laws are to be guides to the union? Amid contending economists, some holding that free trade, some that protection, some that state-owned rail-roads, and some that the taxation of franchises, is most unfavorable to monopoly; while others look upon ignorance, idleness, wastefulness, intemperance, or excessive population—each, as *the* evil on which monopoly rests, comes John Bates Clark, Ph.D. of Columbia, with his: "Four things at least to which we must put an end to." Why do they deserve first consideration?—Besides why not say: Act as *Justice* dictates? For the sentiment of justice—equity, equalness—until blunted by custom is simple, self-evident, and always a surer guide to conduct than "Interest."—"As its (the majority's) interests dictate"—What are its interests? Professor Clark in his term "*Wealth*" includes "*Land*"—all land, not only agricultural, but city land, mineral land, street land, (occupied by trolley companies, and by water, gas, electric companies,) rail-road land—the long strips occupied by tracks, as well their depot lands, yards, harbor fronts, etc. That is, he includes in his term "*Wealth*" the very essence of that monopoly which he is seeking to overthrow. Confusing terms he calls the holders of such land "*Investors*," and has said that to protect such investors "*Is undeniably wise*."

"The *ultimate danger* is in division of thought and effort." A truer statement would have been: The *present evil* arises from a negation of justice in the legal relations of men to "*Land*." And that with discussion and time there may come a concentration of effort upon the *only possible* means of removing that evil—the *restoration of human freedom*, by the abolition of all taxes whatever save the tax upon land-values, that is, upon "*Rent*."

"There is coming a long hard fight in which *honest wealth* and honest labor will be on one side and monopolies on the other, and the power of honesty is the greater." Here again arises the question: What is *Wealth*?—If monopoly is included in the term "*Wealth*" how can wealth and monopoly be on opposing sides?

Professor Clark might now, I think, ponder upon a saying of Aristotle: "It is half way to truth when you know what you are to enquire."

"The *peril* (evil?) will be great," he says, "so long as the public does *nothing that is effective*. It will become small when people generally perceive and follow the course that is *marked out by nature*."*—No doubt of this at all.

*"The course that is marked out by nature?" What is it but the Single Tax?—All men instinctively knowing that robbery is wrong must feel that monopoly—which is really nothing less than a legal power to rob—is wrong. The question is: How is monopoly to be abolished? Burton in his famous "*Anatomy*" says: "I would found an Utopia of mine own and, making laws as I list, would have *no private monopolies* to enrich one man and beggar a multitude." But as to methods he is silent. However custom blinding him to a truth that is really most palpable he no doubt overlooked the grand, the basic monopoly that steadily grows not only from every increase of population, but grows also from every improvement in the arts of pro-

—But what will be effective? What is the course marked out by nature? Surely until he makes clear responses here the professor is merely playing off glittering and very inapplicable generalities.

In the same glittering and indecisive way his article ends: "We need a fair field and no favor, for all would be competitors"—yet he has just told us that "All plans for keeping the old time competition alive are bulls against the comet—one and all."—"It will be hard to *find* it" (this fair field and no favor)—But he has already *found* it.—"In skillful appeals to the *natural force of potential competition*" (Economic argot for free *competition*?) But if we once get it *economic* life (human life?) will be free and democracy will be secure."

Thus, like nearly everything written by scholastic economists, commencing with platitude and contradiction, and ending with platitude and contradiction, Clark's "Century" article simply strengthens one's conviction that it is not an axiom of reform that God works with universities.—And now not confining our diagnosis to Professor Clark alone but including college "Economists" generally—though their hearts apparently are sound, there are few of them not affected with enlargement of head, accompanied by moral strabismus and absence of mind. And their teachings do but exemplify this warning of Socrates which though addressed to contemporary sophists is even more applicable to the sophists (school economists and moralists) of to-day—that "Men cannot teach what they do not know, cannot teach justice, or temperance, or virtue generally, without knowing what justice, or temperance, or virtue, is."



RESPECTABLE AND PIOUS GAMBLERS.

Lest however, we seem to strain at gnats and swallow camels, let us concede the fact that very many of the fortunes of respectable and pious people are really the fruit of some kind of gambling. For example, the Astors are professional gamblers. Their specialty is real estate. They bet that the price of land on Manhattan Island is going up. They hold all they have and buy all they can. They are as sure to win as the Metropolis is to grow. And as the city grows, their rake-off will be an ever increasing sum. Moreover, the citizen of New York must play that Astor game. The law of the land compels him to. Unless he belongs to the 10 per cent who divide the Astors the ownership of that Island, he must play the game as a perpetual loser.

Rev. HERBERT BIGELOW.

duction and exchange. Arts that now have reached (to him) superhuman perfection without removing poverty or mitigating the tension of life. In New York City, Professor Clark has ever before his eyes, but never before his mind, land that just as its productive power has increased: just as exchanges can be made upon it with greater economy and in greater volume, gives to its owners—not as laborers—but merely as owners, a constantly increasing share of the produce; so that its selling value has risen to millions an acre. His mind will not note that surface trolleys, followed by overhead and underground trolleys, do not mitigate congestion but on the contrary—by a consequent growth of land values—intensify it; send buildings up thirty stories high; close open spaces and play-grounds; cramp everybody for room; struggling dealers and manufacturers as well as families squeezed one above another into tenements, flats, apartments. While the most unnatural conditions of idle wastefulness at one extreme, and laborious want at the other, seem to him no doubt like commendable dispensations of the Divine.

Among the social wonders of our times that shall astound our descendants will be the fact that twenty-five years after "Progress and Poverty" our great universities utterly failed to see, what is the clearest of truths, that "Rent" is naturally and justly *The Communal Fund*; and that when privately appropriated tends to sweep up a lion's share of the just earnings of both labor and of capital; continued to teach that private property in *land* and property in things produced by labor (that is property in *Wealth*) rest on the same moral basis. And that such dead men as now occupy our Politic-Economic and Sociologic chairs should have been held in esteem.

THE CHIEF OBSTACLE TO THE SINGLE TAX AND HOW TO REMOVE IT.

(*For the Review.*)

By PETER AITKEN.

In submitting this title for the subject of my essay, I use the term "Single Tax" in what is known as its unlimited sense. I make this distinction because the chief obstacle to the proposal to take only so much of ground rent as may be needed to defray the expenses of an economical government will be quite different from that encountered by the proposal to make land common property.

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, and make land common property. And we propose to do this without compensation to the present holders, for the benefits which they would receive from the change would be simply their share of the common benefit, and cannot logically be called compensation for the special privilege they now possess. Our attitude on this question 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 the success of our cause.

The statement that our proposal arouses opposition among men of common honesty may surprise and incense some of my more ardent colleagues, but even at this risk, I repeat it. A distinction should be made, it seems to me, between abstract and practical or common honesty. Right and wrong have been said to be matters of geography, and applied to men's conceptions of morality this is true; though there doubtless is such a thing as abstract right or justice in human relations, quite independent of time or place. That this ideal justice is, and always will be beyond our power to realize in practice, is probable; though this consideration while it may reconcile us to the shortness of our steps, should not prevent us from going as fast as we can in that direction. On the other hand, the consideration that our own imperfect conceptions of justice are not inconsistent with honesty on our part, should prevent us from condemning as dishonest those whose conceptions are still more imperfect. 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, whereupon the Socialist calls us cowards and dishonest.

Henry George himself has been charged with bending the knee to the money power in his defense of interest, and I confess that I have found it difficult to understand how he could advance the argument he does on this point. But I would not think of charging Henry George with dishonesty. Some of us make the mistake of supposing that it is always easier to be dishonest than mistaken. In other words, that it is always easier to decide what is right to do than to do it, and so we attribute to motives of self interest what is really due to honest doubt. For my own part, I am unwilling to question the honesty of such men as Heber Newton and Dr. Rainsford, even though they draw large salaries which would be endangered by their unqualified endorsement of Henry George; nor do I consider that the purity of my own motives in refusing to condemn these eminent citizens is seriously contamin-

ated by my confessed desire to conciliate, and if possible enlist them in our ranks. Such men, it seems to me, should be much more valuable to our cause as allies than as enemies, or even neutrals, and perhaps the most encouraging disclosure made by the death of Henry George was that of the large number of prominent men whom he has almost persuaded.

Now a very important and timely question, perhaps the most important to our cause at present, is what shall be the attitude of Single Taxers toward these occupants, so to speak, of the anxious seat. 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? And these men are worth winning; not so much by reason of their own numbers, but because of the number of those whose opinions they influence, if not control. These are the religious, or perhaps I should say church-going, people with progressive instincts, who may be said to constitute the working conscience of society, and through whom I believe our reform must come, if it ever comes peaceably. These people not only honestly oppose our proposals, but they oppose them *because* they are honest. Without personal interests to serve, but honestly diffident, and with good reason, of their own power of forming correct judgments in matters of public morality, they accept piously the teachings of those whom they consider authorities. They would no more think of forming an opinion of Henry George without consulting their clergyman or newspaper, than they would think of treating their sick child without consulting their doctor.

Still, one of the most cheering signs of the times is the growing preference of this large class for new and advanced ideas. I think we should cultivate a little more respect for this class, if only for its size, or at least try to disguise our contempt for its judgment. One of our own number, who by reason of his lineage ought to know better than to put himself so perilously near being in danger of Hell fire, has recently expressed the opinion that any one who confesses himself a disciple of Henry George, and at the same time a believer in compensation, confesses himself a fool.

Well, Carlyle said the British were mostly fools (meaning, doubtless, all but himself); and the universal expression of sympathy in this country at Henry George's death, coupled with an almost equally universal condemnation of his confiscation doctrine, indicates that our censorious brother has a similar opinion of his countrymen. But we are all fools—fools of nature, Hamlet calls us—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 one of the worst. For Henry George's arguments for the beneficence of his panacea are just as strong with compensation as without it, and if the argument for the advantages of the Single Tax were no more convincing to the average mind than the argument for its justice without compensation, I should be much less sanguine than I am of its ultimate adoption. We may as well confess the fact, that incontestable as Henry George's arguments for the justice of his remedy seem to us, they do not appear conclusive to many even honest and disinterested people. We should remember that we are cranks with abnormally tender consciences, at least in public matters, while the average citizen has a conscience suited to the state of society in which he lives. His interpretations of the moral law are furnished him by the decrees of legislatures and the decisions of courts, not by the arguments of a set of cranks, who must always, in the nature of things, be in a contemptible minority. *And while as a sincere and consistent crank I give my full adhesion to the no compensation position, I propose to take the liberty, with kind permission of the REVIEW, of presenting the other side.*

To begin with, I wish to observe that the analogy between the system of private land ownership and that of slavery, which in this controversy we so invariably and persistently seek to establish, while close enough to be perceived by one who desires to do so, is at the same time sufficiently incomplete to justify the blindness of one who does not want to see. For example, while it is true that in some countries titles to land can be as clearly traced to force or fraud as the title to any slave ever dragged or lured from his native wilds, the possession of the suffrage by the masses of the American people from the inception of our government, places the responsibility for the system in this country quite as much upon those who have suffered as upon those who have profited by it. If this is slavery, it is willing slavery, and it seems to me that a willing slave is hardly fit for freedom. It may be replied that many of the black slaves in the South preferred their slavery to freedom, yet that made it none the less our duty to free those who wanted freedom. But this argument would lose much of its force if the slaves had originally agreed to enter that condition, and subsequently changed their minds. Remember, I do not say it would lose all its force, for even the ordinary conscience recognizes the necessity for some qualifications besides freedom in the making of a valid contract; but in this case of the community versus the landlords, one party is as much entitled to plead the baby act as the other, for both were ignorant of what was involved in the contract. I am not seeking now to deny the analogy between ownership of slaves and the ownership of land, which undeniably exists, but only to draw attention to its incompleteness which, as I said before, justifies the blindness of one who does not want to see it, and that is the one we must reach, if we are to be successful in our attempt to accomplish this change peaceably. The existing public conscience fails to recognize immorality in the private ownership of land, and a new conscience is not born in a people without more bitter pangs than the American Nation has felt since it was inseminated by the genius of Henry George. Moreover, in appealing to the war created conscience of the American people to justify our proposed land emancipation act, we are taking an advantage which is much more likely to produce resentment than conviction in our opponents. A judgment wrung from a people by a cruel war, is not one they feel bound to square their actions by under all circumstances. The proper question to determine the dictates of the popular conscience on the land question is not, Was the emancipation of slaves without compensation just? But would it have been just to so emancipate them before the war? And I doubt very much that the majority of the American people would even now answer that question affirmatively, while Abraham Lincoln's long hesitation before issuing his proclamation near the close of the war, shows what the popular opinion must have been at its commencement.

This deep seated prejudice in favor of property of any kind then is what I conceive to be the chief obstacle to the general acceptance of Henry George's teachings. It is not ignorance, for while evidence is sadly too common that ignorance of the question is the rule and knowledge the exception, I am satisfied that there exists among a large number of the more influential and independent public speakers and writers, not only enough knowledge of Henry George's theory, but enough faith in its efficacy as a means of social redemption to dissipate the general ignorance in a short time if this terrible spectre of confiscation were laid to rest. At any rate, one most unfortunate result to our cause of the uncompromising insistence by Single Tax advocates upon confiscation as a necessary part of their reform, is that of keeping it out of public discussion as a practical question. Not only is the landlord instinct too prevalent among farmers to allow them to even consider seriously a measure confessedly designed to rob landlords, but with the more thrifty among city

workers, investments in land are large and constantly growing in popularity, as witness the pages upon pages of advertisements in the Sunday papers.

But it is not the opposition of special interests like these that is most deadly to our cause. The general sense of the community is against it. We may see this more clearly perhaps by observing the way in which socialism is viewed by the American people. We who have considered it dispassionately have other objections, but the prejudice of the people at large is due simply to the division of property which it involves, or which they believe it to involve.

We are sometimes surprised that Henry George should be called a Socialist. Here is the reason. The essential feature of socialism to the popular mind is confiscation of private property, and any scheme which proposes that, no matter on what pretext, is confronted at the outset with a tremendous mountain of prejudice, and this prejudice is quite as insurmountable in the minds of those who have no property to divide, as of those who have. Perhaps more so, for the consciousness of being actuated in their opposition by disinterested motives is with some natures a greater inspiration to perseverance than the possession of threatened material interests.

But I have promised to point out not only what seems to me the chief obstacle to the spread of our ideas, but the easiest way, in my view, of overcoming that obstacle; and as a necessary preliminary to this I wish to suggest that we should recognize and admit the weight of the obstacle. If all we had to do were to prove to our own satisfaction that these people are inconsistent and illogical, our task would be easy, but we must prove it to theirs. We are all apt to judge others by ourselves, instead of trying to see the matter from their standpoint. We must remember the state of the man convinced against his will, and see if we cannot make them willing to see the force of our arguments, and as the first step towards this, I think we should cease insisting upon confiscation as a necessary means to the accomplishment of our end.

If we can agree upon this point we shall be in a better position to meet the compromise proposals which Henry George used to say we should allow to come from the other side. At least hints that such proposals would be acceptable are coming, if not from the landlords, from their spiritual advisers. At present we can only meet them in one of three ways. We may evade them, or reject or accept them. There are several clever methods of doing the first. One is to point out that by our most ingenious and highly approved plan for shifting taxation from the products of labor to land values, there won't be any confiscation in the majority of cases, and in the few cases where there is, the victims having plenty of other property will be well able to stand it. The only trouble with this evasion is that it does not meet the case of the widow and orphan, with all their money invested in vacant land, and one such possible case is sufficient to condemn in the average mind, the whole scheme.

Another favorite reply is to show that after we have kept up our agitation for a few thousand years—which is all that will be necessary at the present rate to convert the majority to our view, the selling value of land will have dwindled to such a point that there won't be anything to confiscate, the great beauty of which contention lies in its absolute immunity from disproof, at least in our day. Such arguments are generally more convincing to those who advance them than to any one else. For my own part I always feel that our opponents look on them as a kind of trick. They really are perfectly fair, as far as they go, and once a man is started in our direction they make excellent cumulative evidence. But the initial prejudice against confiscation is rarely or never overcome by such arguments. A much more effective method is to absolutely reject on high moral grounds any and all proposals to compensate landlords; to insist, though as I have shown the case is not exactly parallel,

that if any one is to be compensated, it should be the slave. 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?

Of course, success is not all. It is better to deserve success than to command it, and if I thought that to harbor proposals for compensation meant the sacrifice of a single shred of vital principle, rather than propose it I should welcome the armed strife which now seems to me the only probable alternative.

But our principles are not involved. Rather are they sacrificed if by any mistaken devotion to them we retard their practical application. It is a matter of policy purely. Shall we say that Henry George sacrificed his principles by advocating their gradual application? To abolish one after another all other taxes, substituting for them a gradually increasing tax on land values till these are entirely absorbed, is his formula almost in his own words. No doubt he would have preferred to stop the robbery with one full stroke, but he was too practical a man to propose it. His object was to minimise opposition and disturbance, as far as was consistent with the principle. And that this gradual application of the principle is a form of compensation, can be easily seen if we suppose it applied to slavery, as it actually was in the scheme to compensate the slave holders in the British Colonies by apprenticing the slaves for several years to their former owners in addition to paying the owners one hundred million dollars. Imagine Wendell Phillips' indignation at a proposal to gradually abolish slavery! Even in the case I have mentioned, it aroused such opposition on moral grounds that it was soon abandoned, though the money payment was made in full, showing that paying price for instant freedom was less repugnant to the sense of justice than prolonging the slavery even temporarily and in a modified form. So it seems to me, that if the principles of freedom and justice, which we all prize so highly, could survive the gradual application of the single tax, we need not fear for their destruction by the preaching, or even the practice of compensation.

Some of us seem to think that the conscience of the people will be debauched by the proposition, and that even though we get the single tax by such nefarious means, it would do us no good. They say that for any reform to be effectual, the people must first be educated up to it; must see the justice as well as the desirability of it, and I have heard it said that the anti-slavery war, terrible as it was, was not too dear a price to pay for the national conscience bought by it.

Well, I am inclined to think that if the American people had had to pay as much for the freedom of the slaves as they had for the war, they would have been quite as firmly convinced as they are now of the injustice of compensation, and I am quite sure that a direct tax levied for that express purpose would have been infinitely less injurious to the public conscience, as well as less expensive to the public purse than those fruitful parents of trusts and perjurers, the tariff and the Pension Bureau.

And I see no reason why in accepting a compensation amendment we need abandon Henry George's impregnable position, as to the justice of the Single Tax without it. The fact that others are unable to see it is due to their blindness, and not to its absence. The question is, how can we most easily open their eyes, not only to the immense advantages of the change, but ultimately to its justice as well? At present the apparent injustice of our plan debars them from the consideration of its merits, which a sympathetic examination would quickly disclose, and who shall say that in many cases the same examination would not also disclose its justice? I for one think it would, and this consideration suggests the reply to what is

perhaps one of the strongest practical objections to our acceptance and advocacy of the principle of compensation, namely, that it would tend to strengthen the monopoly of land and raise its price by encouraging land holders to expect, in the event of our success, to receive the proverbially high price which the State pays for such property. It is pointed out, too, that this would be a double loss, for with the advance of our proposals in their present form, the price of land is bound to decline. Well, in regard to this latter, if the advance of our cause during the past ten years is to be measured by the contemporary decline in the price of land, I fear we can hardly congratulate ourselves very warmly, whereas, if our advocacy of compensation should lead landlords to look upon the accomplishment of our reform as profitable to them, thereby transforming their enmity into aid, I for one would not only welcome their assistance with a clear conscience, but I would be quite willing, when the matter of price became a practical question, to trust the American people to make a fair bargain, more especially when as the result of investigation thus stimulated, it became clear to millions now blind to it, that the people themselves have created the very value for which they are proposing to pay.

But it is also said that the true landlord values his privilege chiefly for the control of his fellow men which it gives him, and that the prospect of certain destruction to this control, involved in free opportunities, would lead him to oppose our plan whether accompanied by compensation or not. This is not without force, but apart from the consideration that all landlords are not landlords in this sense, we must remember that a vast majority of the people are not landlords at all, and while there can be little doubt that a compensation attachment to our scheme would make it acceptable and even attractive to many landlords who are now opposed to it, my chief reason for advocating this new departure is not the hope of conciliating them, but the firm belief that in no other way can the disinterested masses be induced to give our proposals a sympathetic hearing.

I have already tried, and I hope not without success, to dispose of the moral objections to compensation, and some of the practical ones. But I realize that on the fiscal side of the question lie what have hitherto been believed to be insurmountable difficulties, and this belief has been responsible to even perhaps a greater degree than conscientious scruples, for our persistent refusal to entertain the idea of compensation. It has been pointed out that the interest on a sum equal to the aggregate land values of the country, would amount to as much as the rent now paid, while under the influence of an appreciating dollar, the principal measured in products would grow as rapidly or more so than the land values, so we would be no better, if as well off as at present; whereas if we offered less than the market value for the land, the conscientious objections would be as great as now, and the opposition of vested interests little less.

In reply to these apparently conclusive objections, I wish to say in the first place, that even if they were final, they need not prevent us from accepting the overtures and assistance of compensationists, if only for the encouragement of discussion, throwing upon them the onus of formulating some feasible plan of compensation. In the second place, I do not believe for a moment that more than a very small percentage of the advocates of compensation would favor allowing the landlords to name their own price, and I am inclined to think that the result of the discussion on the question of price would be a decision to pay, if anything, the amount at which the land is assessed for taxation, which as we know, averages less than fifty per cent. of its selling value, and which compromise might be strongly defended on the generally accepted ground that sauce for the goose is sauce for the gander.

Taking this then, as a basis for calculation, and accepting Mr. Shearman's

estimate that fifty per cent. of the ground rents of the country would defray the expenses of government, we would have left over every year one-half of these rentals with which to pay interest on the purchase price. Now the rent of land being four per cent. of its full market value, one-half of the rent would suffice to pay four per cent. on one-half of that value, which is the amount of debt supposed to be incurred. But two per cent. being a fair interest on Government bonds, the other two per cent. could be devoted to paying the principal, which it would do in fifty years.

Some of our friends believe that the ground rents under the Single Tax would increase enormously, in which case the principal could be paid so much sooner. And while I am not so sanguine on that score as many, there is one fund I am quite sure *would* increase enormously, namely, the wages fund. It is when we come to consider this phase of the question that the fiscal difficulties of compensation dissolve. The increase of wages under free opportunities is the corner stone of the Single Tax edifice. Henry George says it would be enormous, and Mr. Shearman reckons it conservatively at one hundred per cent. Let us suppose then that wages will be doubled. Sixteen million wage earners averaging one dollar a day each, which I should call a reasonable estimate for this country, give annually the sum of five billion dollars. This then is the increase over their present income which producers would receive in case wages were doubled by the Single Tax. Mr. Shearman estimates the land values of the entire country at some twenty-seven billions. Now, if we suppose that by a special tax levied in such a way as to fall on wages, fifty per cent. of this increase were taken by the State and devoted to paying the twenty-seven billions, it would not only pay two and one-half per cent. interest yearly, but in fifteen years would pay off the entire principal. Is it not evident from this that it would be greatly to our advantage to buy out the land owners, even at their own price. A sure fifty per cent. increase in wages at once, and the equally sure prospect of having them doubled fifteen years later.

It may be said that it would be pretty hard on the wage earners to take twenty-five per cent. of their hard earnings to support the landlords while they looked for another job, especially in view of the present custom of landlords allowing those whom they throw out of work to shift for themselves; and perhaps when the workers are actually confronted with the situation, they also will see it in this light and act accordingly. That, however, is their own affair. I simply point out that if they will insist upon paying for their own property this is the best and easiest way to do it.

NOTE.—Replies to Mr. Aitken's article by Edward D. Burleigh and Samuel Milliken which we designed printing in this number, are unavoidably crowded out. They will be published in our next issue.—THE EDITOR.



FAIRHOPE CRITICISED.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I have read with much interest Mr. T. F. Gaynor's article in the Autumn number of the REVIEW. He says, "The Fairhope colonists are the Pilgrim Fathers of the twentieth century as the practical representatives of the cause of economic liberty." Will you kindly allow me space in your columns to call the attention of your readers to a difference between the Plymouth pilgrims and those of Fairhope that is of vital importance.

The first act of the Plymouth pilgrims upon their arrival on these shores was the signing of that famous document known as the Compact. Two hundred

and eighty four years have elapsed since that memorable event; the little colony has grown to a mighty commonwealth. From a dependency of the greatest of monarchies, it has become a part of the greatest of republics; and yet through all these changes its people have maintained a pure democracy in local affairs. Once a year the people assemble in town-meeting and transact the entire legislative business for the ensuing year; its officers have but to carry out the instructions of the town.

The results of this system have been all that could be desired; they have always been above criticism; never has the suspicion of dishonesty invaded the administration of its local affairs, and had the same system been applied to the city and state governments of Massachusetts, Lawson's "Story of Amalgamated," so far as it applies to that state, would never have been written.

The Fairhope colony was confronted by different conditions; land had to be purchased and the colony unwisely adopted the membership plan to raise money. It was soon found however that a membership fee discouraged the acquisition of land just as much as landlordism, and it was found necessary to admit others than members to settlement. Since this time the lands of the association have been leased to all who have applied, and the membership fees have cut no figure whatever. Only two residents of Fairhope have become members in the last five years to pay money to the association.

Instead of retiring these memberships when it became apparent that their usefulness had passed, the system once adopted has been clung to most tenaciously, and its actual operation has shown the policy of the management of the association to have been to contract rather than expand its membership. To-day probably above ninety per cent. of its people are merely tenants and not members.

These are the people to whom the success of Fairhope is mostly due; the people who have cleared its lands and built its homes; who have made its land values and paid its rentals; the value of whose efforts it would be difficult to reckon in dollars and cents; and yet, because of the payment of one hundred dollars and a vote of acceptance by the executive council, less than forty people (nine of whom do not live on the colony land) hold absolute power and sway over the administration.

The arguments that are used to uphold this system are the same arguments that have been used in the ages that have passed to uphold every kind of tyranny; they are based on the assumption that the people must be governed; the fact is, some one wants to govern the people.

The Fairhope colony is a body of people who have neither voice nor representation in the management of their own affairs, A COLONY OF SERFS, and if their backs are not bared to the knout, their welfare and prosperity are in the hands of the representatives of a majority of an irresponsible and self perpetuating membership, and that membership is exactly the same thing which when having grown to larger and more dignified proportions is called an aristocracy.

What are the results of this system? The wharf which paid the association nearly a thousand dollars last year is in a condition to jeopardise the lives and limbs of its patrons. The water works consist of a windmill and tank from which the water is carried in buckets (when there is any) by those who still think that sometime the water will work and have not put in wells or cisterns of their own. Although the earnings of the boat have been the boast of its management, the investors have never received a dollar, nor has any report of its earnings ever been made to them.

Notwithstanding these things, every spare dollar was this year put into a local telephone, a house-to-house affair, which has few subscribers, is the ridicule of the village, and which was installed against the will of the people.

These things are the concomitants of a government OF the people and

not of a government BY the people. They are the fruits of a government by representatives.

Meanwhile the rentals are soaring, and the people are becoming alarmed; no detailed reports are ever made, only the gross totals are allowed to escape. Whether the Fairhope Association has a right to collect and disburse its rentals without responsibility to its tenants, or whether the peculiar circumstances of the case warrant the belief that the tenant is entitled to a financial report and some assurance that the rentals are really expended for his benefit, is a question that must sooner or later come before the courts of the State of Alabama for adjudication.

The piney woods colony is interesting only because it poses as the exponent of a great reform, not less interesting because it has shown what should not be done rather than what should be done. It is only a speck on the map of a great republic which is in itself an experiment. A republic that for more than a century and a quarter has "*Proclaimed* liberty throughout the land and to all the inhabitants thereof": But have we liberty? From every quarter comes the cry of "graft." The modern knight-errant armed with indictments goes forth to put the representatives of the people in jail, and if he succeeds we elect him to high office and congratulate ourselves that at last virtue has triumphed over vice. But the system remains unchanged.

The Single Tax people ask that the vast sums which represent the increment to our land values be turned into the public treasury; as these values are the creation of the public they ask only justice, but they promise much; they promise the kingdom of Heaven upon earth, the millenium. But is there any reason to-day to believe that we shall reap the full benefits of the single tax so long as the power to make laws is delegated by the people to an inferior body? Will not the lust for power and privilege dominate our legislatures when the lust of avarice shall have vanished?

Volanta, Ala., Forefather's Day, Dec. 21st, 1904.

PRESCOTT A. PARKER.



REPLY TO PRESCOTT A. PARKER.

Editor Single Tax Review:

I thank you for the opportunity to reply in the same issue to Mr. P. A. Parker's criticism of Fairhope—though regretting the necessity of any controversy with so good a Single Taxer as I know Mr. Parker to be.

Referring first to Mr. Parker's criticism of that feature of the colony plan which provides for the administration of colony affairs by members of the colony corporation, who must pay a given amount and be accepted as members; it is an absolutely necessary condition not only for the purpose of securing means to buy the land, which "had to be purchased," as he says, but to ensure the administration of that land on Single Tax principles. With Single Taxers out-numbered one hundred to one, as they generally are, to our sad knowledge, it is the simplest kind of a mathematical problem to demonstrate that if every one who came to Fairhope because he liked the location or the climate, or because he found land easier of access than elsewhere, were admitted 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 to criticise by the time another issue of the REVIEW was due.

Please bear in mind that Fairhope only claims to apply Single Tax and Democratic principles to as great an extent as is possible under existing con-

ditions. We believe that it is possible to go much further in that direction under the colony plan than in any other way now open, but it has its limitations, regrettable, but not to be ignored. One, as Mr. Parker has cited, is that it is necessary to buy land. Another is that it must be controlled by Single Taxers. Under the paid membership plan, we can and do say to Single Taxers, whether able to come and live with us or not: "Help us with funds with which to add more land to be administered under the Single Tax principle for the benefit of all who may ever reside upon it, and we will give you a voice in holding our colony to that policy."

Bear in mind, too, that our colony administration is not a government superimposed by force upon any one. Ours is a purely voluntary association organized for a specific purpose. We came to what then seemed an out-of-the-way corner of the world and secured a tract of land which was then practically valueless upon which to demonstrate the virtues of a well-defined policy. That policy has been steadfastly adhered to. No one has been invited to participate in it in any way, except he approved of it and every proper effort has been made to acquaint all comers with that policy. Any one who does approve of the policy is welcomed to full participation in the administration to-day on exactly the same terms as those who endured the hardships of pioneers. Those who do not approve the policy, have all the rest of the world to choose from.

Yet further: 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 could justly be done. The money which has been paid in for membership fees has all been expended. During late years for land purposes only; during early years, necessarily for promotion and public improvements as well. It would manifestly be unjust to present members now to admit others without fee, without returning to them the amount they had paid. But the property of the corporation cannot be sold for the purpose; the revenues are pledged to be expended for the benefit of the rent payers, and certainly it would be idle to ask Single Taxers to put up money to refund to other Single Taxers money paid for property the benefits of which they were enjoying.

Fairhope Single Taxers do not want to "govern" anybody. They do want to administer the land which they and their Single Tax friends have furnished the money to release from private landlordism, upon Single Tax principles—for their mutual benefit, and that of any others who think it to their interest to take it at the terms upon which it is offered, and for the purpose of practically demonstrating to a world not caring for abstract theories the righteousness and beneficence of the Single Tax. They have done everything they could be expected to do, and more, when they say to non-members and non-Single-Taxers: "Take of our land if you wish it, agreeing to pay to our corporation an annually appraised rental which shall equalize the varying advantages of location and natural qualities and convert into the treasury of the corporation for the common benefit of the lessees all values attaching to such lands not due to the efforts of the lessees," and we will agree on our part that "no discrimination shall be made between members and non-members in rent appraisement, and that no part of the rent paid shall be appropriated as dividends to its (the corporation's) members or any other persons, but that all shall be administered as a trust fund for the carrying out of the principles and purposes of the corporation as expressed in its charter, and for the equal benefit of those residing upon its lands."

The loyalty of a claimed "Single Tax Colony" to Single Tax principles is readily conceded to be proper matter for discussion in a Single Tax journal. Matters of the administration of local colony affairs may, it seems to me, with

propriety and safety be left to the resident members, whose high average of intelligence is common subject of remark. No one at a distance could possibly be given information sufficient to enable him to judge accurately of local business matters. Yet I will note briefly Mr. Parker's criticisms along this line.

Fairhope wharf is at least twice—I think thrice—as well equipped for the care of business as any other wharf along the eastern shore of Mobile Bay. Doing a heavy traffic it is constantly needing repairs—and getting them. Of the \$1,237 of wharf earnings in 1904, \$581.95 were spent on its repair and betterment.

Our “water works” are not what are desired, but are the best in Baldwin County, and we hope will soon be improved.

The increase of business of the boat has been mentioned with pleasure, but about eighteen months ago the loyal people of Fairhope were contributing monthly to a fund to make up a deficit in operating expenses. It has not yet been deemed safe to take of the narrow margin to the good to declare a dividend. A full report will be published soon, and in the meantime any party at interest can have access to the accounts.

The local telephone system, which has cost \$557 to date, is a thoroughly well constructed and up-to-date one, through which, and its connections, by favorable contracts made by the Executive Council, Fairhoppers can telephone to every important point in Baldwin County—including Volanta—without charge, and to Mobile for a small fee. The question of putting it in was under discussion for years, and especially for four or five months before a dollar of expense was incurred, was discussed at almost every meeting of the Council and through the *Fairhope Courier*. The Council had no reason to doubt that it was generally approved by the people. Its severest critics are those who are interested in the telephone business on the usual basis.

The rents are “soaring” somewhat. For, be it remembered, Fairhope is a thriving community, increasing in business and population 25 to 40 per cent. a year. But, unlike the land values—perhaps “prices” would be a more accurate term in this case—at Volanta, they are expended for the benefit of the people of Fairhope, instead of the land speculative company which owns the Volanta town site.

The wharfinger reports regularly to the Council his weekly receipts, and the treasurer makes condensed monthly reports which are read in open meeting—all meetings are open meetings—spread upon the records and filed where they can be consulted at any time, as can the treasurer's books, by any one interested. Full annual statements giving totals received from the different sources and purposes for which expended, are regularly made at the annual meeting and published in the *Courier*.

The Colony may be called upon to meet in the courts some day the questions of the fairness of its rents and the proper expenditure of its revenues, and is supremely confident of its ability to maintain its position before any intelligent jury, though it may be taken for granted that it does not consider any jury of non-Single Taxers half as likely to deal justly with such matters as a majority of the resident members of the colony, who under its constitution and practice are the final authority on all colony matters.

Mr. Editor, it is a well defined principle of law, and ethics as well, that he who would hale his fellows before the bar of justice, or public opinion, must himself come with clean hands. Mr. Parker is now and has been for years, a member of the colony organization. It is not within my recollection that he has in good faith made use of his right and privilege vigorously to combat the alleged evils of which he now complains. His chief individual interest in this vicinity now is that of a promoter of a private railroad and town-site speculation, operating within a little more than a half mile of the boundary of

Fairhope, to the success of which the existence of Fairhope as a Single Tax colony is the greatest obstacle. I do not mean to charge that Mr. Parker is consciously actuated by motives of personal interest in seeking to discredit Fairhope in the minds of Single Taxers, but it is a remarkable man indeed whose actions are not consciously or unconsciously affected by his personal interests.

Very Sincerely Yours,

E. B. GASTON.

Fairhope, Ala., Jan. 10, 1905.



SINGLE TAXERS OF GERMANY IN CONFERENCE.

(*For the Review.*)

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

The fourteenth annual convention of the German Land Reform League took place on October 15th and 16th 1904, in Darmstadt, the first time in the history of this German Single Tax party that a convention has been held outside of Berlin, where the League had its birth. It was a good move on the part of the committee to choose Darmstadt for the experiment, owing to the central position for South Germany of this friendly little city, and owing also to the fact that the Grand Duke of Hesse-Darmstadt has been for some years most favorably inclined towards the teachings for which the League stands. Then, also, the date chosen for the Convention immediately preceded the meeting of the Convention to consider the Housing problem, which was to assemble in Frankfurt-am-Main, an hour from Darmstadt. A number of men of prominence in the world of social thought were pledged to appear at Frankfurt, and it was no hardship to be at Darmstadt a day sooner, while members of the Land Reform League could the more easily attend both conventions. It had been decided that the spread of Single Tax theories had been so successful throughout Germany that it was worth the trying to meet elsewhere than in Berlin, to test the power of the League to bring people together without the attractions of the Imperial Capital.

Over two hundred delegates met at Darmstadt, and the Convention was opened by the Vice-President of the League, Mr. Carl Marfels, of Friedenau, near Berlin, an ardent and devoted Single Taxer of many years service. After greeting those present in the name of the League he proceeded to say:

"The task which the League of German Land Reformers has set itself is a most important, in fact a most fundamental one. The League recognizes that all our progress, all improvements, all advance of civilization has had for main effect the heaping up of incomes from property in land for a small minority, and it desires, through a proper taxation of the enormous sums drawn from land values every year to the harm of the workers, to turn these incomes to that source from which they spring, to the community. This great object covers and contains all endeavors for betterment of social conditions, which are so active nowadays in the form of the Housing Problem, sanitation, ethical education, and all of those efforts towards a solution of what we call the social problem." The speaker then proceeded to praise the active interest taken in social reform by the German Emperor and the Grand Duke of Hesse, whose little country had the best housing laws of any German State.

Messrs. Roth, of Stuttgart, and Heenrich, of Darmstadt, were elected Secretaries of the Convention, and the former read aloud the many letters and telegrams received from those who could not be present. Messages with sin-

cere regrets at forced absence were received from Count Posadowsky, Secretary of the Interior; from Baron von Riedel, Minister of Finance for Bavaria; Head Mayor Adickes, of Frankfurt; Head Mayor Beck, of Mannheim; Head Mayor Gauss, of Stuttgart, and the Ambassador for Norway and Sweden in Berlin, Count Taube, who asked in his message that two copies of the account of the proceedings be sent him, as there was a strong interest for these very questions in the countries he represents. A long message of greeting and encouragement on the part of the Single Taxers of Great Britain was sent by Charles Trevelyan, M. P. American Single Taxers were also represented by a written message.

Then followed a summing up of the work of the eighteen months elapsed since the last Convention, read by Adolf Damaschke, President of the League. The following were the main points of his report:

During the eighteen months Single Tax speeches have been made in eighty-four different towns, including cities of the importance of Berlin, Munich, Stuttgart, Cologne, Bremen, Hanover, Dresden, down through a long list of large provincial towns and townlets. One hundred and thirty-five men and nine women have shared in the work of giving these speeches, and three of the lectures have been known to have directly influenced political action. These were the lecture on Taxation of selling values held by Dr. Foehr, Principal of the Technical Institute of Cothen, at a meeting of one hundred and fifty mayors and municipal office holders of Saxony and the Duchy Anhalt, in 1903. This important and interesting speech undoubtedly brought about the introduction of assessments of lots at their selling value in a number of Saxon cities, lead by Magdeburg. Further, the interest aroused by the remarks of Messrs. Eichholtz, Pohlmann and Damaschke on the occasion of the recent Colonial Convention in Stettin, caused important resolutions, *re* land speculation in the Colonies to be passed. The most recent successful Single Tax speech was that of a young physician, Dr. Hauser, held at the Convention of German-Austrian Cities, in Teplitz, in September last. His remarks caused an animated discussion which led to the appointment of a committee to investigate the Single Tax theories with a view to their direct application in municipal affairs. Mr. Damaschke gave an account of the literature used for propaganda, and told of a proposed issue of "Documents of Land Reform" in the shape of little pamphlets containing all bills, edicts, contracts, etc., concerning or touching on the question of land taxation. One method of literary propaganda reported by Damaschke is a most excellent one, and could be copied with good result anywhere. The German League issues a bi-monthly "Land Reform; News Notes for Dailies," a collection of notes and short articles which are sent out to two hundred and fifty newspapers of all shades of political coloring. Some of these notes are so cleverly worded that they can appear in any sort of paper, and one can easily see what a useful means of propaganda such a regular organized correspondence would be. Damaschke's own book, "Tasks of Municipal Politics," has gone into a large fifth edition, bringing the number of printed copies of this work up to twenty thousand. His "Land Reform," which is a systematic history of Single Tax thought, has gone into a third edition. The main body of the League has had an increase of two thousand members within the last eight years, and the actual number of members, including corporate members (members of clubs that have joined the League in a body), is nearly one hundred and ninety thousand. The recent addition to the list of corporate members is that of an entire town, the flourishing village of Opladen between Cologne and Düsseldorf. The town joined the League in a body, as a unit, represented by the Mayor and the City Council, the first time such a thing has ever happened. It is certainly a most encouraging novelty to have an entire community pledging itself as a body to advocate and carry out the ideals for which the League stands.

An important item in the report was included in the heading, "Land Reform in the German Parliaments," and told of the discussion and legislative action concerning taxation of land values and of the unearned increment now going on in the law-giving bodies of Bavaria, Baden, Saxony and Bremen. The question of ownership of the water power came up in Baden, and the Second Chamber declared unanimously against permitting these natural resources to become private monopoly. These discussions were nowheres closed, so that a final report could not be given, but the fight was on in many places, and gave prospects most hopeful for the cause of just legislation.

The subject that then came up for report and discussion was the most important and interesting on the programme, namely the "Legislative Attempts towards an Introduction of a Taxation of the Unearned Increment." Prof. Baumeister, of Karlsruhe, gave the opening speech. He spoke of the land tax, payable yearly on an assessment of the actual selling values of the land, introduced by Miquel in the Prussian law for Communal taxation 1893, in the taxation of building lots, Wurtemberg, 1903; and in a bill proposed in the House of Representatives in Bavaria 1904, accepted by the House but vetoed by the Council. The taxation at selling value is about to be introduced in Baden by a new law of 1900 compelling a re-assessment.

The taxation of increase in land values, of what is popularly known as the "unearned increment," has been made a law for the first time by a bill passed in Frankfurt in 1904. A similar bill has been proposed and is being discussed in Saxony, and also in Baden. This last is the particular bill which the speaker had chosen to describe, it is known as the Zehnter Bill from the name of its proposer. On Dec. 4th, 1903, Zehnter proposed that "The Second Chamber of Baden request of the Grand Ducal Government that it lay before the legislative bodies at present convening, a bill to tax increase of land values, the unearned increment, on all improved and unimproved land, in towns of five thousand inhabitants and over, for the benefit of the community." The motion was opposed by the Association of land and house owners; by the Gardener's Association; and by four Citizen's Clubs in Karlsruhe. It was seconded by the Karlsruhe branch of the Land Reform League, which included members of all political parties, from Conservatives to Social-Democrats. A Committee was ordered to investigate the matter, and several important meetings were held on the subject, in which the pros and cons were discussed with vehemence, but it was noticeable in all these discussions that but very little doubt was shown as to the fundamental justice of the proposed taxation, the method to be employed being the principle cause of debate and disagreement. The points advanced for and against the taxation of increase in land values are most interesting, as showing the high standard of social thought in the municipalities in Germany. It is recognized everywhere that land should not be made an object of speculation and of private greed, and that legislation concerning land ownership is the first move towards a legislation that shall really represent the greatest good of the greatest number. Finally, as a result of committee work and open discussion, the Second Chamber of the Baden Landtag made the following unanimous petition to the Government:

"That, in connection with the proposed reform of the income tax and the thereby necessitated revision of communal taxation, a bill be presented to the next Landtag which shall promote the taxation of the unearned increase in value of unimproved, and if possible also of improved land, and that the terms of this bill be made public before its presentation to the Landtag that those interested may have time to investigate it and make their wishes known."

Dr. Jaeger, of Speyer, told of similar suggestions made in the Bavarian Landtag, and of a similar petition framed by this body to its Government, asking that the question of taxation of selling value, as well as the taxation of unearned increase of value be presented to the Chambers for legislative action.

An interesting discussion followed these two reports at which minor points were drawn into debate, but all were agreed that the legislative action here described could be counted as the longest step forward our movement has yet taken, and as the one most hopeful for the future. The discussion closed the first afternoon session, the evening meeting opening with a short speech by Mrs. Marie Brumm, representing the Woman's Group of the League, which already numbers two hundred members. Professor Dr. Max Gruber, Principal of the Hygienic Institute in Munchen, followed with a long and most interesting speech on "The Spread of Tuberculosis and the Housing Problem," which started a discussion that kept the meeting in session until nearly midnight.

The following morning at half past ten the sessions were resumed, beginning with an election of officers, which made but few changes in the previous list. The morning had two important speeches on the programme, a report on "National Ownership of the Water Power," made by Prof. Dr. Schar, of Zurich, leader of the Single Taxers of Switzerland. The importance of this report and the questions presented in it, led to a resolution to preserve it in a pamphlet for propaganda purposes, and a formal resolution was made by the entire Convention as follows:

"The League of German Land Reformers protests against allowing the streams of our country, the inexhaustible sources of power for electrical purposes, to pass into the hands of private companies and private speculators. The League demands that the right to use the water power remain in the possession of the State or the communities, in order that the production and utilization of electricity be regulated in the interests of the whole people."

Another important report was the talk of Admiral Boeters on "Land Reform and Colonial Politics," in which he represented that the Imperial Government and the Colonial Office were most anxious to regulate legislation in the Colonies in order to improve conditions both for the natives and for settlers, and to prevent any abuse by the home government, and particularly to prevent the evils always following in the path of unhindered land speculation in newly opened countries.

In the afternoon a private session was held at which matters concerning organization and propaganda were discussed, and the Fourteenth Convention closed with the conviction in the minds of those present of progress all along the line, and the best prospects for the future.



"EQUAL TAXATION" IN NEW JERSEY.

(For the Review.)

By GEO. L. RUSBY.

To a few people "equal" taxation means *just* taxation; to most people "equal" taxation suggests only a reduction of one's own taxes regardless as to who is to pay the amount thus remitted.

It was thought that both of these classes would naturally be attracted by this seductive phrase, which was therefore adopted as the campaign slogan of the Democratic Party in this state in the recent effort of that party to appropriate to itself the offices and accompanying perquisites at present enjoyed by the Republicans. That there was a serious miscalculation on the part of those who conceived the plan is indicated by its crushing defeat. The real significance of this "equal taxation" campaign lay in the avowed purpose of its instigators to secure legislation which would equalize taxes as between the railroads and other owners of real estate. That there was and is a reasonable and urgent need for real reform in this direction, there can be no doubt, as is shown by

the provisions of the present law, viz.: that first class railroad property (main stem of road bed, passenger depots, franchises and personal property) shall pay only one half of one per cent. (to be paid into the state treasury) on assessed valuation, and second class railroad property (real estate outside of main stem) one and one half per cent. on assessed valuation (paid to the local taxing district). With the rates of taxation in the various taxing districts throughout the state averaging about 2.20, we see that the present law would involve most glaring injustice even if honestly applied; it has been easy however to thwart such honest application in various ways, one being the formation of scores of small "independent" railroad companies as owners of short lines of road, leased to the parent company for switching purposes but taxed as first class property because technically "main stem" instead of switch.

As remedies for this condition we had these two rival propositions made by the respective candidates for the gubernatorial offices: Mr. Stokes, the Republican candidate, proposed to tax "second class" property at local rates for local uses, and to consider "after election" the question of increasing the tax on other railroad property; Mr. Black, the Democratic candidate, proposed to tax railroad franchises for the use of the state, and to tax all real estate and tangible personal property at full local rates for local purposes.

In view of this advanced stand taken by the Democratic candidate and the widespread dissatisfaction among property owners, with existing tax laws, it would at first thought seem surprising that the Democratic party did not achieve an overwhelming victory, instead of experiencing a stupendous defeat. What is the explanation?

The electorate may for convenience be divided into three classes, viz.:

1. Those who being non real estate owners, are not direct taxpayers and who, therefore, take little or no interest in the discussion of taxation questions.

To awaken the desired interest in this great class of voters it will be necessary to enlighten them as to subtleties of *indirect* taxation and to the fact that the tenant really pays most of the tax which is handed over by his "landlord" to the tax collector.

2. Real estate owners who recognize that railroads are not paying a proper share of the taxes. Undoubtedly a large portion of this comparatively small class supported the Democratic candidate in the recent campaign; that the entire combined influence of this class was not cast in that direction, is due to a suspicion of insincerity upon the part of the Democratic leaders who promised reform. This suspicion was strengthened by knowledge of the fact that during the many successive years in which the Democratic party was in complete control of the state machinery, no effort was made to accomplish these reforms, promises to undertake which at this late day look considerably like bait cast out to recapture the coveted offices.

3. A still smaller class, influenced by convictions as to principles of justice involved, and desirous to secure improved tax legislation. That the Democratic proposition did not receive the undivided and enthusiastic support of this small but important element, was due to the latter's belief that "the game was not worth the candle." They recognize that the so-called "equal taxation" programme proposed, would, even if successfully enacted into legislation, do little or nothing to establish real equity. To fight for the doubtful benefits that might be expected to result, would demand time, effort and means out of proportion to such results and would tend to even further becloud the People's view of the real issues involved in the taxation question.

It would be highly inappropriate for officers of the law to discuss terms upon which Mr. Jones might retain possession of a watch or other property belonging to a neighbor. In the same way it seems to the writer highly out of place that legislatures, the guardians of our commonwealth, should seriously

discuss whether the tax should be one per cent. or two per cent. upon the extremely valuable public property now in the hands of private railroad corporations. The appropriateness of the analogy will be apparent to those who are aware that at least 90 per cent. of the assets of the railroad companies of New Jersey, consist not in *wealth*, but in land values and franchise values, which are not the product of human labor but which are created by the presence of the people as a whole, and which therefore *belong* of right, to the people as a whole.

When a citizen of a non-monopolistic corporation acquires property, full value must be paid, representing just so much labor performed, and then that property remains subject to the prevailing tax rate. The immensely valuable franchises in the possession of the railroad companies are public property, and instead of beclouding the public mind by a discussion as to whether such property should remain in private hands, subject merely to a trifling tax, the people should be informed *that 100 per cent., the whole annual rental value of such franchises* should be taxed into the public treasury, thus proportionately reducing the burden of taxation as laid upon our citizens. The process of educating the public mind is a slow process and yet upon it depends all social progress; our tax laws cannot be made to even approximate justice, until the public shall recognize the natural line of difference between private property, that which human labor has produced, and *public* property, those values which human labor has not produced but which are created by the presence of the whole people. When this natural distinction shall come to be recognized by leaders of public thought, the present unprofitable discussion of "what the public should own" will cease, the real and therefore the practical question is "what *does* the public own?" and the first step toward the solution of our great national problems must be to recognize that the public *does* own land values, including franchise values, even though these be at present regarded as private property.



RADICALISM IN LITERATURE.

PART I. Its Justification.

(For the Review.)

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

Throughout the ages there have been two great themes for the poets, for all the arts in fact, the two great motor impulses that make the world go on: love and hunger. Art puts them in this order of succession, but nature reverses it. With nature as with mankind, hunger comes first and is strongest. The instinct of self-preservation is the first impulse known to the child, and is far stronger, preceding and outliving the instinct for the propagation of the species, the love instinct. Now, as art has been defined for us most cleverly as a bit of nature seen through a temperament, and the poet's temperament, being the temperament of the grown man with higher ideals than those of the multitude, it is natural that the lesser impulse, and the less purely instinctive one, should have most appealed to him. It was the only other thing that could occasionally engage the attention of barbarous man, and make him forget the more primal occupation of seeking his food. Because it was an intermittent interest, and the food seeking was continuous and part of the necessary daily routine, therefore the love instinct seemed something finer and better, and the artist soul, made of finer clay, seized upon it as a special field set apart for the development of beauty through art. But a one-sided beauty is a dangerous

thing, even for genius, which should, and can, lead human thought. While the daily routine of life, that part of man's work and interest impelled by hunger—which includes every means of seeking a livelihood, and incidentally all the work of the world—while this daily routine was rough and rude and brutal, unrelieved by variety or invention, it was around the love impulse that all the finer things of life gathered, all its beauty, its refinement, its daintinesses. Then it was that the poet could sing of love exclusively, and hold his audiences. But even then he sang of hunger and still held them, for he sang of war, and war is but the barbarous expression of the food seeking instinct. So that even in the Dark Ages the poet sang of both love and hunger, more of hunger perhaps than love, even then. The war songs have continued down through the ages to be the only expression in poetry and art of the hunger impulse, and this is just where the division between the New and the Old, between classic and what is specifically known as "modern" literature, in a narrower definition than merely that of literature produced within the last century. The love song has not changed, the technical manner of expression may have changed, and a greater recognition of hunger as a factor even in love, may characterize the modern love literature, but the basic impulse is the same and will be while human nature exists.

But the expression of the hunger impulse is what has changed so entirely with the shaping of modern civilization, and has changed until the motor instinct at the base of it all has been so buried under a mass of refinement of living, of complicated economic and political machinery that we forget that it is still hunger that makes the world go on, just as it did in the days when prehistoric man grubbed for roots or slew the mammoth. The difficulty of finding the single fundamental point in all the complication made the poet forget the importance of the hunger instinct, and for a time it was love and only love that bore the burden of his song. During this time a public taste was formed that still in a measure gives the tune for criticism, unofficial and official, and the modern poet who is returning to the hunger impulse for his theme; in other words, to economic and political conditions . . . because the poet has his finger on the pulse of the age and knows the war song to be out of place, . . . is still misunderstood and not unwillingly recognized. Unless he be a genius, of course, for genius is its own law-giver. Therefore talent, which is the interpreter where genius creates and leads, is the more easily frightened because the less independent, and abides in the safer lower levels that look to the so-called public demand and the chance of royalties for a reward that shall take the place of the less substantial immortality. But it looks as if a too close scrutiny of that most uncertain factor, public taste, and of the possibility of royalties, often results in a missing of both, and the new way of singing of the hunger impulse is winning not only shadowy immortality, but substantial shekels for many of the poets of greater daring. In America last of all, of course; and the critic's lament that American literature does not touch American life, is still all too true, in spite of some brilliant exceptions. A foreigner reading what, from a literary point of view judged by academic standards, is certainly the best in our literature, would gain a very different idea of our mental habit than he would from reading the newspapers. In the one place all activity, a combat all along the line between the Old and the New, economic and political energy, a contest of ideas and actualities stirring and exciting, . . . in the other, calm classic smoothness, psychological hair-splitting, academic serenity. He would wonder, and if he were a man of perspicacity, he would conclude that the mass of the people read the newspapers for information, and literature for amusement, or for a sort of dimly understood uplifting. And he would feel sorry for us, for while newspapers are not reliable guides to thought and while it is very well to have a smoothly kept park in one's mental land-

scape, it is a pity to make over all Nature's wild exuberance into academic gardening.

In Europe, in those countries where the poet is still considered the teacher and preacher, radical thought has long since obtruded itself into literature. And in the literary sense, radical thought means at the last no more than a realization of the fact that all our complicated modern machinery rests upon the same hunger impulse that set some prehistoric savage to grubbing for roots to eat raw. The poet who stands outside the battle line and can see both sides of the question, should always be the one to understand the laws of equal justice, and to recognize the equal rights of man through the veiling of man's jaws. When he does this we have radical thought in literature, and as the creative genius that leads is far less frequent than the sincere talent that interprets the trend of modern thought, modern radical literature has in but few cases been responsible for modern radical economic and political thought, but it is a most interesting measure of the actual spread of the new economic thought, which is but the century-old thought of Justice and Equal Rights.

That it is not the freedom accorded the spoken and written word that fosters radicalism in literature, but the attitude taken by public opinion towards the position the poet should hold, whether it be that of teacher or merely entertainer, is shown by the fact that it is Russia with its rigorous press laws that has the most radical modern literature, Germany coming next, while free England shows comparatively little, and freer America still less. If the poet takes himself seriously as a leader and interpreter of the thought of his nation, he will express that thought, even in the face of probable imprisonment and death. But if he sees that nobody cares for more than entertainment from him, and that he is respected by the shekels he makes in entertaining his audiences, he is not likely to injure his health dealing with more serious subjects. At his best he withdraws into an academic solitude and occupies himself, away from the madding crowd, with the Study of the Beautiful.

This last is justifiable as an art form, and must always be a part of all healthy literature, but no literature is healthy that does not show also a reflecting of the burning questions of the day, a picture of the serious, earnest conflicts of the times. And the most serious question of the day is undeniably the social question, so called, the economic question of the distribution of wealth, which is the present day manifestation of the hunger instinct.

Civilized man considered that he had gone a tremendous step forward along the line of progress when he had clothed the crude satisfying of his hunger in a more refined and dainty way of getting his food, and still further, when he cloaked the basic impulse in all the complication of the modern economic system. His self-satisfaction led him to think that he was progressing in the right direction and that all the advance necessary lay along the same lines, to refine still further the manner of getting food, to complicate still more the economic process. But every now and then some poet-teacher has suggested that a little justice in the distribution would be good, that refinement did not mean all it should, if it were to remain the property of the few. Finally these warners divided into two classes, the teachers proper and the poets proper, those who taught without poetry and those who taught through poetry. The voice of the latter is still as powerful, if he deals sincerely with his mission, and his influence reaches a wider circle than that drawn about the official teacher of any thought.

Through the influence of the poet, the gradual enlightenment of economic and political thought is reflected for all to see, and in every civilized country the frankly radical tendency of the best in the new literature is a cheerful sign of the demand, even if unconscious as yet, for a greater freedom and justice in our economic life. The New Thought in literature, as in every other mani-

festation, must be combative and aggressive at first; must overdraw to make the moral plain to him who will not heed a hint; must exaggerate to drive the lesson home. But the poet can do all this with so much more effect than the teacher proper, for art is a prism that reflects even the sharpest colors in blended beauty, and art's frank appeal to our emotions permits an over-accentuation that would be out of place elsewhere. Therefore the poet is the agitator's and the reformer's chief ally, and it would be a sad day for public opinion in any country, and for that country's literature, when Art is divorced from Life, when the Beautiful only shall be worshipped, and not the living Truth. It would be divorcing the two great motor impulse, Love and Hunger, and considering the lesser, Love, as sufficient to fill the place that should be shared by both.

NOTE.—Part II of Miss Colbron's essay on "Radicalism in Literature," *Some Recent Manifestations*, will appear in our Spring number.—THE EDITOR.



NEW YORK CITY'S PROGRESS IN TAX REFORM.

(For the Review.)

By DURBIN VAN VLECK.

The changes made during the past three years in the method of levying taxes in the City of New York have placed this city in the front rank of municipalities on this question. There is still much to be desired in the way of minor changes, but so much progress has been made that there is little room for criticism. Changes in methods, even though the vicious principle of taxing all property is retained, are interesting to Single Taxers because of the bearing they have on the ultimate introduction of a just system of raising revenue.

Three conspicuous changes have been made in the method of levying taxes since 1902, and all are interesting from the Single Taxer's point of view. These changes are: the 100 per cent. assessment first applied for the tax of 1903; the separation of the land value from the total assessment, introduced first in the tax of 1904; and the publication of the assessments, which has only just been completed for the tax of 1904. All three changes are interesting to the Single Taxers and useful to the student of taxation generally. It is yet too soon to determine what the practical effects of these changes will be, but there can be no doubt that the educational results have already proved gratifying. We can hazard a guess as to some of the direct effects of the changes, and one result which is sure to follow and of which there is already some evidence, is that the mere ownership of land will no longer be as profitable as heretofore. Of course, Single Taxers will recognize this as a result which is bound to follow from an increase in the tax on land values, without a corresponding increase of the amount to be paid on improvements. The 100 per cent. assessment has materially equalized the valuations of vacant and improved real estate, and as a result the land speculators are loud in their complaints and their condemnation of the system which increases the cost of holding vacant lots held for speculative purposes.

It is well nigh impossible to determine the effect on building that the change has had. Other factors bearing on this question have to be considered, such as the new tenement house act and the stricter investigation and supervision by the Building Department of new structures. As a matter of fact during the past year there has been very little building in some of the newer

sections of the city, while in some parts of Brooklyn, with which borough I am most familiar, there has been the greatest activity. This is most noticeable in the Brownsville section, where the Hungarian and Russian Jews have settled by the thousands and land values have doubled and trebled in the course of a year, and where it may be said, parenthetically, that some of the worst features of the over-crowding on the east side of Manhattan are duplicated. I have in mind one row of frame tenements built on the end of a block of otherwise vacant ground, with another row of somewhat smaller tenements erected on the rear of the same lots, while for a distance of about two miles back the vacant farm lands stretch to the shores of Jamaica Bay. Thus we have about sixty families huddled together on a plot 120 x 100 feet in size, with acres on acres of vacant land held at the most exorbitant prices, lying next door. It is a fortunate thing that the limitations of human ingenuity prevent the exercise of private ownership of the air, else these poor sweatshop folk would be absolutely no better off than in the teeming east side of Manhattan, for at this spot they at least get fresh air.

The separation of the land value from the total assessment has undoubtedly had the effect of improving the accuracy of the assessments. Although disliked by the average assessor because of the additional work it entails, such separation has caused a closer approximation of the real value of the parcels assessed. Indeed the desirability of this system was recognized by at least one assessor before the law made it mandatory, and he used it in fixing his assessments, valuing the land of a given acre first, and then adding the value of the improvements. Of course, the chief end in view in the policy of separating the land value from the total is the object lesson it furnishes of the impolicy of assessing improvements at all.

The publication of the assessments is a most desirable factor in the process of educating the public as to the merits and demerits of our tax system. It is to be regretted that the publication in the "City Record" does not occur immediately on the opening of the books to the public in January, so that the taxpayers may take advantage of inequalities that are noted, and ask for a re-adjustment of the assessment. The six months' delay in the publication makes it useless so far as effective protest by the taxpayers is concerned. This is apparent when it is understood that the publication of the lists for 1904 has only just been completed, whereas the time for protesting against the assessments expired on the last day of March last. The tax books for 1905 were opened for the inspection of the public January 9th, and the publication of these assessments will not take place until next October.

It takes six volumes of varying size to publish the lists of the entire City, one volume for each Borough, except Brooklyn, which requires two because of the larger number of parcels, it having about 200,000 pieces of real estate, about twice as many as in Manhattan. The section, block and lot number is given with each parcel, and this is all that is necessary to identify a piece of property. The value of the land is shown in one column and of the property with all improvements therein in a separate column. Other details show the size of the lot, the number of stories of the house, if any, and the street number if known, also, if it be known, the name of the owner.

The publication lacks some things which would make it more useful for purposes of study and comparison. No totals are given, so that it will be impossible to compare the work of 1904 with that of 1905 as a whole, but individual assessments may be compared. There can be no doubt that the administration of the Tax Department has improved very much in the last few years, and while there may be still room for improvement it is also true that the people of this City are much more fortunately situated with reference to this branch of government than perhaps any other American municipality.

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.

WINTER NUMBER, 1905.

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

The special offer of a club subscription of ten names for five dollars still holds. How many of our friends will do that much for the REVIEW? Ten subscribers ought to be easily obtained in any locality. Our readers will also note the special offer we make in the announcement that follows.

The REVIEW wants articles illustrating phases of the taxation question which may be illustrated by photographs, stories of land speculation, histories of great estates, tales of boom towns, etc. Realizing that example is better than precept let our contributors turn to the work of getting articles of this nature before our readers.

Will our foreign correspondents kindly bear in mind that we cannot hear too often from them on the progress of the movement abroad? Will they also remember that perhaps the most interesting information to REVIEW readers are personal sketches of our comrades who are upholding the banner of human freedom in distant lands?

Remember if you want a book of any kind that you can aid the REVIEW by ordering from us. Note in our advertising columns the books that we have for sale, and the special offer covering the anniversary edition of the works of Henry George. Note, too, the special offer in our advertising pages of *Progress and Poverty* in cloth for every two additional subscribers to the REVIEW.

NOTE TO PUBLISHERS.—We will review all works of an economic or radical character, even novels. No book received from any source will remain unnoticed.

THE REVIEW FOR 1905.

Arrangements have been completed for continuing the REVIEW through 1905. But to do this without loss it is necessary that our readers bestir themselves. The cost of the REVIEW is not met by the returns from its subscription list, and humiliating as is this admission, it is the common experience of most reform papers.

The REVIEW is a Single Taxer's publication, and every Single Taxer should feel it his duty to place it on a self-supporting basis. This can easily be done with a little effort. To increase its subscription list we make the following special offer: To every two new subscribers (not renewals) we will forward to any person named a copy of "Progress and Poverty" bound in cloth. Where preferred we will send "Social Problems." This is the Doubleday-Page edition with which most of our readers are familiar, and is a well printed, substantial edition of the work, published for \$1. It will be sent without extra cost for postage. Now here is an opportunity for the clubs of the country. Let them in their organized capacity solicit subscriptions from such of their members as are not subscribers to the REVIEW, and use the volumes of "Progress and Poverty" to which they are entitled for propaganda. In this way they will be able to lend out dozens of copies of the work without expense to themselves, and need not mind if some of the volumes are never returned.

The secretaries could make this a special work, and effect great results. If five thousand copies of "Progress and Poverty" could in this way be placed before the reading public the REVIEW would be in a position to increase its issue by several thousand, and even with the additional cost of these extra thousands would be self-supporting. With the help of the clubs the thing can be done.

It may be asked why not extend the same offer to the old subscribers who renew? The answer is that the REVIEW cannot afford to do so. But every present subscriber of the REVIEW can certainly obtain two others, in which case he will be entitled to the book. This experiment is designed to make the REVIEW self-supporting by the end of 1905, and our readers are urged to do what they can to make the project a success. If every present subscriber will obtain two more the REVIEW will have attained the position no Single Tax organ has ever yet occupied—that of a publication which need look no further than its subscription list for its self-respecting maintenance.

If you receive a copy of this issue of the REVIEW it is an invitation to subscribe.

We crave the indulgence of our contributors because of the interesting communications that are crowded out of this issue.

DEATH OF ARTHUR M. KENNEY.

Arthur M. Kenney, of Elgin, Ill., died December 19, 1904. Mr. Kenney was a believer in the Single Tax and always foremost in promoting the cause. He was a member of the "Elgin Single Tax Club," and was for a long time its president. He was ever ready to discuss the subject and try to interest others in it, and through this means made many converts.

During the past twelve years many Single Tax speakers have visited Elgin and Brother Kenney was always liberal in the use of his time and money to make their work effective.

When the special effort was made in Delaware it was principally through his influence and efforts that a sum of money was contributed from Elgin each month. When reformers combined to establish a "People's Church" in Elgin, which was conducted successfully for fifteen months, and from whose platform many speakers of national reputation addressed large audiences, it was Brother Kenney who raised the funds which made the undertaking possible.

In his connection with labor organizations it has always been his purpose to forward the principles of his faith as much as possible without exciting prejudice.

In Brother Kenney's death our cause has suffered a great loss, and to those who have known him the memory of his life and devoted work will be an inspiration to faithful endeavor toward establishing conditions that will make this world a happier place for coming generations.

AN ELOQUENT TRIBUTE.

A short time ago the REVIEW was called upon to chronicle the death of George Boeck, of Plattsmouth, Nebraska, at an age close to the allotted three score and ten. Mr. Boeck was a faithful worker in the great cause.

His children have now issued for private circulation among friends and believers a short sketch of their father's life, accompanied by the funeral oration delivered at the grave by Hon. J. J. Points. These are contained in a pamphlet printed in beautiful type on heavy paper and bound together with black cord—a fine specimen of the art preservative. Certainly no more fitting tribute could be made by children to a father who in the early days of the movement stood for a maligned and despised truth, and who in his last illness requested that a funeral address should be delivered at his grave by one who shared with him the belief in the true social evangel. The selection fell upon Mr. Points, and most fittingly and gracefully was the assigned commission executed. After a full, yet necessarily brief statement of the principles of the Single Tax, the speaker closes with this fine tribute to Henry George:

"It is often said of Henry George that he was a dreamer. No more glorious tribute is ever paid to any of the sons of men. The architect must dream his dream before the builder can present it in all its perfection of form, color, and usefulness. It comes, hence, that the world owes all that it has in the way of achievement in the past, in the way of opportunity and liberty in the present, in the way of aspiration and hope for the future, to the dreamer. It was a dreamer who, at Bethel, on his way to Padan-Aram, with the sky for a shelter and a stone for a pillow, saw the messengers and received the promise. It was a dreamer who, unconscious of his future glory in Egypt, or his coming power to bless his father's house, saw the slaves of his brethren making obeisance to his own. It was a dreamer who slew the Egyptian oppressor and led a nation from bondage to an independence and a glory which he knew he was not to share, in a land within whose borders he might not set foot. And yet, because he preferred to suffer among his own rather than be called the son of Pharaoh's daughter, we may well say of him:

This was the bravest warrior
That ever buckled sword;
This the most gifted poet
That ever breathed a word;
And never earth's philosopher
Hath traced, with golden pen,
On deathless page, truths half so sage
As he wrote down for men.

And, finally, it was a dreamer who looked down from the cross in the final agony upon a few disheartened followers, too uncertain for action and too fearful for a profession of their faith. And yet, for that pale dreamer, at the distance of nineteen hundred years, millions of men would lay down their lives.

So, when your work is done, when your name is a memory, a history, an inscription, no one will pay you a higher tribute than when he says of you, as men now say of Henry George, "He was a dreamer."

DEATH OF CLINTON FURBISH.

The news of the death of Clinton Furbish will occasion to many of the readers of the REVIEW sincere regret, but little surprise, for Mr. Furbish had been fast failing for nearly a year.

Mr. Furbish was an active Republican up to the time of the nomination of Peter Cooper in 1876 on the Greenback ticket, in which campaign he made many speeches. In 1888 he supported Cleveland for the presidency, actuated to such course by Mr. Cleveland's attitude on the tariff. He served as Chief of the Bureau of American Republics until the close of Cleveland's administration. In 1896 he threw himself with his usual energy and fervor into the Bryan campaign.

Mr. Furbish had among his friends many of the prominent public men of the past and present day, and was full of anecdote and reminiscence. He had perhaps a too great impatience with those who differed with him. But he was a man of very positive convictions and large impetuosity, and to such strong emotions as were always aroused within him by the spectacle of undeserved suffering, much could be pardoned.

He had done good service for the Single Tax cause, and he could say, as was said of Heine by Heine himself, "I was a brave soldier in the war for human freedom."

DANIEL KIEFER'S CHARGES NOT PROVEN.

In a recent issue of the *American Israelite* Daniel Kiefer has a letter referring to an article of his published in the *Public* in which he attempts to trace the origin of anti-Semitic feeling to the caste spirit of the Hebrews and their devotion to plutocracy. He points to the fact that among those who are aiming to abolish special privileges anti-Semitism does not exist. If Mr. Kiefer refers to the Single Tax movement it is equally true that among us there is a like absence of anti-Protestantism, or anti-Catholicism, or any of the hateful "antis" to which anti-Semitism is allied. And the reason for this is the enlightening influence of a truth which substitutes love for hatred.

Prof. Deutsch in another and later issue of the *Israelite* opposes the position taken by Mr. Kiefer, but does so in poor taste, heading his article "The Jewish anti-Semite." If pointing out what one conceives to be a certain tendency of this class of our fellow citizen is to be a Jew hater, then, unhappily, our Jewish friend, Mr. Kiefer, is one. This charge together with a covert sneer at the Vine Street Congregational Church, of which Herbert Bigelow is pastor, and which Mr. Kiefer attends, detracts from the force of Prof. Deutsch's reply.

But we think Mr. Kiefer is wrong, and that he illustrates again the impossibility which Buckle pointed out of bringing "indictments against a whole people." The Jews are no whit more subservient to plutocracy than other groups of our citizens. The allegation that "they acted as a body in 1896 on the side of plutocracy, corruption and legalized plunder," is much too strong. Many, perhaps most, voted the Republican ticket in that year, but as did thousands who were not plutocratic. We would remind Mr. Kiefer that many Single Taxers voted that way, too.

As a matter of fact nearly all reform movements—the Single Tax movement especially—number among their foremost members those of the Jewish persuasion. Their names will occur to the reader without suggestion from us. To their great hearts and splendid intellects the cause of

which Henry George, living or dead, is the leader, owes much.

PASTORIZA'S LOG CABIN.

The log cabin of J. J. Pastoriza is famous in the city of Houston, and its fame has travelled far beyond the boundaries of Texas. The *Houston Daily Chronicle* thus describes it:

"A cosy log cabin, old-fashioned and homely, stands in the outskirts of the South End, and those who look for the first time upon its clapboard room, its mud dobed logs and its homely surroundings are reminded of the days of Daniel Boone and Davy Crockett. The cabin is newly built and the idea of the constructor to reproduce a habitation like those which dotted Texas and American soil in general a century ago, is faithfully carried out.

There is a fence surrounding it of rails like Lincoln split, and in the place of a modern gate an old fashioned stile must be climbed to get within the yard.

The cool, rough board porch fronting the south, the massive post oak foundations, the chimney and wide mouthed fireplace built of sticks and mud, are the markings of the old cabin in which American freedom and greatness were cradled.

It is the Pastoriza Single Tax Cabin—the home of the Single Taxers of Texas.

Mr. Pastoriza is a man of original ideas, and in the edifice he has constructed he has undoubtedly given a most unique monument to the great economic theory of which he is a student and believer.

The cabin stands for simplicity, honesty, sturdy yeomanry—basic requisites for a great people—and it is a worthy symbol of the teachings of Henry George—the new idea which advocates of it believe presages the coming of an Utopian period for a sadly demoralized world."

In answer to an inquiry by a representative of the *Chronicle* Mr. Pastoriza said:

"You ask me why I built a log cabin in the center of the residence district of Houston, with a population of 70,000 people. The object I had in view was to call attention to the Single Tax theory. I selected this particular spot because a company of which I was a member bought about 80 acres of land here and subdivided it into city lots, making from 300 to 400 per cent. on its investment.

"If the Single Tax had been in operation this increase in value would have been taken by the city in the form of taxes and used by it in paving the streets, extending the water mains and lighting the territory. As it is, we few individuals have pocketed the profits, but the streets are unpaved and the territory unlighted, and those who have bought the lots for residence property have not the advantage of city water or sewerage.

"When quite a young man I gave considerable thought to the social conditions of

the country, and often wondered why it was that the man who did the hardest work secured for his use the least money. I saw that the farmers, who produced everything, retained very little of what they produced, while the middle man and speculator reaped a rich harvest. The Single Tax would remedy this, and be a greater benefit to the farmer than any other class of workers.

WHAT "EQUAL TAXATION" REALLY MEANS.

The late political campaign in New Jersey was fought over the question of equal taxation, in which conquest both parties faced each other in what for the most part was a sham battle. Railroad properties in the State are taxed much less proportionately than other properties, and this has been a sore point with the citizen whose civic or direct interest as a taxpayer outruns his apathy. No one believes in the sincere intention of either party to remedy this state of affairs, for the railroads of New Jersey themselves are the final arbiters of the law-making power of the State—for such they have proved themselves to be since the time Charles Sumner confronted with scathing arraignment one of their chief representatives in the United States Senate. The nominating powers of both parties, especially in Hudson County, long the chief sink of political debauchery in the State, are hopelessly corrupt. It is therefore refreshing to read in the *Observer*, of Hudson County, an interview nearly a column in length with Mr. James McIlvaine, of Hoboken, recently appointed chairman of the New Jersey Single Tax League for Hudson County, in which he says:

"Equal taxation is or may be a good thing because of its tendency to equalize the burden of taxpayers, but it does not really mean what its name implies, nor does, nor can anything other than Single Tax, as we Single Taxers advocate, mean equal taxation.

WHAT IT MEANS.

"By Single Tax we mean the taxing of land only at its real value, that is, its market value. If that were done you would not have so much land lying idle, reducing often the value of adjoining property and not infrequently a menace and an eyesore to the community. Take, for instance, that meadow swamp in which so many lives have been endangered and lost and which came near swallowing up a team of horses with a driver and a large truck a few nights ago. That is certainly a public menace. If I am not mistaken the law requires that such property should be filled in, but you see it has not been done.

"If land were taxed on its real value, as we propose that it should, that property, which is now a menace to life and a detri-

ment to property, would long since have been reclaimed and built up.

"Why does your property owner let his land remain idle? Because he is waiting for the value to increase. Who increases the value of land but the community at large, and is it not just then that they should reap the benefit of that increase?

"With land taxed at its real market value all other taxation would be unnecessary and could therefore be abolished. Your railroads would certainly then pay more than the nominal tax which they are now compelled to pay and they would not allow so much land to lie idle. It would not pay to let it lie idle. They would build it up or dispose of it to some one else who would build. The result would be work and wages and better living all around."

GEORGE L. RUSBY.

(See portrait).

George L. Rusby is one of the strong men of the movement whose devotion to the cause is for ever at a white heat. One cannot fail to watch the intense earnestness of his attitude, the strained attention with which he inclines his ear to the arguments for the rebuttal of which he is developing the forces of his keenly logical mind, without feeling that profound interest that comes in observing a man who is intellectually alive in every pore and fibre.

It was said of Thomas Brown, of Rugby, that he rose each morning with the conviction that every question was an unsettled one. Mr. Rusby's mental attitude is of a different sort, but it leads him to regard the questions that mankind have looked upon as impossible of settlement as by no means insoluble in view of the new revelation which Henry George has given to the world, and that all such questions call for a reexamination in the light of the new truth. This manner of regarding the great problems of the universe lends an inexpressible charm of freshness to his speech and conversation.

As a speaker Mr. Rusby is calm, logical and convincing, with an excellent platform presence. His accession to the forces of the Henry George Lecture Bureau, and the fact that the management of this most efficient Bureau under Mr. Frederick H. Munroe will be able to command the services of Mr. Rusby in the lecture fields, mainly in New Jersey where he is best known, is good news for that corporation and monopoly-ridden state. It ought to put new life in the movement in New Jersey where the agitation has been allowed to wane. We desire to call attention to the article from Mr. Rusby's pen on another page.

The Ethics of Democracy is one of the books of the New Church's Educational Association's Reading Course.

DR. MCGLYNN MEMORIAL MEETING.

The fifth anniversary of the death of Dr. Edward McGlynn was held at Murray Hill Lyceum, New York City, on the night of Sunday, January 8th. Sylvester L. Malone, President of the Dr. McGlynn Monument Association, presiding. Among the speakers were Louis F. Post, Cornelius Donovan, Henry George, Jr., Mrs. Marguerite Moore, and Justice Samuel Seabury. The musical programme was rendered by Miss Sophie Fanoni, soprano, and Mme. de Levenoff, pianist, and Master Jones, violinist.

Dr. Funk, who was to have spoken, wrote as follows:

"I trust that a permanent monument may be erected to his memory in this city, the city of so many years of his labor, and which he so well loved. When the time comes that heart is the measure of greatness, Dr. McGlynn will be counted one of the greatest of our men."

Mr. Post spoke of "Those stirring days when his voice rang out full and strong for the Fatherhood of God, the brotherhood of man, and the peace of the world, are fading in the memories of us who have been accumulating years since then; but the memory of the man will never fade. While human brotherhood is a cause to fight for, Father McGlynn's name will be honored and his memory loved."

Hon. John De Witt Warner wrote: "I regret that a prior engagement will prevent my sharing the pleasure of a tribute to the work of Dr. McGlynn, who in his life was one of the most worthy of New York citizens, and whose influence, great then, has steadily increased since he has left us."

THE WORK OF THE MASSACHUSETTS LEAGUE.

The Executive Committee of the Massachusetts Single Tax League has formed plans of work for the current season. Its plans comprise:

1st. Public meetings to be addressed upon the Single Tax, to be held in every Boston ward and in any city or town where the local Single Taxers can arrange a meeting.

2nd. A series of public meetings under the auspices of the League on subjects kindred to the Single Tax, or of present public interest, to be addressed by leading exponents of the particular subjects, such as the Initiative and Referendum, the Eight Hour Law, Public Ownership of Public Utilities, Proportional Representation, etc., each address to be followed by discussion and notices of each meeting to be sent to the individuals and societies who may be interested in the subject of the speaker, thus bringing the League and its work to the attention of reformers who ought to know us and may be in sympathy with us.

3rd. Correspondence with debating societies, high schools, academies and colleges,

with offers to furnish topics for discussion involving the Single Tax and literature bearing on the subject.

4th. Work throughout the State to secure the endorsement of labor unions and others for a law to establish local option in taxation; and

5th. Presentation to the Legislature of the question of local option in taxation and an effort to obtain a hearing on the question.

Under the city ordinances of Boston, on compliance with simple formalities, the use of ward rooms can be obtained for public meetings. One meeting was held on January 5th inst. at the old Franklin school house on Washington street which was addressed by the Rev. Samuel Brazier who while making his address used charts to illustrate the subject, and afterwards questions were invited and answers made. A similar meeting is in process of arrangement to be held in one of the Charlestown wards.

The committee on correspondence with debating societies in high schools, etc., has begun its work by obtaining lists of such societies and has prepared the following series of questions for debate, and will be glad of any suggestions to enlarge the list.

1. Would the Single Tax method of raising public revenue be beneficial or otherwise to a community?

2. What would be the effect of the Single Tax on

- (a) Wages?
- (b) Capital?
- (c) Rent?
- (d) Wealth production?
- (e) On the moral condition of society?

3. Would it be most advisable to apply the Single Tax at once by substituting it for all other taxation for revenue, or gradually by remitting other taxes as the Single Tax was increased?

4. Is private property in land justifiable morally or economically?

5. What would be gained economically and morally by substituting direct taxation for our present methods?

6. What effect would the Single Tax have on trust monopoly?

JAMES R. CARRET,
Secretary *pro tem*.

Boston, January 11th, 1905.

Senator Depew said in a recent speech, "Great Britain is about to abandon free trade." This will happen about the time Senator Depew has abandoned his role of court fool. Yet it is a mistaken view to regard Senator Depew exclusively in the guise of a king's jester. He is not a fool, he is what James Payn, the novelist, used to call a foolometer—namely, an instrument by which the common foolishness may be accurately gauged.

News—Domestic.

ALABAMA, DAPHNE.—(Special Correspondence.—E. Q. Norton).—For some time I have had in mind the sending of a report showing something of the growth of sentiment here in this section, regarding the question of taxation; more especially the growing dissatisfaction with reference to the present method of taxation. Once each year, at least, an expert official examines the books of the county officials of all the 67 counties and makes an heroic attempt to get the tax books in such a shape that he can report favorably upon them. They will compare favorably with the books of other states, but there is no possibility of there being that correctness demanded by a good business house. Aside from the countless opportunities for favoritism, or the countless methods there are for concealing, underestimating or transferring property, there is the lack of uniformity of application of the law, not only in all parts of the same county, but as between the different counties of the state. To properly assess the property of taxpayers, one would need an infinite knowledge of the "true market value" of all things, and this knowledge no one has. Investigation shows one taxpayer is assessed less than \$1,000 on personal property, although having a large house filled with H.H. goods, the character and value of which can be judged somewhat by the fact that one rug cost \$5 and another cost \$1,000. But it is of the difficulties in the bookkeeping part of the present tax system, that I would more especially refer to now, and in furtherance of this, I quote the following from the *Mobile Register*.

"There are some sentences in Special Examiner Chaudron's recent report on the tax collector's office that should receive the attention of all who are interested in the proper administration of the county's affairs. Referring to the accounts of the office under examination, Mr. Chaudron says:

"The systems employed are so far removed from even the ordinary forms of good bookkeeping and so replete with errors of every nature that the task has been a puzzling and tedious one. Under the circumstances there was nothing to do but lay aside everything except the tax book itself. This involved patience and extreme care. There is no coherence between one book and another. Abatements appear on one book, and there is no counter book whereby to check.

"I am informed that an abatement book was kept, but it is contended that the law authorizes its destruction after five years. The cash book is valueless, as many of the stub books are lost and many pages of the cash book are not footed. The references to 'doubles' on the assessment are frequently confusing, and it is difficult to verify some of them.

"The so-called 'error book' (supposed to

be a book of corrections) is surcharged with annoying minor errors. It is safe to say that on this book alone there are no less than 900 clerical errors. A compilation of these is shown on Exhibit 'A.' The vital differences occur in this way."

An "error book" of some eighty pages that contains 900 mistakes of clerical nature is certainly appropriately named, but the erroneous "error book" is but a symptom of the disease. The whole system of account is declared to be "far removed from even the ordinary forms of good bookkeeping" and "replete with errors." Under the circumstances, there is no way of protecting the public interest; and, moreover, the official who is responsible to the taxpayers is at the mercy of his own bookkeeping. We can easily understand that the most well-intentioned official would get himself into a financial mess by means of a system of this sort.

If such is found to be the condition of the books of one department of the county government, like conditions may exist in other departments, although, of course, we have no other reason for thinking that they do exist. Grand juries make periodical efforts to examine the several books and accounts, but it is only a perfunctory performance, as the juries admit in the reports they make to the court. It appears, therefore, that it would be a wise and business-like procedure to institute an auditing or accounting office, with regular examination of all the books of the county, first requiring that a proper system of accounting be introduced in the several offices. In the end much money may be saved by this process."

I commented upon this in my paper the *Standard* as follows:

"The condition to which the above refers is not confined to the city or county of Mobile. It is inseparable from the system, or rather lack of system. No private business could be long conducted, if carried on as is the tax department of the city, county and state. Why longer continue a system which every intelligent person condemns? It is simply impossible for the most expert and honest of accountants to keep a correct account of all the assessments, and where an official has to depend upon clerical aid he is more or less at the mercy of his assistants. It is a waste of time to enumerate the defects of the so-called "system," for it is wrong in principle and absolutely unworkable. We must come, sooner or later, to the system of assessing all taxes upon the annual rental value of the land alone. This is the ideally perfect tax system, in that it complies with all the requirements of the canons of taxation. It is simple, effective, absolutely just, least expensive in its operation, most practical and profitable to the state in its results, while being least burdensome to the taxpayers, giving no advantage to one person at the expense of others, and

encourages enterprise, rewards industry and honesty, and it should be adopted without further delay."

CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.—(Special Correspondence.—Ralph Hoyt).—Now that the national campaign is entirely out of the way, and people have tired of talking about it, there is a much better opening for Single Taxers to get in their work for the only true and logical method of bringing about the desired change in our social and industrial system. It is comparatively easy now to interest people in Single Tax principles. It is so in this southern section of California, and I learn from reliable sources that such is the case in northern portions.

Los Angeles is still booming; it is rapidly increasing in population and wealth. It is also increasing in the number of people who are sufficiently intelligent to understand that in order to create and continue a condition of genuine prosperity there must be a solid basis beneath the outward movements in the matter of trade activity, and the erection of new and costly buildings. True, we have in this city only a very few avowed Single Taxers, but scores of people are beginning to get a peep at "the cat," and the more they see of it the more they manifest a desire to follow up their investigations. And that's where good Single Tax literature comes in to great advantage. At present I have a moderate supply of such documents for (free) distribution; but I shall soon need more.

A few months ago I received a call from Herman Hetzel, of Philadelphia, who spent several hours with me at my home. I regarded it as a rare good fortune. We talked over the famous Delaware campaign of 1896. Hetzel was then and is yet a war-horse in the Single Tax army, as everybody knows who is acquainted with him and his methods. He was charmed with California, and especially with Los Angeles.

W. J. Danforth, a former attorney of Chicago, and an uncompromising Single Taxer, is now a resident of this city. He recently accepted an invitation to deliver an address before the Progressive Club, which holds free public meetings every Sunday. The audience was large, and decidedly mixed, a big percentage of those present being Socialists—as was expected—for it was announced that such Utopians would be permitted to reply to the speaker of the day, which a few of them did. All that they said, however, failed to shake one single argument set forth by Danforth, whose address was a splendid effort, and delivered in a calm, scholarly, but earnest manner. He made a fine impression on all who heard him without prejudice. His speech appeared in the *Herald* the next morning. He will doubtless prove a very valuable accession to our small force of Single Tax speakers in the Angel City.

A few weeks ago I received a call from

J. G. Wright, of Berkely, accompanied by his wife. Mr. Wright had been spending several months at the Exposition in St. Louis, and had also visited friends in Canada and elsewhere. He was full of enthusiasm over the progress our cause is making in Eastern centres.

At present we are looking forward with intense pleasure to the time when we will have John Z. White here for a good long campaign. We hope then to create a revival of enthusiasm in behalf of equal rights for all, with special privileges for none. White is just the man needed out here. I have heard him speak many times in Chicago, and had the honor of introducing him to large audiences. I have announced the fact that he is booked for this coast next spring, and have secured many mentions of his assignment to this region in various newspapers. If White comes here he will have a chance to reach thousands of people who need to learn what the Single Tax means from just such a logical, clean-out reasoner.

ILLINOIS, CHICAGO.—(Special Correspondence.—G. J. Foyer).—The Chicago Single Tax Club scored a decisive victory in the Fall election by the adoption of the referendum vote upon Home Rule in Taxation. The efforts of the club to secure the presence of this measure upon the "Little Ballot," which was carried throughout the State, was perhaps one of the important advances made toward the Single Tax. The bankers throughout the State to whom we had sent letters along this line had endorsed the move, and were lending their influence to secure votes in their community for local option or Home Rule in taxation.

The past Presidential election is itself a very healthy sign. As shown by the returns many States cast a large vote for Roosevelt and at the same time elected Democratic Governors. The vote cast for Socialism also contains a promise, and this vote more than any other will cause the politicians much worry and induce them to make further strides toward justice. The club continues to meet and discuss subjects of the day, while it waits for the opportunity to exercise its influence in local as well as State politics. At this time of the year the only opportunity for the members of the club is to discuss the coming spring election, in which we will endeavor to become an active force. We have through the winter months tried to enter the political arena on questions not in the public eye, but up to date have been unable to gain admittance. It is the desire of the club to have a representative upon the committee to draw a new charter for the City of Chicago. If the Legislature of Illinois will adopt the measure of the "Little Ballot" in regard to taxation, and a suitable charter can be secured for Chicago, the fight will then be made at home and can be made with effect.

MASSACHUSETTS, WOLLOSTON.—(Special Correspondence.—Eliza Stowe Twitchell.)—There is little doing here at present for the propaganda of the Single Tax, at least, directly; but indirectly, the cause is advancing. Formerly, when anything was accomplished, there was the direct work of some enthusiastic friend of the cause behind it. Now, all is changed, but the seed that was then sown seems spreading in all directions.

The Mayor of Boston has recently vetoed a "right of way" given by the Aldermen of Boston to a railroad for a two-mile franchise, on the ground that "the time has come when the public should exact from every company or individual seeking the use of public property (land values) the value of the privilege sought." That is good Single Tax doctrine, and it is commended by the daily press.

President Eliot continues to enlighten the public on the subject of Labor Unions, although what he does not know of their usefulness would fill volumes. But representing, as he does, the highest institution of learning in the land, he assumes to know as much about the Labor Question as about his Greek lexicon, and talks down to President Gompers and his large following as though they were his school boys of the fifth grade. He assures them upon his word of honor that they constitute a monopoly, according to the root meaning of the word; but a monopoly of what he does not state. I suppose he thinks that they monopolize the opportunities to work. Some Single Tax brother, who is a prominent member of the Labor Unions, ought to enlighten President Eliot on this point, and show him that it is *land held out of use, or unjust laws*, which grant social privileges that monopolize the opportunities to labor.

If President Eliot understood this, he could confine his instructions to the subject of the dignity of labor, especially manual labor. His imagination is almost creative upon this subject. He has already told the public of his regret that he was not, at one time in his life, a coal digger, and has written a prose poem on the enthusiasm for work in a field so full of danger and hardships as a coal mine; but he always leaves out of his poem the root of all enthusiasm, viz.: the hope of reward, in proportion to the sacrifice.

Another means by which progress is being made, along our lines, indirectly, is the coming address before the Economic Club by Prof. Seligmann sometime in January, on the subject "Of the advisability of taxing the future unearned increment."

This club is a very influential one, consisting of about five hundred members, most of whom are men of light and leading, well known in Boston for either their wealth or their professional or literary ability.

Charles Francis Adams is a member, and

when the arrangements were being discussed in regard to Prof. Seligmann's lecture he made a brief but forceful address in its favor, frankly avowing (as he has done before) his belief in the Single Tax as the cheapest, most just, and most scientific of any system of taxation.

At the same meeting (which was under the direction of C. B. Fillebrown) the chairman of the Rapid Transit Commission for the City of Boston also expressed himself in favor of the Single Tax, so far as he understood it, and favored a lecture upon this new and interesting subject.

Rapid Transit in Boston has greatly increased the rents in some of the most desirable locations. For instance, at the Park Street terminal of the Subway where thousands of passengers are landed daily for shopping in Boston, and where the stores opposite would naturally receive their increase of trade, the rents have risen far beyond the volume of trade. For one store the landlord has increased the rent from \$8,000 to \$12,000. Every clerk in that store will have to work harder to pay that tax of \$1,000 per month. Merchants and manufacturers know no other way of meeting additional expenses but to lower wages.

Could they but realize that every public improvement is a social gain which adds value to land, what quick work they would make of socializing ground rents.

But to-day nearly every clerk in that store on Tremont street would scoff at the idea that his wages would rise as soon as ground rents were socialized. That question is too complex for them to understand, but many of our merchants and manufacturers are beginning to regard it as a wise move to tax the future unearned increment and so abolish all taxes on merchandise.

In this way our cause follows somewhat the movement of the anti-slavery reform. Those early advocates of freedom sowed the seed in the early dawn, and it was reaped by the Republican party, most of whom were neither abolitionists nor reformers, and for many years it was quite generally believed by the rising generation that it was Lincoln who freed the slaves by his emancipation proclamation. So, again, when we who have labored in the early dawn have done our work and at the close of day have entered into our rest, other hands will take up the task of gathering the harvests—of changing the incidence of taxation—little realizing, perhaps, the far-reaching effects of their work for the comfort, the happiness and progress of the human race.

"Never yet
Share of Truth was vainly set
In the world's wide fallow;
After hands shall sow the seed,
After hands, from hill and mead
Reap the harvest yellow."

MICHIGAN, DETROIT.—(Special Correspondence.—H. M. Holmes.)—Michigan Sin-

gle Taxers have recently been visited and "touched" by that prince of organizers, Mr. Frederick H. Monroe, manager of the Henry George Lecture Association. He relieved them of a good deal of their Christmas money, but incidentally he stirred up their enthusiasm for the cause.

During the recent election there were two Single Taxers on the Democratic legislative ticket in Detroit. They were Frank P. Dwyer and Tom Bawden. The latter is a street orator and is called a "bawler" by the local organ of the Employers' Association, but he is popular with the rank and file. This was shown by the votes. We have a primary election system in this county, and nineteen Democrats came forward to secure the eleven places on the ticket. Their order on the primary ballot was determined by lot, and Baldwin drew the ninth place. In the voting he came out sixth, and in the election, therefore, his name stood sixth in the list of eleven. The entire Democratic slate was defeated, not a Democrat being elected to the Legislature in all of Michigan—such is the effect of a "safe and sane" policy—but Bawden came out second on the Democratic side in the number of votes, and this in spite of the fact that the Municipal League and Saloon men both refused to indorse him.

Tom Bawden continues to edit his *Commonwealth*, which is keeping up the work of education in Detroit. We also have a new paper called the *United States Daily*, which is edited by that well known Single Taxer and cultured man, Willis J. Abbott. His editorials are a source of constant delight to all who have "seen the cat," and must set thousands of others to thinking. This paper is run on a new plan. It has a trading stamp scheme as its basis. It is sold on the street like other papers for one cent a copy, it is distributed by advertisers to their regular customers, and on the corners are colored coupons which can be detached and exchanged for papers or for cash, or for goods of different kinds.

In Detroit, also, there is another afternoon paper called *The Times*, whose editor is an out-and-out socialist, and who isn't afraid to say so. This is better than a slavish acceptance of the old explanations of economic phenomena, and tends to make readers think.

The Detroit Sunday *News-Tribune*, while not committed to our ideas, is owned by Hon. James E. Scripps, State Senator and a man who had come to believe, even before Henry George wrote "Progress and Poverty," in the policy of taxing land values only for local and State purposes. Mr. Scripps had thought it out for himself. While no longer engaged in newspaper work, he writes an article for every issue of the Sunday paper on a wide range of subjects, and occasionally takes up the tax question and deals with it in a very intelligent manner.

We have reason to believe that true

democratic ideas are taking a deep hold on the citizens of this State, even if they are not clear enough in their thinking and voting to give them practical effect in the Legislature. The greed and arbitrary methods of the franchise-owning corporations are doing their natural work, paving the way to the destruction of all privilege founded upon law.

I would advise Single Taxers who like to "keep up" in economic literature, to get and read "The Distribution of Wealth," a recent book by Prof. Carver, of Harvard. While the Malthusian theory and the alleged law of diminishing returns are taught, he is not confused as regards land and capital, he calls rent-takers "parasites," and he squints very hard at the Single Tax. I wouldn't be surprised to hear all the college professors of political economy come out in a few years for the Single Tax, claiming that they had always believed in it and were its first and only true friends.

PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA.—(Special Correspondence.—W. L. ROSS).—The Sunday evening meetings of The Henry George Club began the first Sunday after election, but have not been as well attended as usual owing to the fact that the hall was not comfortably heated and had to be abandoned for a more suitable meeting place. The club has secured a large room from the Independence Club where John Z. White will be the principle speaker at the first meeting on January the 8th. The location and room are both attractive, and the programme, which is excellent as the result of the painstaking and very able efforts of the secretary, Mrs. E. B. Montgomery, is sure to bring good audiences to these meetings.

Considerable interest has been aroused here in the Single Tax Colony at Fairhope. Mr. R. F. Powell has been quite successful in his management of the Fairhope Improvement Company and is just completing the building of a number of cottages. They are all sold or rented and the demand seems greater than the supply. The Company has also purchased the Fairhope Hotel and is improving the building, when it will be transferred to Edwin S. Ross, who will re-furnish and operate it.

The Central Single Tax Club, of Philadelphia, the success of which is due largely to the efforts of Mr. William Ryan, gave its first annual banquet at Odd Fellows' Temple in November. About eighty people were present and the affair was a success in every respect. Henry George, Jr., Hon. Robert Baker, S. C. Sweezy, H. L. Ross, Frank Stephens and Mrs. Florence A. Burleigh were among the speakers. Mrs. Wm. Wallace, president of the club, presided.

TENNESSEE, MT. PLEASANT.—(Special Correspondence.—A. Freeland).—Dr. J. C. Barnes, of Arcola, Ill., one of the Old Guard, recently passed through this state. He reported that Ross Wynn, for years a

brilliant anarchist writer, at present residing in Pulaski, this state, is now a Single Taxer.

W. E. Alexander, of Lewisburg, who has a score of converts to his credit in Marshall County, writes me that an old schoolmate, Rev. W. B. Nance, a missionary to China, recently returned on a visit, called on him and congratulated him as a brother single taxer. He had read some of Henry George's work while in China and declared that he "regarded single tax as the ushering in of God's Kingdom on Earth." Both then turned their batteries on the missionary's brother, the leading merchant of Lewisburg, with good prospects of effecting a speedy capitulation.

Alexander's latest converts are the Gregorys, father and son, photographers, the former an exceptionally clear thinker and lucid reasoner.

Ellis Cocke, Esq., a Federal Court lawyer of Nashville, will have a bill introduced at the present session of the Legislature, known as the "Volunteer Homestead Law."

The bill is simply an enabling act, authorizing the establishment of volunteer homesteads in aid of the public schools of the various counties of the State. Such counties as choose to avail themselves of the act may solicit contributions of land or money; the latter in any sum from one dollar up, the same to be applied to the purchase of urban or rural lots, these to be leased to worthy landless poor at 6 per cent. per annum of original cost.

Mr. Cocke believes that in fifty years the public schools will draw a regular income, sufficient for their entire support, from this source.

Many educators, including State Superintendent of Public Education Mynders, are said to be heartily in favor of the bill.

Single Taxers will doubtless write to Mr. Cocke, Prof. Mynders, and their respective representatives in the Legislature and to their local papers, urging their support of the measure, with the amendment that the rental shall be "6 per cent. of the annual assessed value."

The *Memphis News-Scimitar* urges the following experiment in taxation. It would have the State exempt real-estate from taxation and reduce the State tax rate on personal property to four mills on the dollar. It would place heavy penalties on tax-dodging. Between the light tax rate and the heavy penalty the *News-Scimitar* believes that it would be feasible to "remove all State taxes on land and thus dispose of the jealousies between different communities as to which possesses the highest and pays the most towards the State expenses."

U. S. Senator Carmack is one of the owners of this paper. State Senator Rains, an active Bryan Democrat, is the principle owner. These are leaders of Tennessee's Democracy (?)

News—Foreign.

TORONTO.

CHEERING NEWS FROM CANADA.

The news of the passing of the \$700 Exemption Act in Toronto by a referendum of the voters, which was carried by a majority of 7,327, will come as a cheering message to Single Tax workers everywhere. This together with the adoption by the city of Edmonton, Alta., of a measure permitting the exemption of all improvements, shows that our brothers of Canada have worked to some purpose. No wonder that there is a feeling of exhilaration at these steps which brings measurably nearer the abolition of all taxes on improvements. The *Toronto News* prints interviews with Messrs. W. A. Douglas, Vice-President of the Single Tax Association of Toronto, A. C. Thompson, its president, A. B. Farmer, its secretary, and Ald. Dr. Noble. The last named has this to say: "I am father of the \$700 tax exemption scheme. I am glad it has passed, and I think it will prove a good thing. Personally, I intend to push it along in the Legislature at as early a date as possible. I believe, according to *The World*, that Prof. Goldwin Smith recently stated that if we kept on increasing the taxes of the rich man that the latter would cease to be charitable. We don't want charity, and we don't want paupers. We desire every Canadian to have a home of his own; and I believe this is a step in the right direction."

PROGRESS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Indications are not lacking that the movement in Great Britain is gathering strength as it proceeds. A letter addressed to the President of the National Liberal Federation by the Tyneside branch of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values containing the following significant paragraph is signed by Chas. Trevelyan, M.P., who is the President of the League, and bears the name among others of Augustine Birrell, who is far better known in the United States as a brilliant essayist than as land reformer or member of Parliament, in which august body he has served for many years with signal ability:

"We hope that this does not imply that the National Liberal Federation intends to meet the 'raging and tearing propaganda' for tariff reform with a merely negative policy. This, in our opinion, would be a very grave mistake, not only as a matter of principle but also as a matter of tactics. The word of command by leaders to the Free-traders of Britain should not be 'As you were,' but 'Forward! Not less Free Trade, but more.' It is far the most important part of the duty of the Progressive leaders to-day to create a strong hope in the mind of the average man that a Liberal Government will mean radical and fearless social reform. Disappointment and dissatis-

faction are steadily growing that the official utterances are still chiefly confined to attacking Mr. Chamberlain and not to constructive reform."

The Tyneside manifesto presenting the alternative of the Chamberlain fiscal policy is as good a Single Tax pamphlet as has been issued in Great Britain and is given prominent place in the *Manchester Guardian*:

"To-day the land tax is still levied on the values of 1692, and, instead of one twenty-fifth part of our national revenue, it yields only £750,000 out of £140,000,000, or one 188th. If levied on present values the land tax would realize £40,000,000, the land values of the United Kingdom being estimated by the 'Financial Reform Almanack' at £200,000,000 per annum. Under this land tax, therefore, the landlords pay every year 39¼ millions sterling less than they ought to pay, and as a necessary consequence the labor and capital of the country are forced to pay under other taxes 39¼ millions every year more than they ought to pay

"If there is to be a fiscal inquiry this 'land tax fraud' which has lasted for upwards of two centuries must be inquired into—must be put right. And we must also put right the frauds of later date, the doles given to the landlords and the parsons by the present Government of landlords.

"By these means we should obtain a revenue of £48,000,000 a year, with which we might (1) introduce payment of members and of election expenses, £1,000,000; (2) abolish the breakfast table duties, £6,750,000; (3) establish old-age pensions, £25,000,000; (4) repeal the coal tax and the sugar tax and take 1d. off the income tax, £9,500,000; present yield of land tax, £750,000; total, £43,000,000."

In the United Kingdom at present some 12,000,000 acres of good cultivable land, capable of supporting a family to every five or ten acres, are held idle for deer forests, game preserves, &c., while millions of acres more are only half used, "labour-starved." Were the land tax of 4s. in the pound levied on the full yearly value of all land, whether in use or not, these 12,000,000 acres would soon be put to use. This means that 1,200,000 families, or 6,000,000 men, women and children would be drafted from the slums and the mining districts into the country. There would be 1,200,000 families fewer competing for wages in the towns and the mining districts, therefore higher wages; 1,200,000 families fewer competing for house room, therefore more house room for those left behind and lower house rents. . . .

These 1,200,000 families on the now derelict 12,000,000 acres would afford a home market of upwards of £62,000,000 per annum for all the products of mine and factory, while the great increase in the amount of home-grown food would immensely strengthen the position of the Empire.

The existing system of local taxation is most absurd and suicidal. . . . The fines levied on houses, shops, warehouses, fac-

tories, and machinery amount to from £40,000,000 to £50,000,000 a year. But the dog-in-the-manger monopolist who holds land idle, and thereby holds labour and capital idle and seriously hampers our trade and industry, pays not a penny in rates. . .

"Not less Free Trade, but more!" must be our battle-cry. We must free not exchange only but production also from tax burdens and from monopoly. To free production we must free the land."

The London County Council on November 22 recommended:

"That the Council reaffirms its opinion in favour of the direct rating of site values; and that it be referred to the Parliamentary Committee to approach the members of Parliament representing London constituencies with a view to their balloting for a place next session for a Bill on the subject of the rating of site values."

NEW SOUTH WALES.

PREMIER CARRUTHERS A SINGLE TAXER.

No more cheering news has come from Australia than the following culled from an English newspaper, and communicated by a Sydney correspondent:

"A representative deputation waited on the Premier to-day to ask that in any amendment of municipal legislation the principle of taxing the unimproved value of land should be the basis adopted, in lieu of the existing system, taxation upon the rental and capital values. The Premier said he needed no advocacy of the principles to convince him of its soundness. What they now desired to see was that the long series of years of advocacy should be crowned by the performance necessary to make the principle law. He hoped that during their tenure of office this Government would, in regard to the question of municipal reform and local government, prove their claims to the title of Liberals. If the Government survived measures of this character would be passed. So far as its basic principle was concerned, taxation on the unimproved value of land would be introduced. He did not favor the optional system in regard to local government. To do otherwise would only create a difficulty someone else would have to face and sweep away later on. So far as the question of rural government was concerned, there could be only one sound basis of taxation—the unimproved value of land. In respect of municipalities the question was undoubtedly complicated, and perhaps the Government would be compelled to put in an optional clause. He was quite satisfied, however, that in practice the principle would so commend itself that the ratepayers would exercise the option and practise the system of unimproved value taxation. The thrifty and industrious should not be penalized. He felt sure that all had experienced

the injustice of the existing system. The man who improved his property even by adding a room found that an increased tribute was demanded of him, while the owner of an adjoining allotment, probably used as a refuse tip, escaped. The proposed change must benefit everyone. During the general election he was twitted with being a Single Taxer. He could tell them that he still continued to support the body advocating the Single Tax, and he trusted to be able to continue to give his mite in the same direction. He would deem it a great honor if this Government were privileged to pass legislation which made for the development of freedom and the industrial life of the people. He could not, however, promise to introduce a short measure during the present session to give power to the municipalities to tax the unimproved value of land. The days of this session were already numbered. The Government had a big task before them to accomplish in a few weeks, but without fail next session this matter would be tackled, and if they could not overcome this question it would overcome the Government. The question would be whether this State was going to have local government and amended municipal government, or whether the Government were going to continue in existence. There would be no shirking the question. Either they would carry out the reform or others would take their places."

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND.

The land reform movement has been pushed forward with considerable vigor during the last three months. In the House of Representatives a debate has taken place of a nature which clearly shows that our principles are in the domain of practical politics. The best speeches on the side of the land reformers were delivered by Mr. G. Fowlds, President of the Single Tax League of New Zealand, Mr. Bedford, senior member for Dunedin, Mr. Taylor, Mr. Ell and Mr. Laurenson. All of these speakers showed a clear grasp of economics and are in earnest for land reforms. The speeches on the other side were very good considering the bad cause they had behind them. Such debates as this among our legislators must call public attention to the land question.

The Secretary of the Labor Department, Mr. Tregear, who is a very able man and who has without doubt a most complete knowledge of the labor laws of this colony, has addressed a circular to the Premier pointing out the evils of land monopoly and showing in a concise manner how the private ownership of ground rent is absorbing the high wages of the workers and nullifying the effect of all human legislation. The remedy suggested, however, is not of much value, and the Wellington Single Tax League has passed a magnificent series of resolu-

tions showing that the taxation of land values is the only effective remedy.

A very successful Single Tax social was held in Wellington on October 17th, about 120 persons being present. Mr. O'Regan presided and referred to the policy of Mr. Chamberlain, which was forcing the attention of Liberals to the taxation of land values as an alternative policy. Three members of Parliament also spoke. There have been no polls on the proposal to rate unimproved values lately, but I understand an effort will be made in that direction in Auckland before long. Single Taxers in New Zealand were shocked to hear of the sudden death of Mrs. Henry George and unite in sending their sympathy to the family of the great leader.

GEORGE STEVENSON.

DENMARK.

That the Single Tax movement in Denmark is progressing most favorably is shown by the fact that the party is already strong enough to have its own paper, a little monthly, the title page of which reads as follows:

The Right.

A Journal for Human Rights and Land Rights.

Organ of the Danish Henry George Movement.

Published by a circle of disciples of Henry George.

The third number for December, 1904, contains a portrait of Leo Tolstoy and an article on Tolstoy, making a point of the Russian thinker's espousal of the ideas of Henry George; further, a resumé of "The Programme laid down by Henry George"; an extract from "Progress and Poverty" (one of a series giving the main points of the book), and a very interesting article entitled "Denmark's Pearls," showing the danger to a country of unhindered private ownership of land by taking the example of the beautiful little island of Møen, one of Denmark's beauty spots, whose owners threaten not only to cut off the famed sea cliffs from public use, but to cut them down for the rock. It would be a desecration worse than that going on in the Palisades on the Hudson, for the destroying of the Møen cliffs would not only rob Denmark of one of its greatest landscape beauties, but would lay the fertile land behind the cliffs open to the fury of the Baltic storms. The Danish Single Taxers have thoroughly grasped the idea that such individual greed is not to be prevented by any other legislative action than by a change in the taxation of land values. The little monthly contains further news from the movement throughout Denmark, a list of meetings and speeches showing most encouraging activity, and news of all political movements and doings in which the party is interested. An extra sheet containing an article on "What the

Individual Owes to the Community," written by the Danish Single Tax leader, Sophus Bertelsen, for a Danish journal, *The New Century*, is given with the December issue. In Denmark as in Germany the postal card is considered an important means of propaganda, and the Danish Single Tax postal is illustrated by a reproduction of a sculptured bust of Henry George, with the motto "Charity may rest upon Justice, but cannot take its place."

Of all European Single Tax factions, the Danish "Henry George League" as its name implies, rests entirely upon the ethical and fiscal teachings of Henry George, and follows out his theories with completeness.

GOOD NEWS FROM VANCOUVER, B. C.

A Single Tax proposition is to be introduced in the Vancouver city council. Alderman Francis Williams, who has just been elected, is furthering the plan. Under the present assessment plan 50 per cent. of improvements are exempt. Williams' plan is to exempt 70 per cent. of the value of improvements and to increase the rate on the land assessment to make up the deficiency.

TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

The work of the Henry George Lecture Association has been continued regularly since the last report in the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*. Lectures have been delivered in Missouri, Iowa, Nebraska, Illinois and Pennsylvania.

There is without doubt a growing belief that our industrial affairs are in a deplorable condition, and a well settled opinion that the situation results from a mistaken application of legal power includes an ever widening circle.

This recognition of wrong is undoubtedly the first step that must be taken, for if there is no disease there surely is no need to discover and apply a remedy. Facts, however, are daily enforcing the lesson. One newspaper, to-day, tells of 16,000 men, women and children at the door of starvation in Fall River, Mass., because of failure of demand for cotton goods. The explanation was originally offered that the high price of raw cotton necessitated an advance of the manufactured article, with, of course, declining sales. Just now planters are burning cotton because of its low price.

The same paper tells of the arrest of an old man and his wife (man 80, woman 71) because the police found them in possession of all sorts of goods bought at auction and bargain sales. The woman was five days in a cell without knowing with what crime she was charged. Investigation showed that they merely had a silly notion of buying these things because they were cheap. Upon being brought into court not a scin-

tilla of evidence of guilt was forthcoming. There was nervous collapse for the poor old lady, however. She fainted when told of what she had been suspected.

Now, why the suspicion? Just one ground for it. They were evidently poor, and therefore possession of these curiously assorted goods, instead of being nine points of the law in their favor was, in the opinion of Captain Daly, of the New York police force, ten points against them. When told the facts by the old man, the police captain laughed and said, "You will have to invent a better story."

If the good captain had strayed into the home of some art collector of wealth he would not have made an arrest. But why the difference—one is doubtless as silly as the other? What is Rockefeller "collecting" a thousand millions of dollars for? Is he not as silly as the old couple? The truth is plain. Poverty has come (not avowedly, but in fact) to be recognized as a crime—or the cause of it.

Meanwhile, the Board of Health is very thorough in New York. After a patient recovers from a contagious disease it fumigates the premises in the interest of higher hygiene, or higher criticism, or something. In order to secure this elevation it, by its minions, removed a child of one and a half years, just recovering from a complication of pneumonia and measles, from a warm to a cold room. The baby died. The New York Board of Health doesn't treat the babies of the rich to lessons in higher hygiene. It is a crime to be poor. Day after day the good people of this Republic are being taught lessons in freedom that look so much like Russian tyranny that only an expert government official, on a salary, can tell the difference.

Perhaps, in time, the feeling will penetrate the understanding—in which case we will—ah—dig another canal! That will stimulate trade, which is heaven—by the way, the old couple were stimulating trade, and were arrested. Perhaps the police captain could be charged with blasphemy.

Mr. White's tour in Missouri included a number of cities, among them St. Louis, Jefferson City and Kansas City. At St. Louis the Fair and its accompaniments held the center, both ends, and the rest of the stage. Still he had the good fortune to meet several audiences, owing largely to the active interest of J. W. Steele. A class of young men in one of the Episcopal churches is reading and discussing "Progress and Poverty." They were much pleased to listen to an address that outlined the general doctrine and possibly helped to clear up some more or less hazy points. One man, in particular, who was a graduate of some German university, had the biologist's notion of the statement in the Declaration of Independence, that "all men are created equal." He thought this was clearly erroneous, because some men are short and others tall,

and were in fact equal in no way. All of which, as he understood it, is unquestionably true. But when his attention was called to the fact that the document under consideration was not introduced as a contribution to a biological discussion, but was offered in connection with certain proposals relative to government, he agreed that it should properly be interpreted in that respect alone. He finally agreed that a giant naturally had no greater right to breathe the free air than had a pigmy. From this point it was, of course, easy to reach rational conclusions. Many questions were asked and answered with seeming satisfaction to all concerned.

Two labor unions were addressed, and invitations were extended by both to call again. At one, however, a socialist put in an appearance, but he was not "scientific," for which reason no merit was to be derived from even a victorious encounter. Questions were quite numerous, and the interest manifested was of the sort that may properly be described as very encouraging. The referendum law did not carry in Missouri, but as a matter of fact, the election of Folk overshadowed all other considerations.

Two religious bodies were also visited—one of them being addressed twice. This was quite encouraging, as the doors of one society were opened only after a somewhat vigorous knocking. They apparently thought the Henry George movement was some kind of an effort to tear up, or down, the eternal foundation of things. At the close, however, the pastor was very generous in offering congratulations and hearty wishes for our continued success. He is not the only man afraid of ghosts.

At Jefferson City a number of meetings were held. Some interest was developed, but it must be admitted that small cities that are also State capitals, and therefore the scenes of active political wire pulling, are not the most desirable places to begin an active propaganda for a plan of action calculated to overthrow that same wire pulling. Still there was more or less evidence of interest in our proposals, and a few men are thoroughly aroused to the need for a change in existing methods in the conduct of our public affairs. Of course, nearly every one was in favor of the election of Folk. A good many, in fact, seemed to believe his election all that was needed.

At Kansas City, however, at a dinner given by the Knife and Fork Club—a very excellent impression was produced. Professor Ely, of the University of Wisconsin, also spoke at this dinner, as did a professor from some seat of learning in Kansas. The latter gentleman's address was simply a real estate boom for the country lying west of the Missouri river. When questioned as to

the desirability of permitting men, instead of railroad and other corporations, to get at the Great West, his only reply was, "Why don't you come and get some of it." No question of equity has filtered through the understanding of the professor from Kansas. Is that the reason they keep him, or have they not as yet become acquainted? He ought to be put in charge of a roulette wheel instead of being placed in control of the plastic minds of the young.

But Professor Ely! The professor held that there are no laws of political economy. Therefore, one must suppose there is no science of political economy. In the name of the Prophet, then, what is the professor teaching? A no science? Truly, a dignified professorship! And then he told us that political economists were being employed, at large salaries (he mentioned \$10,000) by corporations and municipalities for the purpose of giving advice with regard to the application of this no science—or science without laws. This matter of employment of professors of political economy at large salaries was the definite and emphatic part of his address. It seemed to be the only proof he had to offer as to the value of a professor of political economy. All other attributes revealed were so hazy, vague, indefinite and void that no business man would think of paying \$10,000 a year for such service. But the fact that they actually were so employed was evidently expected to overcome any natural hesitancy that might be felt at the prospect of engaging services so particularly described as wholly useless. It is only fair to the professor to say that he witnessed that some public utilities might properly be administered by the people in their communal capacity, but he did not tell us why. Just the fact—somewhat doubtfully, to be sure—but still the fact, on the authority of a professor of "no science." The listeners were a large body of representative business men of Kansas City, Mo., and they heard wonderingly. Faith healing is a marvel of clear, concise, cogent reasoning, in comparison. Several of the gentlemen approached the single tax man, and asked if it is really true that such ideas are taught in the schools? To which reply was made that the professor is no doubt fairly representative of the cult. The committee of arrangements were wise, for they placed the single tax address first on the list. It was a notable fact that several very wealthy gentlemen were vigorous in their endorsement of the most blunt and searching arguments advanced in support of George economics. Opportunity to present the two schools of thought before rational men is all we can desire—and surely it is all we need.

AN address was also delivered before the business men of Kansas City, Kas. It was generally applauded throughout and the president was equally generous in expressions of approval at the close of the address;

even going so far as to say he wished similar addresses might be delivered at every meeting of the organization. Other addresses were made at labor societies and churches. At one church a talk on "Carlyle" was given, where the pastor told with pride of the liberality of his church, and proved it by introducing the speaker to talk on Thomas Carlyle—a *materialist*. Speaking of the church, Carlyle said: "That a man stand there and speak of spiritual things to men is beautiful; even in its great obscuration and decadence, it is among the beautifullest, most touching objects one sees on the earth. This Speaking Man has indeed, in these times, wandered terribly from the point: yet at bottom whom have we to compare with him? I wish he could find the point again, this Speaking One." Wonder what he would have thought of the Speaking one—out West. Fine fellow, too, and doing good, even if he is not acquainted with the great Scotchman.

At Creston, Iowa, the high school was visited—Prof. Bell, Principal—and a very jolly time was the result. It is easy to teach the young who have not learned a lot of things which are not so. No opportunity is offered on these occasions for questions, but it is a very great pleasure to observe the unmistakable evidence of quick apprehension on the part of the pupils—and, incredible as it may seem sometimes on the part of their instructors. Prof. Bell desired to look farther into the matter. Let us hope he will. There are a few good Single Tax men in Creston, and they are slowly making their influence felt. One city official is a strong advocate of protection, but, wonder of wonders, he admits it is purely selfish—that ought to help some.

In the evening a meeting was held, but was not so well attended as the local men had hoped. No response could be drawn. Not a question was asked. The case was given up as seemingly hopeless and the meeting adjourned, when at least half the audience surrounded the speaker, and questions came thick and fast. After a little the explanation became clear. No word had been said regarding the tariff, but they realized that the basis of that curious contrivance had been torn up, and they were bent on its defense. It was lively for a time. They were in earnest. The most aggressive was the editor of the local paper. He even walked to the hotel and parted with the assertion that he would certainly get "those books" and thoroughly investigate. The meeting was not so hopeless after all.

At Omaha several meetings were held. The first was not well attended, but subsequent gatherings were much better in this respect. A leading local real estate dealer attended all of the meetings and asked many questions. He seemed to be very

well disposed, but was evidently perfectly willing to find some flaw in our position. The head of the city taxing office was at two meetings, and also asked questions. He seemed to think the Single Tax would not provide revenue enough, but is not so sure now of the accuracy of that position. One man held to a notion not heretofore encountered by the lecturer. He agrees that taxes on land value will make land cheaper, but holds that taxes on goods also make these cheaper. It seems to be something like "the foreigner pays the tariff tax."

At Lincoln, Neb., the high school of twelve hundred pupils were addressed, and it was even more joyous than the experience at Creston. Dr. Wolfe is principal, and was very cordial—even after the talk. The pupils are always eager to hear a jest, but listen with equal eagerness to the explanation of the doctrines offered by Henry George. That the Single Tax can be presented directly to the pupils in high schools is of itself a most excellent indication of decline in the prejudice that has so long obstructed our efforts.

From the high school we went directly to the University of Nebraska, and spoke to the chapel for half an hour. The students here were of course not children, but they seemed just as open-minded, and were, in fact, not at all unfriendly in their greeting to Single Tax argument. If one may judge from appearance, they are not wholly unfamiliar with sound economics. Some of the professors are strong men and true men. Perhaps all of them are, but some of them certainly. And they are not apologists for privilege, which, perhaps, is strange. If we could only be rid of the Tory influence that emanates from so many of our centers of education; but, then, talent is very largely for sale, like shoddy.

A curious incident occurred at a social gathering, which included quite a group of business and professional gentlemen. One who was reported to be an old time Democrat expressed the emphatic opinion that the one serious result of the late election was the defeat of Peabody for Governor of Colorado. This, in his opinion, was a distinct victory for the forces which make for disorder and anarchy. Another gentleman replied, with even more emphasis, that the defeat of Peabody was the most hopeful sign given by the late election. He held that no matter if all said against the workmen in Colorado is true, still violation of law by officers of the law is much more dangerous than like violation by mobs of any sort. And then the surprise—the latter gentleman was pointed out as not only a Republican, but the president of a National bank and a man of great wealth. Did some one mention a new political alignment?

A series of meetings were held in Bloomington, Ill., before stopping at Chicago and

returning to the East. At Bloomington, which is the home of O. R. Trowbridge, the author of Bi-socialism, the State Normal school was visited, and a meeting attended by many citizens, besides a large body of students was addressed. President Femley is quite sympathetic with our views.

The Wesleyan University at Bloomington is an extremely conservative institution, but an opportunity was offered to meet the pupils in chapel. President Smith said that economic questions were growing in importance, and he would be much pleased if everyone would consider them dispassionately, as had this morning been done. This meeting was another strong evidence of the change in mental attitude that is taking place, and which perhaps may be described as the thawing of prejudice. A few years since it would no doubt have been utterly impossible to get an invitation for an avowed Single Taxer to appear before this university. Now we got the invitation, together with a complimentary reference from the rostrum by the president.

Two women's societies were visited. At one of them a very pleasant lady hoped we would not be able to introduce the Single Tax. A few questions developed the fact that she was the owner of two fine farms. The reverse picture was shown, but she thought we would take those farms from her. It was pointed out that we would merely make it possible for her tenant to get a farm of his own; that she could keep the farms; that labor would be scarce; that to get crops she might be obliged to go to work. Gradually it dawned upon the good ladies that in reality they desire crops—not farms.

A church fair was in progress, and an address on the French revolution was made before them. The failure of the French to appreciate the value of Turgot's efforts to secure freedom for individual endeavor in the industrial field—together of course with administrative reform—was indicated as the reason for the collapse of that mighty struggle.

A group of the enterprising young professional and business men of Bloomington have been investigating matters economic in company with Mr. Trowbridge, and although their surroundings, social influences and business interests are such as are usually described as conservative, they are largely sympathetic with sound industrial conclusions. In addressing this group care was needed, for apparently they were as well informed as Single Tax men in general. There is but one explanation for this great success in one of the most conservative communities to be found in the West. Trowbridge always avoids antagonisms.

One meeting was addressed in Chicago, an association of so-called radicals. So far as was revealed, they are men who, having

grasped one view of industrial affairs, are not capable of perceiving another. If the first view happens to be right, well and good; otherwise they "are dead to the world." Why will men not first ascertain another's idea, and then oppose it, if it be found erroneous. Just an ordinary Democrat or Republican is, of course, expected to live on prejudice, but one professing emancipation from these influences might at least try to avoid equal stupidities.

A meeting was held at Zelienople, in Pennsylvania. M. L. Lockwood, president of the Anti-Trust Conference held at Chicago is a resident of this city, and acted as chairman of the meeting. Mr. Lockwood was so much interested that he accompanied Mr. White to the next city, New Castle, to hear more safe and sane economies. At New Castle a socialist put in an appearance, but he might learn much by corresponding with some of his Chicago brethren—they probably have enjoyed larger association with Single Tax men. These meetings were very good, and Mr. Lockwood left with many expressions of pleasure and hope for a continuance of the good work.

An address on Robert Burns was given at a church in Rochester, Pa., to a very intelligent and sympathetic audience. In fact there is quite a strong feeling for real democracy in Western Pennsylvania. Many known Democrats were openly congratulating themselves on the overwhelming nature of Mr. Roosevelt's victory (or rather, Parker's defeat). Chas. W. Eckert, of Beaver, is a lawyer, and possibly the most active and energetic Single Tax man in this part of the State. He is one of the men one may safely tie to; that is, he is both capable and sincere. Curious we are obliged to emphasize these traits.

A small meeting was held at the school house in East Palestine, Ohio, which is just over the state line. The good people apparently got a notion that Single Taxers are trying to inaugurate chaos, but as the representative conformed to customary usage, used the fork at table and so on, a better feeling seemed to prevail when Mr. White came away.

Three addresses were made at Fayette City, Pa., to increasing audiences. C. B. Power is a very earnest and industrious single tax man, resident at this city, and is steadily making way among the people with whom he dwells. He already has quite a group of supporters. The genuinely conservative nature of our proposals is steadily producing its logical results. Many questions were asked at these meetings, and the closest attention given throughout.

The representative of the Henry George Lecture Association reached Pittsburg, Pa., on December 6. The first meeting was at a suburb called Parnassus, and was held in

the United Presbyterian Church. The subject, "The Dignity of Labor," called for a full exposition of labor's rights, and the loss of dignity that is involved in their invasion. This gathering was much interested, and a number of questions were asked at the close. A very evident desire was manifested to give labor its due; but of course it was also desired to accomplish this result without disturbing vested wrongs. If we could only accomplish the impossible how much easier it would be to obey God—and serve Mammon, too. And this, though well advised to the contrary, the twentieth century is setting itself to accomplish—and the effort, no matter how hopeless, is evidence of a certain heroism—or something analogous.

The Hebrew Temple, presided over by Rabbi Levy, was visited on December 7. This was a fine audience, the hall being completely filled with people who seemed wholly devoid of prejudice. The closest attention was given to a discussion of "the doctrines of Henry George," and all pointed arguments were warmly applauded. As the audience held many professional and business men, the reception given was extremely gratifying to all Single Tax men present. On calling for questions at the close of the talk, the gentleman who occupied the chair in the absence of Dr. Levy was very complimentary, and confessed to being nearly convinced we are right. Many questions were forthcoming. Most of these were from the usual point of view, but one socialist was there. However, he was a genuine seeker for truth, and was not absolutely certain that he already possessed it—he was a good socialist. He, of course, thought we would need machinery, and so did we. But he seemed to think that somehow or other it might be given to us, while we held to the notion that, with normal opportunities, we could make machinery—just like other people.

On the next evening a lecture was given before the Woman's Monday Club at Carnegie on the subject, "Thomas Carlyle." Those who call for a consideration of Carlyle are usually a trifle nervous as to a discussion of Henry George. It is curious, for the two men thought very much alike, in fact, but held to different notions as to the best method of practically realizing their ideals. Carlyle imagines an English Duke to say to the rest of the English people: "What would become of you, if we decided, some day, on growing no more wheat at all? If we chose to grow only partridges henceforth, and a modicum of wheat for our own use? Can we not do what we like with our own?" A little of Carlyle's sarcasm, like this, has a tendency to make many wonder if George can be worse. However they seem to enjoy the rugged old Scotchman. One good old lady said, "I have seen all that in Carlyle, but did not

seem to feel the emphasis." That is the difficulty. When one reads Carlyle, one will see the land question—if one is looking for it. Carlyle had no faith in a democracy, but he knew, that, whatever the form of government, the land must be administered for the benefit of the people.

Another suburb of Pittsburg, called Swissvale, was visited on the following evening, and although the meeting was small, it developed a strong interest. The subject was "The Single Tax," and all present seemed to agree that no sane man could really desire to be taxed more than once. Quite an interest in questions was displayed, and apparently all were satisfactorily answered. The assurance of much better attendance at some future meeting came from all quarters. It is quite possible, and distinctly worth while to teach the truth in Pennsylvania.

Carnegie Hall, Allegheny, was opened on Sunday afternoon for a lecture on "The Single Tax as a Cure for Municipal Corruption." A number of gentlemen of local prominence were in the audience, and became more interested than they apparently were at first as the nature of our case was developed. For it was shown that in the absence of our remedy corruption is practically inevitable—while, with our remedy, it is practically impossible, and certainly needless. Questions were asked, and the meeting closed amid much good feeling.

In the evening a meeting was held in the Sabbath school room of the Presbyterian Church, at Wallace avenue and Wood street, Pittsburgh. The meeting was not a success in point of numbers, but the pastor and a number of the substantial members of the church were present. These were entertained, for much to their surprise, as well as that of the speaker, over an hour and a half was consumed—to a considerable degree by questions.

The next evening, December 18, was devoted to a debate with a lawyer who attempted to defend prohibition of the manufacture and sale of "spirituous liquor, wine, beer or cider," or something similar. At least the resolution read as follows: "Resolved, that the Single Tax, as proposed by Henry George, offers a better solution for the evils of intemperance than prohibition." It was really quite enjoyable to make emphatic declaration in favor of the well recognized religious concept of "individual responsibility." That not only sounds well, but it is a little difficult to see just how a man can be held to have sinned unless he had the choice of doing or not doing. Of course our prohibition friend had the usual figures as to the people spending eight or nine hundred million dollars annually for liquors. But we felt compelled to call attention to the fact that a gallon of high wine

that costs wholesale \$1.25 would cost only fifteen cents if the federal tax were removed, for the simple reason that the tax is \$1.10 per gallon. It, therefore, seems valid to say that most of the immense sum named is spent, not for liquor, but for taxes. Possibly the buyers don't want the liquor—are merely unusually patriotic. The fact that the Single Tax would abolish involuntary poverty was emphasized, and that only a free man could be expected to be a moral one. One of the Pittsburg papers gave a very good report, and our Single Tax friends voted it a most excellent evening—in spite of the weather.

On the afternoon of December 13th a visit was paid to the Lawrenceville New Century Club, a woman's society, and an address given on "Thomas Carlisle." The ladies were cordial in extending thanks and hoped to learn more definitely of the George doctrine in the near future.

The East End Board of Trade of Pittsburg was addressed on the subject "Single Tax." It was a most excellent meeting, in that it was made up of men of affairs who can readily comprehend a business proposition—which is the precise nature of the single tax. Payment for value received all along the line is all that Single Tax men ask. Pay to the public for what you get from the public, thereby securing common rights, just as we secure private rights. Many questions were forthcoming, all in the best of humor, and most of them indicating a favorable inclination toward our position. The meeting broke up at a late hour amid congratulations on all sides. The East End Board of Trade of Pittsburg is alive.

Another gathering of ladies was addressed and a certain disagreement among the members discovered. One lady in particular was evidently of the opinion that the present status of society is all right. She had some difficulty in explaining just why she thought so, but that she did think so was a "sure thing"—and she would like to see the one who can make her believe differently. Fortunately the ability of the club, which in some instances is marked, is arrayed in opposition.

At Johnstown, Pa., after a friendly talk with our old tried and true Single Tax friend, Warren Worth Bailey, editor and publisher of the *Johnstown Democrat*, and his brother Homer, who is associated with him, an address was given before the high school literary society. This meeting was pleasing to all concerned, and on the following day another talk was given to the teachers' institute at Wyndberg, a comparatively new town near Johnstown. Prof. William Scott is principal, and a Single Tax man. In the evening a debate was held before the institute on the assertion that the citizens' rights could be secured only by the ballot or its equivalent. Chas. C. Grier, city

solicitor of Johnstown, held the negative, but insisted that he wished to be accepted only as a vicarious offering. The debate was arranged merely for the purpose of laying before the teachers and others the nature of popular government, and it seemed to serve this purpose very well. Mr. Grier is a vigorous man and struggled manfully with an unwelcome task.

On the following evening, which was Sunday, the Turner Society was visited and a presentation of the doctrines of Henry George offered. Many of these men and women are essentially Single Taxers—some definitely so—and all are friendly. The evening was enjoyable and the Turners extremely sociable.

Monday morning the Ministerial Association was addressed on the subject, "Individualism versus Socialism." The good brethren seemed to think they were to receive something in the nature of a "drubbing." It seems some one had talked a little vigorously to them some time before, and some one else had repeated the arraignment more recently, and on top of it all local newspapers had taken them to task. Life was becoming strenuous. A rather grim lot of faces met the speaker. As a consideration of the matter under discussion involved no antagonism toward either churches or religion, haste was made to show that some functions of associated men were private and some public, and that, therefore, there is a field, fully according with accepted concepts of morality, for the proper exercise of individual initiative, and also a field for the proper exertion of social dominion. As the nature of the presentation developed, the grim faces relaxed, and they were prepared to listen patiently while it was explained that recent researches seemed to make clear the fact that Babylon maintained landlordism, and also a revengeful criminal law, while our records tell us that Moses corrected property laws, or landlordism, but maintained the criminal law of an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth. Again our records tell us the later dispensation recommended forgiving our enemies, or an abolition of the Mosaic criminal law. In our day, however, we not only have not maintained the law of Jesus nor yet that of Moses, but have very firmly re-established both the criminal and civil law of pagan Babylon—that is, landlordism and revenge. We are now very modestly asking the churches, help to introduce once more at least the civil law of Moses. If they absolutely refuse to endorse the proposals of Jesus of Nazareth as to our criminal practice, can they not bring themselves to endorse the wholesome part of Moses' commands? The ministers were highly delighted, but whether at the ideas advanced, or because they escaped some degree of abuse, is perhaps doubtful.

In the evening the "Single Tax" was discussed before the Economic Circle, and quite a number of outsiders were present and asked questions that indicated a desire to get at the exact truth. A few Socialists—rather young ones—were much annoyed because they could immediately overthrow the George position with the same ease that they dispose of all others. They, like others, will live and, let us hope, will learn.

Next evening the Merchants Association, Chas. Swank, chairman, listened to a discussion of the "Cause of Industrial Depressions." The merchants knew the direct cause was failure of demand. But just why this occurred was matter for doubt—unless it resulted from failure of men to get remunerative employment, and this could only happen from failure of demand. So here we are again. The fact that landlords take part of product without return, and that this leads to land speculation, seemed to be a new idea to most of them. Holding land out of use, and taking part of what is produced, would very naturally leave the people with diminished purchasing power, and therefore failing demand.

"Public Ownership of Public Utilities" was discussed on the following evening before an association made up of the principals of the public schools. Some of these gentlemen are familiar with economic literature and friendly to the cause of reform, but some are still in darkness. They asked many questions, and some seemed to assume that the matter might be disposed of according to decree. The idea of natural law is seemingly so difficult of attainment—in some cases.

The series of engagements at Johnstown closed with a banquet at the Crystal Cafe. Judge of Cambria County, Hon. T. J. O'Connor, was toast master, and the committee of arrangements were Hon. Robert E. Cresswell, Hon. James W. Walters, John H. Waters, President of the National Radiator Co., and W. W. Bailey. The banquet was attended by the prominent ladies and gentlemen of Johnstown, and was voted a very enjoyable affair. One attorney, however, took exception to the Single Tax doctrine advanced by the speaker, who had responded to the toast, "The Future of Democracy." A curious fact was that while the objector is a Democrat, a Republican listener whispered, "He is making our argument." Is it not strange that a Democrat cannot be Democratic? Is Democracy a lost art? It was reported next day that the Single Tax man had "got the whole town by the ears." The Republican paper felt impelled to give us an editorial paragraph, which was kindly, but held the plan impracticable. A short reply was made, and this called forth a column editorial, in which there was a gradual shifting from the ground of impracticability to that of

injustice. Republican editors, like Democratic lawyers, are sometimes rational. The banquet was highly enjoyed, and it was generally agreed that the objector was a good witness against his own case.

Reading, Pa., was next visited, and, among other entertainments, there was a debate with a socialist. At least that was the claim put forward on his behalf. His whole notion seemed to be abuse of the opposing counsel, and poor work was made even of this. A meeting was also held in a church and a number of questions were asked by a few socialists. The defence of private property seemed to please the business men present. The pastor of the church asked some questions that were not cast in an unfriendly form, and it appeared that some of the socialists present could have performed much better service for their cause than did the champion put forward at the debate. Some time ago a Single Tax man was elected to the board of tax commissioners of this city and succeeded in getting quite an increase in the levy on vacant land. They have not as yet succeeded in removing the increase. The real work is slowly beginning.

A good meeting was held at Pottstown, Pa. There is quite a group of Single Tax men at this city. They are self-sacrificing, and went to work with a will to make the meeting a success. Newspapers in Pottstown, Johnstown and Pittsburg gave very good reports of meetings held. In private conversation we met one man who said he was in receipt of \$150.00 per month when he was twenty years of age, and being satisfied had always voted against any change of government policy. He was and is a Republican—so he says.

A meeting of Single Tax men exclusively was also held at Pottstown, at which were discussed ways and means of propaganda. After canvassing the situation it was agreed that opportunities actually were present, and that much could be accomplished without severe effort. Perhaps as much real amusement can be secured by devoting one's leisure to Single Tax work as by engaging in progressive euchre. Why not try to make the single tax work inviting rather than disagreeable? Make it play—not work.

Mr. George Fowlds, member of the New Zealand Parliament for Grey Lynn, was tendered a reception by his supporters numbering nearly 500, on which occasion he was presented with an illuminated address. The speeches were eloquent personal tributes to this determined fighter who has done so much for the cause of the Single Tax under the Southern Cross, and Mr. Fowlds in his response pledged himself anew to continue the fight "till the day of special privileges and monopolies has gone past."

PROPOSED NEW YORK SINGLE TAX COLONY.

The article of the writer, in the last number of the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW* suggesting the establishment of a Single Tax colony near New York City, has aroused great interest among Single Taxers everywhere and the proposition has been very favorably received.

The Manhattan Single Tax Club and the Brooklyn Single Tax League have had the subject up for consideration and its merits presented by the undersigned, and the result has been that twenty persons have enrolled their names as members of an organization committee to carry the project forward. The signers to the committee enrollment include some of the most active and well known Single Taxers in New York City. They have given their warmest approval and cooperation to the undertaking and are willing to do what they can to further it, while recognizing the difficulties of attaining success and the limitations involved in any local application of the Single Tax principle under existing conditions.

Correspondence with Single Taxers outside of New York City has also resulted in several more names being added to the committee, subscribers in this way are obtaining local membership and the project is thus securing friends in different parts of the country.

The Fairhope Single Taxers have given the kindest words of approval and encouragement, as well as the benefits of their experience.

As a result of the *REVIEW* article and incidental correspondence letters of advice and approval have been received from some of the best known Single Taxers in the country, which would be given in full if space permitted in this communication.

Governor Garvin states that "Our theory is correct and the hour ripe for a trial. The water front appears to be essential. Tilling the soil is a secondary vocation in such an attempt, manufacturing standing first. Certainly a Single Taxer who was also a manufacturer should see his way clear to engaging in an enterprise in such a community. He would be sure not only of lower cost of production than elsewhere, but also of a superior class of employees. The details should be worked out very carefully by a small committee, which should include practical men as well as theorists. It ought to flourish and grow near New York City."

Hon. John De Witt Warner writes: "I can think of no more practical or promising demonstration of the 'Single Tax' principle than the establishment of such a colony—in which all the local developments shall be paid on the 'Single Tax' principle. The only question is whether means can be found adequately to test the 'Single Tax' principle by actual experiment. Personally, I have no doubt, whatever, of its success, or that this is the way in which the principle

must be demonstrated before it will be accepted. Five years of practical illustration would advance the cause more than fifty years of any conceivable propaganda by discussion about it."

Mr. E. B. Gaston says "there is no reason why the Single Tax plan cannot be applied with excellent results anywhere land can be secured." Mr. Prescott A. Parker states that "the plan is excellent and cannot fail to produce good results even under adverse conditions. Your vicinity (New York) is more favorable for a Single Tax colony than this (Alabama) for the reason that everything here is run by the county. If you can control an entire township it will be greatly to your advantage." Mr. J. Belangee says that "the idea is all right and perfectly feasible. It will be as Fairhope has been, a great undertaking. The idea of free transportation is an entirely feasible one. It would give the renters New York privileges with only the slightest drawback of time consumed in the run between George City and New York." These latter three gentlemen are prominently identified with Fairhope, so their opinions and advice are very important.

A Brooklyn citizen offered, as a colony site, a tract of 400 acres in New Jersey, 30 acres free of cost, balance on liberal terms.

As soon as the committee is thought to be sufficiently large in numbers, the members will be called together and will organize and divide itself into small working subcommittees, and thus begins its operations of development. Membership in the committee does not involve an obligation to locate on the colony's grounds, nor contribution of funds or labor, but rather the cooperation of those who are friendly to the project and will give advice and encouragement to the committee. It is therefore hoped that other Single Taxers will enroll their names on the committee membership no matter where located, as all the moral help obtainable is required.

The organization committee's preamble is given below that all may know the conditions and purpose of membership, and which may be signed and sent to the undersigned, who will send an original subscription paper upon request.

T. F. GAYNOR,
18 Broadway, New York.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO MEMBERSHIP IN ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK SINGLE TAX COLONY.

We, the undersigned, believing in the wisdom and practicability of establishing a Single Tax colony, near New York City, do hereby subscribe our names as members of an association to be known as the "ORGANIZATION COMMITTEE OF THE NEW YORK SINGLE TAX COLONY," the object of which is to take up and carry forward the matter of establishing a colony based upon the

"Single Tax" principle, as advocated by Henry George in his book, "Progress and Poverty," as well as it can be done in a colony under existing conditions, and

Said Colony to be located within the closest proximity to—and outside of the limits of New York City, and

This Committee to continue in existence until its work and attainments have reached a point, in its judgment, when a permanent organization can be created by it as its successor to take up and carry on the Colony, and to which this Committee is to turn over all its affairs without consideration of any kind, and which when done,

This Committee will be considered as having completed the object of its creation, and shall then be dissolved and go out of existence.

It is expressly understood that no obligation to locate upon the proposed Colony's properties is incurred in any manner by the members of this Committee, nor are any contributions or funds or services required as a necessary qualification for membership in this Committee.

It is, however, expected that each subscriber to membership believes in the objects for which this Committee is created, and will do all that lies in his or her power to cooperate with the Committee and do all he or she can in promoting its object.

This Committee shall have power to increase its membership, to make rules for the conduct of its affairs, and by a majority vote of all its membership it may expel an objectionable person for cause.

And, In Witness whereof, We hereunto sign our name and addresses.

LECTURE ASSIGNMENTS OF REV. HERBERT BIGELOW.

NEW YORK AND BROOKLYN.

Wed., Jan. 25, 8 p.m., Public Library Auditorium, Newark, N.J., Geo. L. Rusby in charge, Ph. 2230 Franklin. Address, 128 Fr.

Thurs., Jan. 26, 8 p.m., Dr. McGlynn Memorial Association, Bricklayer's Hall, 224 E. 24th Street, Sylvester Malone in charge. Business address, 220 Broadway.

Fri., Jan. 27, 8 p.m., Single Tax Club, 224 E. 62nd Street.

" Jan. 27, 4 p.m., Parlor Lecture, Residence, Miss Alice Carpenter, 74 Columbia Heights, Brooklyn; Fulton car to Orange Street.

Sat., Jan. 28, 8 p.m., Safety Engr., A. J. Smith, 227 West 121 Street, N.Y.C.

Sun., Jan. 29, 11 a.m., Hugh O. Pentecost's Church, Lyric Hall, Sixth Avenue and 42nd Street.

" Jan. 29, 4 p.m., Fourth Unitarian Church, cor. 18th and Church Avenue, Flatbush, Brooklyn. Take Brighton Beach Br. Elevated to Church Avenue Station, or Flatbush Avenue car to

Church Avenue, Ph. Flatbush 505; H. B. Maurer, 626 35th Street.

" Jan. 29, 8 p.m., East Side Settlement House, 540 E. 76th Street. Wm. H. Keely, Headworker.

Mon., Jan. 30, 7.30 p.m., Garment Worker's Union, A. J. Smith.

" Jan. 30, 8.30 p.m., Sunrise Club, Cafe Boulevard, Second Avenue and Tenth Street, E. C. Walke, secretary, 224 W. 143rd Street.

Tues., Jan. 31, Lockwood Academy, 188 So. Oxford Street, Brooklyn; Fulton Street car to Oxford Street.

Wed., Feb. 1, Stereotyper's Union, No. 1. Address can be supplied by A. J. Boulton. Business address, *Citizen*, Brooklyn, N.Y.; residence, 211 Harrison Street, Brooklyn.

Thurs., Feb. 2, Electrician's Union, No. 8. Address can be supplied by A. J. Smith, 227 W. 121st Street, New York City.

Fr., Feb. 3, Manhattan Liberal Club, 220 E. 15th Street, New York City. E. C. Walker, president, 224 West 143rd Street.

IMPROVEMENTS EXEMPT IN EDMONTON.

This letter has just been received in Toronto by Mr. Louis A. Kirwin, from the Secretary-Treasurer of the town of Edmonton, Province of Alberta, North-West Territories, Canada:

Dear Sir:

Referring to yours of the 18th instant, I beg to inform you that under our new City Charter the assessment will be on (1) Land, (2) Businesses, (3) Incomes, (4) Special Franchises.

There will be no assessment on buildings. Until this question has been worked out to a definite footing it is impossible to say yet what proportion of the current expenditure will have to be produced by land taxation, but there is no doubt that it will be by far the heaviest portion, and it will be necessary to assess land at its full actual value. The other sources will undoubtedly produce a considerable revenue, but they must necessarily be of secondary importance.

Yours truly,

GEO. J. KINNAIRD,
Secretary-Treasurer.

It is a comforting reflection that curses sometimes "come home to roost." In Cincinnati, on the corner of Fourth and Walnut streets, there is a structure known as the Union Trust Building. The owners of this building were supporters of Herrick and Hanna in the State campaign, and loud in their denunciation of Johnson and the Single Tax. The assessment on their building has now been increased from \$360,000 to \$459,000, the land valuation remaining the same.

PROGRESS AND POVERTY DINNER.

COMMEMORATION OF THE TWENTY-FIFTH
ANNIVERSARY OF ITS PUBLICATION.

The dinner arranged in commemoration of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of *Progress and Poverty* took place on the night of Tuesday, January 24th, at the Hotel Astor in this city. Among those who constituted the committee which arranged for the celebration, and of which Mr. Hamlin Garland was chairman, appear among others less known, the names of Amelia E. Barr, R. R. Bowker, Richard Burton, Bliss Carman, Grace Isabel Colbron, Bird S. Coler, Thomas B. Connery, Samuel B. Clarke, Ernest H. Crosby, Clarence S. Darrow, George Cary Eggleston, B. O. Flower, Dr. I. K. Funk, Richard Le Gallienne, William Lloyd Garrison, Dr. L. F. C. Garvin, Thomas Wentworth Higginson, Tom L. Johnson, Josephine Shaw Lowell, August Lewis, Edwin Markham, Rev. R. Heber Newton, Walter H. Page, George Foster Peabody, Louis F. Post, Howard Pyle, Frederick Remington, Louis L. Seaman, Dr. Albert Shaw, Edward M. Shepard, Rev. Thomas R. Slicer, J. G. Phelps Stokes, Ida M. Tarbell, John De Witt Warner, Edward J. Wheeler, Ella Wheeler Wilcox. About 250 sat down, and among those present were William J. Bryan, Prof. Richard Burton, William Lloyd Garrison, Edwin Markham, Charles F. Adams, Dan Beard, John Burroughs, J. I. C. Clarke, P. F. Collier, Judge Martin J. Keogh, Dr. H. M. Leipziger, Norman E. Mack, Hudson Maxim, Lincoln Steffens, Judge Samuel Seabury, Ida M. Tarbell, John Brisben Walker, Homer Davenport, F. N. Doubleday, William Temple Emmet, Controller Grout, John De Witt Warner, and Norman Hapgood. Mr. Hamlin Garland was toastmaster.

Mr. Bryan made a speech which more than anything that he has hitherto said shows a dawning appreciation of the importance of the issue. But he confined himself for the most part to a graceful personal tribute to Henry George. He said in part:

"The greatest day of my life was that day a little over a year ago which I spent with Tolstoy. There were two Americans of whom he spoke to me. The son of one of them sits here at my right, the son of the other sits at my left.

"He spoke in highest terms of Henry George and indorsed his economic theories. He showed me something he was reading, a preface to the life of the elder Garrison.

"It is interesting to-night for me to meet here for the first time the poet whose words have touched the consciences of so many. It is a notable thing that there should be at this board the son of Henry George, the son of William Lloyd Garrison, and Edwin Markham.

"Those who deny to children born into

this world the right of equal opportunities ought to give some defense of their position. I can give no such defense. It does not require a very far-sighted person to recognize that parents who leave to their children the right of equal opportunity leave them the richest heritage which is possible for a parent to leave.

"The tendency which seems to-day to be becoming dominant is the seeking of the moral issue in all great questions. Beneath every great economic question is a moral question, and the question is never settled until the moral issue is settled."

Mr. Bryan said that the power of the heart was above that of the body and that of the mind, and he continued:

"I fear the plutocracy of wealth, I respect the aristocracy of learning, but I thank God for the democracy of the heart. I believe, too, that we are entering on a new era, that of brotherly love. I see it in all lands. I see it here. I see it in Europe, and nowhere have we clearer evidences of it than in the home of Tolstoy.

"We celebrate to-day the twenty-fifth anniversary of the publication of Henry George's book, and only four years before that Tolstoy turned from a life of society and ambition to devote himself to the public weal. He says that he never found in society or in literature any such reward as he is finding in his work for the people. His life is a constant spring, and he does not ask where the waters go.

"Love is his inspiration, and it was love that made Henry George what he became. He has touched the conscience of the world, the world will admit, and that he touched it because he loved it the world will not deny."

Prof. Richard Burton spoke on the influence of *Progress and Poverty* upon literature, William Lloyd Garrison on the Book's Plea for Justice, and Louis F. Post on the Economic Message of the Book. Mr. Post said:

"I hold, as did the author of '*Progress and Poverty*', that the political economy which does not reach out to morality, which does not underlie and support morality, which does not correspond to and co-operate with morality—I hold with '*Progress and Poverty*,' that any such political economy is a false political economy. It is false because it is out of harmony with natural law.

"Observe also the influence of the Single Tax idea upon common thought—not in the way of making perfect converts, but of creating a general tendency. This kind of progress may be found also in England, where the general tendency has gone further than here, and in Australia, where the principle is coming into actual use."

Mr. Henry George, jr., said:

"In August 1877 the writing of '*Progress and Poverty*' was begun. It was the oak that grew out of the acorn of '*Our Land and Land Policy*.' The larger book became

'an inquiry into industrial depressions and of increase of want with increase of wealth,' and pointed out the remedy.

"The book was finished after a year and seven months of intense labor, and the undergoing of privations that caused the family to do without a parlor carpet and which frequently forced the author to pawn his personal effects.

"And when the last page was written, in the dead of night, when he was entirely alone, Henry George flung himself upon his knees and wept like a child. He had kept his vow.

"Then the manuscript was sent to New York to find a publisher. Some thought it visionary; some revolutionary. Most thought it was unsafe, and all thought it would not sell, or at least sufficiently to repay the outlay.

"More than two million copies of 'Progress and Poverty' have been printed to date, and that, including with these the other books that have followed from Henry George's pen, and which might be called the 'Progress and Poverty' literature, perhaps five million copies have been given to the world. Such is the power of truth."

Edwin Markham read a poem "The Deathless Dead" and Ernest Seton Thompson read three fables.

Among the letters received was one from George Barnard Shaw, in which he said:

"What Henry George did not teach you you are being taught now by your great 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 a quarter of a century ago for me."

Other parts of Mr. Shaw's letter, devoted to points in which that brilliant Englishman and Fabian socialist differs with "Progress and Poverty," and in which he fondly imagines he "goes further" than the teachings of that book (goes further afield or astray) will be dealt with in the next issue of the REVIEW.

Dr. Albert Shaw, who was down for a speech, and who was prevented from attending, wrote:

"I believe sincerely that in the generations to come, the life and work of the late Henry George will stand forth, in the history of human progress towards better

political and economic conditions, somewhat as the names of Adam Smith, Jean Jacques Rousseau and Thomas Jefferson must always remain as great landmarks in our study of the growth of Democratic ideals. This I say without any regard to the merits of any controversy in detail regarding certain concrete applications in statesmanship of Mr. George's views regarding taxation. We had been obliged, as the fundamental step towards the doing away of poverty, to learn how to create and build up productive capital in a poverty-stricken world. Then came a time when it was needful to distinguish clearly between the wealth produced by the individual and that belonging to the united social effort. More than any other man, Henry George helped to make that distinction understandable and a part of the economic thinking of millions of people. Already the gain to humanity has been a large one, and it has only begun."

Edward M. Shepard wrote:

"Progress and Poverty truly was an epoch making book, the fruit of extraordinary genius, inspired by the love of humanity and finding a clear voice which of itself ought to place Henry George in the highest rank of the literary men of our time. Those who, like myself, are able to adopt but a part of the practical application of Mr. George's philosophy, are hardly less indebted to him than are those who, like many of your guests to-night, adopt the whole of it. Indeed it may be said of Henry George as of other great men, that his achievement was in making the masses of men to think on the lines of human justice and of distrust or even hatred of artificial and unnecessary monopolies and repressions."

Charles Warren Stoddard wrote:

"I knew Henry George nearly forty years ago, when he was unknown to the world, but he was already aglow with the glory that crowned him later on. I pray you make me one of your honorable committee."

Rev. Dr. R. Heber Newton wrote:

"The man (Henry George) looms larger through the years since he left us—larger worldly and morally. His soul glows through his book, making it not merely a *tour de force*, but a revelation of a rare personality. The book is now seen to be truly an epoch-making book. Its ethical temper is already moralizing both political economy and religion. There is less heard now of "Progress and Poverty," but below the surface it is working everywhere."

Thomas Wentworth Higginson wrote:

"Ill health forbids me just now to attend public meetings, otherwise I should be glad to pay my tribute to the author of "Progress and Poverty"; a man whose heroic spirit and whose eminently fresh and fertile style made his books always well worth reading."

Amelia E. Barr wrote:

"I have the heartiest sympathy with the 'Progress and Poverty' ideas—for were they not the purpose and intent of my great countryman, Oliver Cromwell, if he had lived to order another Parliament."

Edward Clarence Stedman wrote:

"My admiration for Henry George was not for his special economic panacea. It was because—and though I met him but once—I realized his sincerity, humanitarianism, *his devotion to his own ideal of the highest service to his fellow men*. You do right in paying this tribute to his memory, and to the good which his greatest book wrought by enforcing attention to the evils of our so-called civilization."

Rev. Lyman Abbott wrote:

"It is impossible for me to attend the dinner, as I shall be absent from the city on the 24th of January, but I would like to put on record here my great respect for his character and for the service which I believe he has rendered to the world, by the courage with which he has faced and discussed what is one of the greatest problems of our time."

Remarkable evidences of the spread of the doctrines were contained in communications or writings received and read from Single Taxers in foreign lands. We cull extracts from a few of the more important of these.

FROM HOLLAND.

With the appearance of "Progress and Poverty," industrial slavery was doomed and modern history begun.—Jan Stoffel, Deventer, Leader of the Dutch Single Taxers.

FROM GERMANY.

"That brave prophet, Henry George, who dared to stem the tide of orthodox democratic thought. In modern America, where land speculation is directly encouraged by the government, and where a corruption without equal is growing up as the child of capitalism, the propounding of the doctrine of Single Tax was a deed of tremendous moral value."—Wilhelm von Polenz, author of a very successful book on America, entitled, "The Land of the Future."

"The fundamental thought of 'Progress and Poverty' is an eternal truth, and the manner in which this thought is propounded proves its author a mind of the very first rank, far excelling many the world calls great in public life. All those who aid in the making known of 'Progress and Poverty' help in bringing about a state of social health in which the welfare of humanity as a whole is not dependent upon chance charity on the part of some individual. The day will come when all civilized nations will revere Henry George for this one book, as one of the great leaders of mankind."—Adolf Damaschke, President of the German Land Reform League.

FROM DENMARK.

"What has made the deepest impression

on my mind in the teachings of Henry George is the profound truth that I should not be compelled to pay a tax on my industry and my work, but that my tribute to society should be made from that wealth or value which I have received from no merit or exertion on my own part."—George Brandes, famous critic.

"What I particularly have to thank Henry George for is that he has made me understand what Justice to All means in society's housekeeping, and that this Justice to All is far more needed as a bulwark for society's welfare than the Right of the Individual.—Svend Høgbro, Member of the Danish Parliament and Advocate of the Supreme Court.

"There are many who thank Henry George for having proved that God did not create a world incapable of providing nourishment for the inhabitants thereof, and that there is sufficient food for all who work, if man will but understand the simple principle of all human society, 'Equal rights for all to the Earth, that has been given to all in common.'—Rev. E. Koch, prominent Danish clergyman, author of important economic works.

"We are beginning to understand in Denmark, that the light which Henry George has thrown on man's relation to land, and on the development of justice among mankind, is of just as much importance to the wholesome growth of human life, as is the development of heart and mind for the individual."—From Valdemar Bennicke, prominent Danish High School Professor.

"Henry George laid the foundation for a new era of thought, he opened the way for religion's true servants, he united morality and science, [and created a new social doctrine, built up on the Ideals of Justice, for the central pivot of agriculture. In many lands there are those who greet the spirit of Henry George's teachings as the bringer of warmth and light, and as the Spirit of Truth, charity and strength, the apostle of peace and freedom."—From Sophus Berthelsen, Lawyer, President of the Danish Henry George League.

FROM SWEDEN

"No view of the land question has aroused such sympathy in my mind as has that laid down by Henry George. It satisfies the desire for justice as well as the desire for freedom. Our best wishes for the development of the community must be found in the hope that the future will see the adoption of Henry George's solution of a fundamental social problem, namely, of how the earth can really become a true mother to all her children."—From Ellen Key, celebrated Swedish authoress and lecturer.

"Our language has no work of social-economic trend, or of philosophic thought to show, which can equal the honesty, lucidity, and thoroughness of 'Progress and

Poverty.' I find I must return to it again and again, when I need light on some difficult economic problem, or seek encouragement in its pages, when assailed by doubts of the eventual victory of Right and Justice."—From Johan Hansen, of Gothenburg, leader of the Swedish Land Reform Movement.

The *Fairhope Courier* has become a weekly, which is an indication of the prosperity of Fairhope. We congratulate the management and Mr. Gaston, who has worked hard to make the *Courier* a success.

"The Wasteful War of Organized Labor" is an effective pamphlet written and published by Thomas Bawden, of Detroit, editor of *Our Commonwealth*. It is illustrated with a number of striking illustrations. Copies of this little booklet sold for two and a half cents each may be obtained by addressing the author at 157 Park Street, Detroit, Mich.

We have received "Letters Relating to Taxation in Jamaica," a small pamphlet published by Mr. Wellesley Bourke consisting of the author's letter to the *Jamaica Daily Telegraph*. Mr. Bourke is one of the active Single Taxers of Jamaica, is a prominent member of the bar, and was once mayor of Kingston. They are excellent refutations of the contentions often made, and forming the burden of the *Daily Telegraph* in its attempt to meet Mr. Bourke's Single Tax arguments of the supposed "unearned increment" of a chair or table, the long sanction that time and custom have conferred upon the institution of private property in land, and finally the injustice of submitting one species of "property" to the burdens of colonial and local taxation. Were influential American dailies as willing to meet, as fully and fairly and with the same admirable courtesy, the arguments of their Single Tax correspondents they would perform a distinct service to their readers. But this would be to antagonize the vested interests which determine the editorial policy of these papers through the counting room.

The *Arena* for January is an improvement even over the high standard which that magazine has maintained since it came into the hands of its present publisher. It is presented with a new and attractive cover, and with more than the usual number of illustrations. The most important of the articles are "Corruption in Pennsylvania," by Rudolph Blankenburg, "The Reign of Boodle in St. Louis," by Lee Meriwether, whose name will be familiar to all Single Tax men, and the "Divorce Problem," by Mrs. Spencer Trask. Joaquin Miller's serial story, "The Building of the City Beautiful," is continued. These articles with others not less worthy of mention, make this number of the *Arena* a notable one.

BOOK REVIEWS.

A STUDY OF A GREAT LIFE.*

This book is the latest of the "English Men of Letters," edited by John Morley, whose fine critical discrimination and ripe scholarship have contributed so much to the success of the series.

Adam Smith and John Stuart Mill are the only ones among the older political economists who can by any extension of courtesy be called "men of letters." The innumerable works of countless others are so much lumber which the world would be richer if it had never possessed. And this is said even while we bear in mind the name of Ricardo and his doctrine of rent, the application of which has yielded so much to subsequent speculations. But Adam Smith did more. He remade the economic map of the world. His work is one of the great books of all time. Not Henry George himself was more in advance of his age than this studious, large brained Scot, with his singular gift of lucid reasoning and clear presentation.

We are apt to forget this when we read in the "Wealth of Nations" so much that is familiar to modern ears. Yet it sounded strangely enough to Smith's contemporaries. And how far we are even at this late day from realizing the great ideals based on the irrefutable train of argument which threads its way through the clear uplands of thought in this great work. So long as the battle of free trade and protection wages this book will be the one great arsenal for the protagonists of commercial freedom. It is an ungrateful task to point out Smith's shortcomings. It is a much more useful and inspiring reflection that suggests to us that without the "Wealth of Nations" "Progress and Poverty" itself might, perhaps could not have been written. Political economy was not to spring full-armed like Minerva from the head of Jupiter. Humanity must wring its victories from truth by successive battles—the war itself is never ending. And Adam Smith was the foremost of the great pioneers in the work of clearing the ground for the greater task that was reserved for the teacher whom Single Taxers delight first of all to honor.

One of the great tasks to which Mr. George looked forward was the publication of the "Wealth of Nations," with editorial and critical notes of his own. We must regret that this was not to be. But it should magnify our appreciation of Adam Smith to know that the author of "Progress and Poverty" contemplated such a work. It was one not unworthy of his powers.

The two men are not wholly unlike. Both had amassed much varied information

* Adam Smith, by Francis W. Hirst, *English Men of Letters*. Edited by John Morley. 12mo. cloth. 240 pp. Price, 75 cents net. Macmillan Company, New York and London.

which they used to illustrate and amplify their great argument, which in each case was a doctrine of freedom as a solution of social problems. Both believed that the most important quest was the well-being of society, and both sought it in first principles, appealing to the natural order, and not to artificial adjustments. Smith, it is true, stopped midway in his great inquiry. But it was an incomparable service to have indicated that much of the way.

One likeness is suggested in this little book between these two great minds in the domain of politico-economic science. We all remember how George, walking the deck of the steamer in mid-ocean, pondered on the misery of a great city, and how the thought would not let him rest. Compare that recorded experience with this paragraph from page 5 of Mr. Hirst's work, which tells of the arrival of Adam Smith in Glasgow: "In this rising mart Smith learned to value the English connection, and as he trod its busy streets and watched the merchandise of the West pouring into its warehouses, the boy saw that a new world had been called in to enrich the old. With the new sights and sounds came new ideas that had not yet penetrated the gloom of Holyrood or the rusty pride of the Canongate." How like seem the mental process of the two!

But their differences were greater than their point of resemblance. Smith was not devoid of moral enthusiasm, but it never rose to the dignity of a "grand passion." He had the reformer's intellect without the reformer's martyr spirit. His language, while occasionally eloquent, never quite reaches the soul of the reader, nor wakens his intenser sympathies. The analysis is not frigid, but it is not warm, either. Yet without it one cannot imagine the human sympathy and tremendous enthusiasms which under the leadership of Cobden and Bright translated the cold maxims of Adam Smith's economic reasoning into fiery and eloquent appeal which changed the laws of Great Britain.

This little work of Mr. Hirst's is not the least important of the "English Men of Letters" series. It is an interesting account of the life of the man, and a fairly intelligent appreciation of Smith's great services to political economy. The author is a free trader in the conventional sense of that term, but he does not perceive where the doctrines of Adam Smith lead if relentlessly applied. Though Smith pointed out the advantages of a "land tax" his biographer assures us that he was "far from being a single taxer." But he was not so far as those who have succeeded him, and who, in failing to follow the direction he indicated, have built for themselves fabrics which resemble the "mystic maze" at the seaside resorts, where the unwary having once entered find no rational mode of exit. J. D. M.

See premium offer on back page of cover.

RUSKIN'S LETTERS.

In a recent volume published by the Harpers, *The Letters of John Ruskin to M. G. and H. G. (Mary and Helen Gladstone)* there are some most memorable bits of correspondence. In all epistolary writing there are few examples surpassing those contained in this little volume. They are the unconscious, purely spontaneous revelations of a most beautiful character.

Not in all respects can we accord with John Ruskin's political conceptions. Some of these principles he had derived from the Sage of Chelsea, whom he called "Master," with a modest failure to perceive in his own genius a much finer strain. He had therefore none of the optimism of a true democracy. But fundamentally he was sound; the democracy he revolted against and which he anathematized in much the same exaggerated fashion of epithet as the "Master," was the crude and ill developed institutions and policies which exist in democracies. It was not steam cars he hated, but the destruction of beauty everywhere wrought by this modern method of conveyance; not factories and factory smoke, but the hideous things, the stunting of human lives, the loss of so much that is precious in human sympathy, with which under modern methods of production, these things are associated. It was in this style of metonymy which, taken literally is so perplexing, that Ruskin elected to speak, for his mind was essentially that of a poet; but if we will ignore for a time the figures of his speech, we shall find him oftener sober and sane than those who defend—sans question—all existing institutions.

He saw how frightful were the effects of private property in land, and recoiled from its contemplation with almost a cry of horror, so exquisitely sensitive was his nature and his genius to such manifestation. Here on page 78 is a letter to M. G. in which he says:

"For these seven, nay these *ten years*, I have tried to get either Mr. Gladstone or any other conscientious Minister of the Crown to feel that the law of land possession was for all the world, and eternal as the mountains and the sea.

Those who possess the land must live on it not by taxing it.

Stars and seas and rocks must pass away before that word of God shall pass away, *The Land is Mine.*"

In 1878 Ruskin visited Hawarden. Here he met the Duke of Argyll, and the Duke is said to have laughed almost contemptuously at some of Ruskin's opinions. On this occasion the former defended Landlordism and War, with vehemence, and summed up by saying, "You seem to want a different world to that we experience," to which the finer spirit replied, "Yea verily, a new heaven and a new earth and the former things passed away." Ruskin reverted to the lords of the soil and their

dependents, citing many instances from Italy and France, but being restrained from what he wanted to say, he afterwards confessed, by the presence of the great "landed proprietor."

J. D. M.

Lord Acton's *Letters to Mary Gladstone* is a recent publication from the press of The Macmillan Company. Lord Acton was one of the most learned men of his time, an omnivorous reader, and intellectually alive to every phase of thought and wind of doctrine. 'Tis therefore not a little surprising to find him in one of the two references to Henry George (page 282) in these letters to Mary Gladstone saying: "The better part of him, with more moderation and philosophy, and a wider induction may be found in the writings of the German Socialists, etc." Surely such impression must have been derived from a very careless reading. In the second reference (page 288) he repeats this criticism, but closes with this endorsement: "Nobody writes with that plain vigorous directness, and I do believe that he (George) has, in large measure, the ideas of the age that is to come." The remainder of this reference. "There are points in which I dare say I do not like him as much as you do," is evidence that Mary Gladstone had expressed a less qualified approval of the work. Where are the letters

of M. G? Well worth publishing must be the letters that in the case of Ruskin and Lord Acton were the occasion of so much epistolary writing worthy of permanent preservation.

The *Church Impeached* is the title of a pamphlet of 88 pages from the pen of H. M. Brooks, of Paris, Ill. Rev. Mr. Brooks has been in the service of the ministry—so we are informed in the words of the introduction—for 23 years. The work is a stinging arraignment of the church for its sins of commission and omission, for its singular complacency toward social wrongs, for its rigid intollerance toward all those who question the letter of the law, though itself persistently refusing to recognize the spirit of that law.

We could wish that the author had chosen a more measured invective, and judged with a larger toleration. But it is significant that there should be found an evidently sincere and high minded man who after over a score of years as a clergyman confesses: "My life has been a sad disappointment as a minister." And if this impeachment is clearly that of a man too wroth to be merciful or even polite, no one can truthfully say that he has written in the least degree falsely.

Ethics of Democracy

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the
Natural Laws of Human Society

By LOUIS F. POST

This book is instructive without heaviness, and interesting without frivolity. It appeals with peculiar force to the devoted clergyman who shrinks from the growing pressure of commercialism and materialism. It brings relief to the business man who has a soul above dollars yet feels the necessity for struggling and straining for dollars. It is a guide to the baffled citizen who recoils from socialism yet sees no other escape from something worse. It invites and will hold the attention of any intelligent man or woman who is disposed to reflect upon social, industrial and political conditions. The author has applied fundamental democratic principles (generic, not partisan) to the greater problems that confront men as the false optimism of youth fades away before the disappointments of mature life. He holds aloft the standards and recalls the objectives of a rational democracy, a sane optimism, and individual responsibility. He leads his reader onward and upward, through appeals to reason and the moral sense, toward a realization of that great and beneficent order in the universe which neither individuals nor communities can ignore with impunity. The book subjects popular materialism to new tests, it gives to idealism a modern and popular setting.

The volume is beautifully bound in rich blue cloth, printed on high-grade hand-laid paper; gilt top, deckle edges, 398 pages. Price, per copy, \$2.00 net.

ADDRESS

SINGLE TAX REVIEW,

11 FRANKFORT STREET,

NEW YORK.