

pay all the federal taxes apportioned to that state on the basis of population. In all states a great amount of land is owned by non-residents, and it is the owner of land that must pay the land value tax—no matter where he might live.

Of course if a State had great land value—due to rich mines or other cause and a sparse population—its share of federal taxes would be too small. But the general adoption of the Single Tax would tend to rapidly redistribute population so that the most dense population would be located on the land that might be most valuable naturally. To me it seems plain that if men were once free to locate on any land they might choose they would choose the land most naturally *productive*. Then the most valuable land would have the people and unoccupied land would be valueless land.

I thank you for the courtesy of sending Mr. Purdy's article to me, but do not think it necessary to consider any of the other points raised.

C. J. BUELL.

Minneapolis, Minn.

TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

Arrived at Portland, Oregon, on July 11. Several good meetings were held at this point, the first being before the Young Democratic Club, at which a good degree of interest was developed. No great opposition was shown, but the customary confusion in relation to economic law was revealed by the questions asked. Quite a number, however, proved to be familiar with fundamental social forces.

A most excellent meeting was held at the Y. M. C. A. rooms. The young men were evidently much interested, as were also the older ones. The whole association at Portland is exerting a broad and liberal humanitarian influence that will be greatly helpful to all movements for the betterment of social life. The fact that men must form an association distinct from their individual enterprises is clearly recognized. That this association is natural and therefore subject to natural law, is likewise perceived. The good will of the audience was plainly with the speaker. The manifestation of a feeling of strangeness toward the Single Tax is rapidly disappearing.

A number of the young men of the Y. M. C. A. gathered on another day for the purpose of questioning the Single Tax advocate, and for an hour the queries were advanced and met. One of the number was sure the landlord would raise rent if taxes were laid wholly on him. As the group broke up, another who had grasped the true relation was "explaining" to the benighted one.

A debate was held with Mr. Lewis, a socialist. He thought that in the act of

paying wages the robbery of labor is performed. Of course the Single Taxer thought if there were robbery, it must be in not paying wages. The historical class struggle was asserted by Mr. Lewis. He claimed that as the capitalistic class had overthrown the old land owning class, so must the working class overthrow the present capitalistic class. In opposition it was held that the land owning class had not been overthrown. In fact, land owners are the barriers to social equity now, and maintain their power through the agency of a bad system of taxation. Mr. Lewis was as careless regarding the consistency of his statements as the ordinary politician. He assured the audience that machinery overshadowed land in productive importance; that labor is a commodity; that a railroad right of way is valuable because of the track; that the logic of the Single Tax is perfect, but that we are in error as to facts; that his idea of land values was hazy; that George was a poor reasoner, and that workmen in the socialist party do not care for the Single Tax. All of which was repeated by the Single Taxer for the benefit of the audience. Lewis was surprised to learn that railroad equipment does not cost over \$25,000 per mile, while the privileged value is over \$35,000. The socialists in the audience seemed astonished at the fact that the land of Manhattan Island, exclusive of property exempt from taxation, is worth twice as much as the improvements upon it. Think of a man saying machinery, which we can reproduce, is more important than land, which we cannot make at all.

A good meeting was held at a free lecture and reading room society. It was well attended, and the speaker took occasion to state with more than usual emphasis the attitude of Single Taxers toward monopolists and their supporters and apologists. Workingmen were bluntly asked if they did not think they were getting their just deserts—considering how they vote? Several socialists expressed their pleasure at the speech, and thereby afforded evidence that they are bent on denunciation rather than construction—like the Irish "patriot" who is much more intent on opposing England than on freeing Ireland. A fact worth mentioning is that the secretary of the Y. M. C. A. is an avowed Single Taxer and acted as chairman of this meeting.

At Seattle, Wash., the first meeting was before the University on the subject, The Doctrines of Henry George, Professor Congdon, registrar, presided. He was very genial and complimentary at the close. The large body of pupils seemed much interested, and vigorously testified their pleasure. Nearly all schools of advanced pupils receive the Single Tax message with high favor.

An afternoon meeting of a woman's club was addressed on "The Sources of Public

Corruption." The women were quick to perceive the points of the argument, and ready to indorse all that seemed to square with their ideas of a righteous life. The fact that the speaker thought a woman just as good as a man—even at the polls—was matter for mutual congratulation. A number of questions were presented, all indicating a favorable attitude, and a clear apprehension of the fact that unfair laws are the cause of all social wrongs.

An evening was devoted to the question of "Public Ownership of Public Utilities" before the Georgetown Improvement Association. City Attorney Andrews was chairman of the meeting. The necessity of the high way in civilized life was shown, and the method by which it has been withdrawn from public control explained. The need either for public operation of all those utilities which are based on a right-of-way, or for the overthrow of the doctrine that such grant to private parties is a contract, was set forth. Several lawyers present listened carefully to the latter matter. If this notion can be overcome in our courts, the way will be open for a genuine regulation of those concerns that are grouped under the head of public utilities. Questions and answers kept the meeting until a late hour.

On the following evening Public Ownership was presented at the West Seattle Congregational church. Interest similar to that displayed at the previous meeting developed, though one man was sure that we could not successfully attempt these reforms until we had found the way to discover more honest public officials. He was asked what inducement would remain for the direct or indirect bribing of public officials if privileged values were removed from the field of traffic. He seemed to have a vague notion that public officials were corrupted merely for the sake of corrupting them—but he did not answer the question.

Nelson's Business College was visited in the afternoon of the following day, and a very pleasant meeting it proved. Many of the pupils were young ladies, and they seemed to be as much concerned with matters economic as were the young men. At first the whole school appeared a trifle doubtful of the value of a talk on industrial affairs, but they rapidly developed an interest that any speaker would consider flattering. Students are good people before whom to lay matters involving common sense.

An evening was devoted to "Carlyle" before the Washington Amateur Press Association, of which J. Y. Erford is president. In presenting Carlyle's theory of government, the seeming impossibility of realizing his ideal by the method he proposed was indicated, and also the illogical nature of his objection to democracy. He thought that each citizen's interest in good government is so small that he will not strive to

attain it. At the same time he says that if our rulers lead us aright, how infinitely happy for us. If infinite happiness follows on good government, how could he think each citizen's interest small? It is perfectly plain that the difficulty arises from the fact that the average citizen does not know how deeply he is concerned in the matter of good government—that is to say, rightly adjusted social forces.

"Robert Burns" was the subject at the Unitarian church. The audience was much more interested in Burns at the close than at the beginning of the lecture. Few, indeed, realize the power of the great Scotchman. He was right when he said to his wife, "They'll think more of me in a hundred years, Jean."

A very pleasant evening was spent with a large company at the home of our old friend from Minneapolis, Oliver T. Erickson. Of course, he would not let the evening pass without a presentation of the gospel for the benefit of those who were as yet unfamiliar with economic truth.

Several excellent examples of increase in land values were given in the leading Seattle daily. This was not published as of interest to Single Taxers; rather it was an advertisement of the best method of getting rich without working, or getting something for nothing, and at the same time of maintaining the utmost respectability.

Coleman block—Ground value, 1856, \$400; 1877, \$8,500; 1880, \$25,000; 1886, \$100,000; 1898, \$240,000; 1905, \$510,000. In addition to rentals, each dollar of original investment has in 49 years increased to \$1,274.

Bon Marche block—Ground value in 1870, \$300; 1905, \$390,000. From 1880 to 1890 this land increased 2,566 per cent. in value.

Bailey block—Ground value, 1859, \$200; 1905, \$324,000. For one dollar in 1859 it is now worth \$1,619.

Burke block—Ground value, 1856, \$100; 1905, \$306,000. After 49 years one dollar becomes \$3,029.

Pioneer Square property—Ground value per front foot, 1856, one dollar; 1905, \$3,500.

Instances are given of high priced property doubling in value in the last five years. Why do we complain of insurance, lottery, or gambling schemes? Is not the basis of our whole industrial life administered as a "get-rich-quick" fraud? There is not the shadow of a doubt that our laws gave to Rockefeller, Rogers, and the rest their first impulse toward wrong doing.

At Vancouver, British Columbia, several meetings were held, and our Canadian brethren were found to be steadily and persistently striving for the realization of a better day in the industrial world. It seems that in this province improvements on land are assessed at only one half value. For a time through the efforts of practically one member of the legislative body this assess-

ment was reduced to one-quarter of value. The worth of this member was not appreciated and the tories compassed his defeat.

One meeting was held at Westminster, B. C. The audience was not large, but was much interested and quite above the average in capacity and cultivation. Hon. J. C. Brown of Westminster is a watchful and capable man, and with his co-workers will see that nothing favorable to freedom is lost through inattention.

Another debate was held at Nanaimo, on Vancouver Island. Mr. Kingsley was the socialistic champion. Kingsley is an ex-locomotive engineer, who met with a serious accident, and is a fine man, in spite of his mistaken economic views and a tendency to accept the Arab proverb that "in the desert every man is your enemy." He rode in the face of all economic thought by declaring to tax land and building, or to tax land alone, would have the same effect. He admitted that everything comes from the land, but insisted that "the landlord cuts no ice." With a somewhat varied interpretation this was admitted. He endorsed the exploded wages fund theory by asserting that the wages are determined by the number of laborers, and at the same time declared that value goes from the laborer to the thing produced. The notion that tenants fix rents, and that prices are made by buyers seemed so absurd to Mr. Kingsley that he nearly choked at the idea, but finally agreed that it would be necessary to make things that others desired if we would dispose of them in trade. He held labor to be a commodity, which was not so bad, when we remember that in one of the high schools of a large eastern city the children were taught that labor is a *perishable* commodity. He was urged to explain how socialists would distribute products, but would only say that they would produce enough to satisfy wants, and would distribute according to some plan satisfactory to themselves. He expressed uncertainty as to "how far the Single Taxer had gone in economics," but there was no doubt as to the point attained by Mr. Kingsley. He is still in the dark ages. He was strong on the "historical" method, and told us much of social conditions of "one hundred thousand years ago."

A meeting was held in the Methodist church, the speaker being introduced by the pastor, Rev. A. M. Sanford. It was a most excellent meeting, and many questions followed a talk on the Doctrines of Henry George. Finally a few Socialists who evidently were not pleased with the debate began inquiries, and failing to make headway, resorted to impudence rather more emphatic than is proper even for Socialists. They were finally prevailed upon to lower their flag, and the meeting closed amid general congratulations—save for the queer folks.

Victoria, B. C., was the next point. A meeting was held at the Trade and Labor Council, the subject being "How to Prevent Strikes." It was a fine body of men, and very close and courteous attention was given the discourse. Just as the meeting opened who should walk in but Clarence S. Darrow, of Chicago. At the close of the talk Mr. Darrow was called upon, and whatever the Single Taxer may have lacked in radical utterance was at once supplied—and very favorably received. It was a splendid evening. The Council wish both speakers to return. A number of questions were subsequently proposed.

A discussion of "Public Ownership of Public Utilities" was held at Spring Ridge, a suburb. The idea of public control, by ownership or otherwise, was the general sentiment.

Our Victoria friends desired another debate with Socialists, and again Mr. Kingsley appeared. He left the 100,000 year matter alone, but insisted that capital is the product of the ages. When will Socialists learn the difference between capital and knowledge—they are nearly as obtuse as the professors. After the usual declarations by Mr. Kingsley that capital despoils toil; that labor is a commodity; that it makes no difference to laborers how taxes are levied; that the police power is merely a scheme to enable the cunning to repress the weak, etc., etc., an attempt was made by the Single Taxer to get the matter into a rational form. He proposed, first, that if one man, or a group, produced 1,000 bushels of wheat worth one dollar per bushel, this product can be exchanged for \$1,000 worth of any variety of products desired. Therefore, to examine production in one form is to examine all production. He then supposed that a community devote itself to catching fish. On the average each captures ten fish per day—their implements being of the crudest. Next, one of the number invents, or makes, a fish net with which he can catch fifty per day. He desires another to operate the net and give him forty, keeping ten. The Single Taxer claimed that no man would accept the offer, but would demand more than ten. No one will work for another unless he can get more than by working for himself. In short capital (the net, or its owner) must raise wages. The employee will learn in time how the net is made and duplicate it. Two nets now appear on the market seeking employees—demand for workers increases. This process continuing, either all will ultimately be possessed of nets, securing fifty fish per day each, or wages will advance until so little remains with the net owners that it barely pays to make nets. Next it was supposed that some one, or many, own the lake, river, or other "fishing ground," and demand ten fish per day from each fisherman, as rent. None but net owners can meet this demand, and those who do not own nets can only seek "jobs" at the

hands of those who do. After much of what is sometimes described as "backing and filling," Mr. Kingsley agreed that the "fishing ground" owner held command of the situation. A very energetic attempt, however, was made to hide the admission in rhetoric. Also an attempt was made to change the illustration from fish to bread, but he was strongly advised to confine himself to fish. If it is merely a matter of capitalists employing laborers and taking the larger part of the product, why do they let so many laborers remain idle? Dr. Ernest Hall, a leading surgeon, was chairman, and displayed a lively interest in the whole series of meetings in Victoria.

A meeting was held by the Y. M. C. A. at which a lecture on Thomas Carlyle was given. Carlyle's economics were shown to be similar to Henry George's doctrines. The difference being that Carlyle had no faith in democratic society, while George had none in aristocratic society. Meanwhile Carlyle did not dodge the issue, as do most modern Tories.

Still another meeting was held in Victoria, at which the doctrines of Henry George were presented. On the following evening a company of gentlemen gathered at the home of Dr. Hall for the purpose of more fully developing the exact points of difference between the Single Tax and Socialism. Dr. Hall was in earnest to know the exact truth.

Returning to the State of Washington, a lecture was delivered before the Board of Trade at Puyallup, on Public Ownership of Public Utilities and the Single Tax. A very good audience assembled and paid close attention to each argument and illustration. With a few exceptions members of the audience were friendly. Newspaper reports were very fair, much more so than at many points.

Another debate was held at Everett, Wash. Mr. Lewis appeared for the Socialists. He insisted that when the improvements are removed from land, whether railroad or other land, the value disappears. He was referred to land on which no improvements had been made, also to Baltimore after the great fire. But facts have no effect on Mr. Lewis. It is easier to deny them. Asked as to how Socialists would distribute products, he said he would leave that matter to Socialist societies—it is a mere detail. The distribution of wealth is the matter under discussion, but is merely a detail. If one man should claim more than an equal share on the ground that he produced more than others, Mr. Lewis would call him a hog—and he would be uncomfortable. And yet in another minute he was loudly asserting that "a man should have all he produced." Socialists are queer.

IN DEFENCE OF FAIRHOPE.

LETTER FROM WILLIAM CALL.

Editor Single Tax Review.

Permit me to reply through your columns to the criticisms of Fairhope by Mr. E. Q. Norton contained in your last issue. As resident, lessee and member for nearly seven years, treasurer for two years, deputy treasurer for two more and at present one of the trustees and never absent from the colony more than three consecutive days, I believe I can speak with as much authority of Fairhope's plan and its application as can the Committeeman for Alabama on the National Single Tax League, and I am sure that I can state it and the facts that substantiate it, more accurately than can he. The "misunderstandings" he deplores he immediately proceeds to extend and amplify by offering a "scrap of history."

This "scrap" is too long to quote here in full, but is contained in the first, second, third and fourth paragraphs of this article and, briefly, state that he opposed the colony from the start and so wrote the founder and former secretary, that he has voiced this opposition consistently and bases his claim to authority on the ground that he is "the oldest Single Taxer, in point of service, in the State if not in the South, and is the Committeeman for Alabama in a defunct organization."

As to his assertion that he has always been opposed to the colony, even before it had located here, I offer in rebuttal his first letter to Mr. E. B. Gaston, dated Feb. 12, 1894, in which he says:

"The plan outlined by you for a cooperative community has more good points than any I have seen heretofore, and is well worth trying. Of course, you fully realize that even if all your own local affairs were carried out as you propose, and every one in your community were to prove in every way all that you could wish as cooperators, still you would be greatly burdened by the ill effects of our present forms of taxation and ill adjusted laws, besides being to a great extent crippled by the effects of private monopolization of the source of all those things from which alone you can draw.

"Locally your own laws may be equitably adjusted, but you will be burdened by the coal and iron monopolists, the timber land owners, the oil kings, the R. R. kings, etc., and so long as general conditions remain as they are, you can get only partial benefits from your cooperation; perhaps whatever benefits may come to you through your plan may ultimately be absorbed by the ever concentrating power that is being monopolized by a few persons. For my part, I would prefer to remain in the field and fight for a change in general conditions that should embrace all the people and all parts of the country and ultimately the whole world."