

Then there is a change. Land values have risen, but they have risen so high that they now act as a barrier to production; Labor and Capital find them too high to overleap, and they are driven back and must camp outside the wall of the city of Natural Opportunity, a ragged and unkempt army. Capital, it is true, is not quite so ragged and hungry, for it can buy at least for a time its bits of privilege, but it is shabby nevertheless. Labor, however, is now very badly off indeed, for hard times have set in. So he looks at his empty table, and according to his mood blames one or more of the following:

God.
The Administration.
The Bankers.
Foreign Immigration.
The Rockefellers.
The Capitalists.
The Jews.
The Japanese.
Wall Street.
The Tariff.
The Rich.

It would be amusing if it were not so pathetic. For it never occurs to him to ascribe his condition to the fact that Labor and Land have been forced apart.

WHAT IS LAND?

The New York *Call* (Socialist) of July 7 has an editorial on "Single Tax for Mexico but Get the Land First," which is its comment on the proposal to carry the Single Tax agitation into Mexico. Passing over, because unimportant and not faithfully representing the later attitude of the Socialists toward our reform, its sneering reference to the Single Tax and Single Taxers, we come to its very extraordinary conception of what is included in the term "land." But before doing so let us make one quotation from this editorial in our more or less esteemed contemporary.

"If the average Single Taxer based his theory more on social necessity and less on its merits as a good 'plan,' it would be considerably strengthened. For there is undoubtedly going to be in many places a

whole lot of legislation—and other activities—apparently in that direction."

Now the Single Tax is not a 'plan,' nor do Single Taxers ignore that it rests on "social necessity." But the taking of economic rent in taxation and the making of land common property by this means—the opening up of all natural opportunities, mines, forests, farm lands, city sites, thus creating a social revolution in the distribution of labor products and the relative positions of the employers and employed (so-called)—is not a "plan," but the recognition by society of the natural order, to which social necessity indeed points the way, but which is no artificial, patent-applied for scheme of social reconstruction.

The Socialist of a certain school will not recognize what is involved in the doctrine of the Single Taxer. If he did he would be somewhat less of a Socialist. We now come to the proof that the *Call* does not, *cannot* understand the Single Tax because it has not begun by understanding what is included in the term "land."

"The Wilson theory is that if the Mexican peasants get the land, the capitalists there, especially the American ones, will be left to peacefully exploit the mines, railways and oil fields of the country. The peons, being pacified, won't interfere with them. And profits will accrue, and property, that is, capitalist property—all except land—will be safe. There will be a 'stable government' on this basis.

"We don't know whether the Single Taxers agree with that idea or not. Perhaps they are not looking so far ahead.

"But we do know that the opposition to this policy is based on the fear that the Mexican peasants, having got the land, will not be satisfied, but will demand the railways, mines, oil fields and other natural resources. And that fear is well founded, too. The general idea is that if the Mexican peons are permitted to deal with one kind of exploiters, the landed ones, by 'robbery under arms,' they may decide to go and 'rob' the others."

If mines, railways and oil fields are not "land," what are they?

Just a word about "capitalist property other than land," from which profits will

continue to accrue. This can mean nothing else but stock and machinery, all quickly perishable and all capable of infinite multiplication by Labor, in whose interest Socialists as well as Single Taxers urge their well-meant agitation, but not susceptible of addition, infinite or infinitesimal, by any effort of Capital.

IN HONOR OF THE MAYOR OF EDMONTON.

A luncheon was held at Kalils, Park Place, this city, on Wednesday, noon, on July 1st, by a group of Single Taxers to honor Mr. Wm. J. Macnamara, Mayor of Edmonton, and Mr. George P. Smith, member of the Alberta provincial parliament. Mr. Edward Polack, Register of the Bronx, acted as toastmaster and introduced the mayor to the diners, about forty in number.

Mr. Macnamara began by an allusion to his city as "the first municipality on the continent." He told of its remarkable growth. The 1910 census gave the population as 24,000 which in a little over three years had trebled itself. Edmonton supplies power to the manufacturers at a cost of much lower than that under private ownership. It owns its water and electric power plants, and supplies lighting at an exceedingly low rate. The electric lighting system of itself has demonstrated the wisdom of the principle of municipal ownership. Its publicly owned telephone system—the automatic system in use in Chicago—charges for its service one third that of any private company in America. The mayor explained that his last campaign was run on a demand for an elective commission government. The tendency of the elective commission plan, he said, is to bring out the best men. Edmonton today has a sort of hybrid commission government.

The mayor spoke of his plan to include the water tax in the general tax levy, which he estimated would add but one mill to the rate. Edmonton today has practically no taxes save one on land values. Formerly it had a so-called "business

tax," a floor space tax graduated on certain industries, but this had been abolished in 1902. The best argument for the Single Tax is that it works. The mayor hoped the cause would grow.

Mr. Smith, member of the Alberta parliament, referred to the argument sometimes urged by the opponents of the Single Tax that in Vancouver it had resulted in a slump in building operations. But if we go across the line to Seattle or Spokane we shall find in the absence of the Single Tax an even greater slump. Mr. Smith told of the wonderful natural advantages of the province which, capable of sustaining a population of 75,000,000, has less than a half million. Alberta has adopted the Single Tax, and many of the cities having their own charters have resorted to it. Edmonton has adopted it in full, and is making a splendid success of it. Mr. Smith, himself a very young man, paid an eloquent compliment to the youthful mayor of Edmonton, and closed with an appeal for free trade which stamps him as an orator of no mean powers.

MARY FELS.

In an admirable article in the *Chicago Record-Herald* Stoughton Cooley discussed the "Evolution in Our Philanthropies" in which he compares the fortunes left by Leland Stanford and Russell Sage and the uses to which these "foundations" are being put with the more moderate fortune of the late Mr. Fels and says:

"Stricken in his prime, Joseph Fels left his wealth and the unfinished work to which he had set his hand. But his will disclosed no "foundation" in which his wealth would be free from taxes; nor was it given into the hands of trustees, to be expended thus and so. It was given to his wife, Mary Fels, without restriction, who takes up the work where he laid it down, and in the same spirit. In an announcement to the public Mrs. Fels expresses the hope that she will be able to contribute the same financial support that her husband did—the conditional clause is due to the fact that he sometimes outran