

This in face of the author's contention and of the argument sustained throughout that until freedom of access to natural opportunities is secured there can be no freedom for the race. This may not be inevitably associated with the "feminist doctrine"—whatever that is—but it is inevitably associated with the economic position of woman in society, and that is what Miss LaFollette is considering.

And when *The New Republic* reviewer comes to the author's suggestion of what would result from the freeing of natural opportunities, she says:

"Utopia, in short. And unfortunately, a reader's mental muscles tend to become lax at the first mention of a Utopian programme. Miss LaFollette is admirable as long as she remains realistic; but beyond this point she is no more stimulating than any other fond deviser of an earthly Paradise."

Laxity of one's mental muscles fits in nicely with the whole policy of *The New Republic*, so why should the reviewer worry? If the self-sufficient critic were able to realize by a feat of the imagination of which she is apparently quite incapable, that the economic position of woman is due to restrictions, she might be able to understand what the removal of all artificial restrictions would accomplish. One is rightfully impatient of this stupid kind of dogmatism which characterizes every solution that goes to the root of the matter as "Utopian."

Here is a work on which more honest and earnest thought has gone than is expended in the making of many books. We say to *The New Republic* that no work on the subject has appeared in recent years more worthy of analysis page by page. Yet it is received with levity and unseemly flippancy by a journal whose pretentiousness is equalled only by its labored cleverness, its avoidance of fundamentals and its milk and water socialism.

—J. D. M.

#### HEALTH, FREEDOM AND SELF-KNOWLEDGE

This is the title of a medical book of 337 pages—or is it "medical," since the author proposes to dispense with nearly all medicines?—by J. Haskel Kritzer, M. D., and published by the Kritzer Educational Foundation at Los Angeles.

The work is calculated to cause a shock in various quarters, for many an established notion regarding the effect of drugs is vigorously attacked. The physicians come in for some fierce onslaughts, nor does the author look much more favorably on the newer schools of practice, osteopathy and chiropractic. He tilts a lance against many pet ideas among which is the use of salt and the bath tub. These he unsparingly condemns.

We are not competent to endorse or reject the author's conclusions, which are frequently supported by testimony from well known authorities. It is a thoughtful book, and presents the author as one conversant with the widest field of medical research and the latest discoveries in that pseudo science. There is much that is valuable in its hints as to diet and means for the preservation of health.

Chapter XXXVI, the last in the book, is entitled Social Economic Justice the Basis of Health and Freedom, confirms the author's acceptance of the philosophy of freedom and the restoration to all the people of the natural resources now monopolized by the few.

—J. D. M.

### CORRESPONDENCE

#### APPROVES WHIDDEN GRAHAM'S ARTICLE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

"The American Farmer and the Single Tax," by Whidden Graham, in your Jan-Feb. issue expresses my ideas of the situation perfectly. More articles from the same pen will prevent many Single Taxers from barking up the wrong tree. Unionism is one of the smoke screens that hides the great truth.

Henry George Hotel, San Francisco.

A. J. MILLIGAN.

#### THE AMERICAN FARMER AND THE SINGLE TAX

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

Dear Sir:—I read with much interest in your last issue an article entitled The American Farmer and the Single Tax, in which the idea

is set forth that the farmer has been neglected by the Single Tax advocate in favor of "labor" and that little hopes of success can be entertained until the farmer has been included in the programme.

This sounds strange to me in view of the fact that my reading and experience had led me to think that the mistakes made with reference to Georgism were mostly of the opposite character. I have a dim recollection of reading in one of Henry George's subordinate books an answer to a criticism that had been passed on "Progress and Poverty" to the effect that it could only apply to agricultural land. Mr. George went into detail to show that it would apply to all land. This explanation interested me much at the time because I then saw something I had not been able to see before that it was broader than a rural proposition. About the same time a friend of mine sojourned in my home for a few days and spent his extra time reading "Progress and Poverty," but before he had finished it he threw it down in disgust and said it was simply a scheme to get everybody out on the farm and set them raising potatoes, and then what would we do for other things which were as necessary to our well being as farm products. In answer to that criticism I tried to convey to him some of my recently acquired information about it applying to all lands, but without avail. This mistake, as I now think, was due to Mr. George's frequent use of agriculture as an illustration. But I am at a loss to discover how the rural application would be missed entirely by the latter day leaders.

It seems to me the farmers are now at a stage where they would be open to the Single Tax Philosophy as a solution for their problems. In view of the fact that such problems are growing serious and no other solution seems to offer itself.

I talked with a farmer recently who was complaining about the heavy and unjust burden of taxation. He had probably never heard of the Single Tax but gave utterance to one of the most common Georgian arguments evidently thought out by himself. He said here are two farmers. Both hard workers and very economical. They had saved a little money. Their farms are considerably run down. So one of them takes his money and improves his house and barn making a great difference in the appearance but adding nothing to his income and increasing his taxes. The other buys tax-free bonds and leaves his premises as they were adding considerable to his income, but his taxes remain as they were. He thought it was all very unjust. Is not a mind like that open to the Georgian philosophy?

I have also been impressed lately with the fact that the farmer who lives a mile or more from town and off the improved road (and that is where the average farmer still is in spite of the vast expansion of the city and good roads) realizes that he possesses little or no site value, though he has no knowledge of that term. I know of four heirs to an estate consisting of a farm on a "dirt" road who were trying to dissolve their joint ownership. One of them proposed to buy out the others at \$700 per share and the others proposed to sell at \$900. I do not know the final price agreed upon but it was not in excess of \$3,600. Yet there was a good house and barn and other buildings of the vintage of the '90s which could not be built now for \$10,000.

I also saw a farmer building a commodious barn on his farm with all the modern equipment for dairying, and his neighbors were criticising him because they said he is spending money more than he could sell the farm land for, including the barn and the house.

I rode out sometime ago with a real estate agent who had a number of farms listed. As we rode up to one farm after another I said what are you asking for this farm, and he told me. I said that the buildings are worth more than that, and he agreed with me, adding "we are offering these farms at very reasonable prices." But none of them sold at those figures. All this within fifteen miles of a city of 125,000 people. It appears to me under such conditions it ought not to be difficult for a good persuader to make the farmer see that they possess no site value in such cases and therefore to put all the tax on site value would not bear heavily on them. I understand also that the programme of the school authorities call for the gradual closing of the

"little red school house" and consolidating in the villages. If that is the case it will withdraw still more of the site value from the "dirt" road farms. If you can indeed take something from nothing, for as I recall Henry George's teaching, the schoolhouse was one of the public improvements that made site value.

This situation may be a little peculiar, for we have been for many years under what our Ohio neighbors call "The Pennsylvania Single Tax" and that is different from most of the tax systems in the rural states. But such a situation is in keeping with George's teaching that under the operations of his philosophy much land would yield no tax though it would not be affected in any other way.

I do not know how it would work out in the West among the soaring farm prices. But I am under the impression that those figures represent speculative value or something else than either site or utility value.

It seems to me that under the Single Tax if it were generally applied farming would approach the condition of a tax-free industry, not even being required to pay a site tax in many cases, and in view of the present groaning under the tax burden there ought to be some power of appeal in that.

I do not think the farm problem is a problem apart from others, but just a phase of the general problem. And since his is still one of the leading industries I do not believe we are going to solve anybody's problems without including him. If the Single Tax authorities today have overlooked him it is time for them to start a movement with the slogan "back to Henry George" for certainly he had the farmer in mind.

Waterford, Pa.

—J. E. BARR.

#### THE ADVANCE IN BRITISH COLUMBIA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

You will doubtless have seen from *Land and Liberty* how our progress in municipal matters in British Columbia appears to them at a distance. We have also made some progress in provincial affairs. I am a farmer here, living directly under provincial laws outside of any municipality. The present government exempted our improvements up to \$1,500. There is also a wild Land Tax of five per cent. on unimproved land. The Wild Land Tax is not very well administered, or it would stop speculation altogether, but it shows how the politicians are interpreting public opinion.

There is a new university at Point Grey, a suburb of Vancouver. The government set aside a certain amount of land around the site to help pay the cost. I wrote to the press explaining the Canberra plan in Australia and advocated a similar plan for the British Columbia University. Shortly afterwards the Minister of Lands in the Provincial Parliament announced that he would follow the Canberra plan in part. That was a year ago. I noticed lately that in answer to a question put to him in the House which is now in session he said that he had sold 30 plots and leased 21. Whether my letter did any good or not I do not know. One thing at least is encouraging—there are takers for the leases, though I have heard nothing yet about the terms. They may be quite fantastic for anything I know. It is usually any way but the straightforward way.

I notice that neighboring municipality, Saanich, took a plebiscite on the question of taxing improvements at the recent election. The vote stood as follows; In favor of taxing improvements, 466; opposed, 1,751. Yet in the face of the verdict the Council is going ahead to impose the taxation of improvements, maintaining that otherwise bankruptcy stares them in the face. Of course they could easily avoid taxing improvements if they were willing to increase the tax on land values, but the speculators are fighting the fight of their lives.

Pender Island, B. C.

ALEXANDER HAMILTON.

#### THE NO TAX DAY COMING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

We in New South Wales and those who reside in Queensland are about as far forward in taking the rent of land instead of taxation as

any part of the world, for we take the revenue required for local government purposes as a proportion of annual rental value of sites, though disguised under the false title of "rating on land values," and take from a third to almost a half of the site rent. When we get wise we will take the whole of it—say a shilling in the pound (as they call it in their patter) on the value of the title, for it is not the land that man has the power to sell, but only the paper, collected by the body nearest the people, the local government, which will pass on half of it, the state government taking about a third and the Federal government the added sixth.

It is only the holder of the fee simple title who may vote at the polls to decide on the method of taxing, but land users readily vote for the Georgian basis, it is only the land withholders who vote for taxes. The "No Tax Day is coming."

New South Wales, Australia.

G. R. HARRISON.

#### BOLTON HALL IN PRAISE OF STANLEY WEYMAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

I always feel grateful to anyone who tells me of an interesting book that has such a literary or significant character as to make me glad, not only to have read it, but to know about it. I think Single Taxers generally feel that way; we all want to be entertained, but not with piffle.

Stanley J. Weyman's "The Great House" is such a book (Longmans Green). P. 134 shows that Stanley knows the Land Question: (the time is about 1848—"the hungry forties" as it was called).

"Have you made a fortune farming?—Why not?—

"Because you are paying a protected rent; because you pay high for feeding stuff. Because you pay poor rates so high you'd be better off paying double wages. There's only one man benefits by the corn tax, sir, there's only one man who is truly protected, and that is the landlord."

His "A Gentleman of France" and "The Long Night" are also high class and fascinating novels.

New York City.

BOLTON HALL.

#### TWO KINDS OF CROPS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

I have carefully read the article of Whidden Graham entitled "The Farmer and the Single Tax." The trouble with the farmer or with too many of them, is that they started out as farmers and land speculators. They wanted their crops of potatoes they produced and the crop of land values that others produced. It is the pursuit of the crop of land values that has put the farmer where he is today, for you cannot have your cake and eat it too.

As for the city dwellers many of them are complaining of high rents, unemployment and slums, etc., but they too are withholding fifty per cent. of the land from use in the cities. In fact they are doing the very thing that causes high rents. There are too many farmers and city workers trying to get something for nothing. They do not realize that even from a selfish standpoint a system of live and let live is better than a system of each for himself and the devil take the hindmost. Not until the workers realize this truth will we progress as we should, and in my humbler opinion we are progressing today as never before. Look at the opposition which is starting colleges to lead people astray from justice and liberty.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

GEORGE LLOYD.

## NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE death of Mrs. Elizabeth M. E. Solly at Colorado Springs, Colorado, at the age of 87, removes from the ranks in which she was a faithful worker one of the foremost Single Taxers in that city, where she had lived for many years. She gave liberally to charity, though she was keenly aware that nothing would permanently remedy conditions save the application of the Georgian policy. She was the widow of Dr. E. M. E. Solly, long known to the city as its "beloved physician." She was for many years a friend of this paper.