

every shadow of reform like drowning men at straws. How much more eager would they be if the real substance of the thing were put before them?

Respectfully,  
F. H. BURYSON,  
of the Seaman's Union,  
37 South St.,  
New York City.

### BOOK REVIEWS.

(Owing to press of matter, reviews of John Graham Brooks' *Social Unrest*, from the pen of Mr. Bolton Hall, and *Benevolent Feudalism*, from the pen of the editor, are crowded out of this number. They will appear in the Summer Number.)

#### "TOWARD THE LIGHT."

Mr. Lewis H. Berens, co-author of "The Story of My Dictatorship," etc., has written another book "Toward the Light," (Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.) a collection of essays and studies in ethics and economics, joined and related into a complete logical work.

It deals with subjects about which his thoughts are neither illusive, elusive or delusive.

Single taxers, who are uncertain about various knotty points in political economy will find their perplexities stated and explained, in simple and lucid illustration and argument.

Mr. Berens is an avowed single taxer, in almost thorough agreement with Henry George, from whom he dissents, however on the question of "Interest," whether it is natural or by-product of distorted economic conditions. He contends that "Interest" springs from private appropriation of rent and legal privilege and will disappear along with their abolition.

Yet upon his own showing "Interest" will continue as a regulator for the economical production of "auxiliaries—tools" alternating between premium and discount, according as the supply is deficient or in excess of demand tending to an equilibrium (pages 160-161).

"Land" and "Labor" are the primary factors of production, supplemented in advanced conditions, by what Mr. Berens terms "Auxiliaries of production—Tools," a capital definition of "Capital," the change in terms, however, does not change the factors.

It goes merely as a matter of statement that these "auxiliaries" are neither one or the other factor—"land" or "labor"—they are both, consequently, to assign "wages" to "labor," "rent" to "land," excludes, (if distribution be limited to these terms, rent and wages) any definite term to the earnings of "auxiliaries."

"Auxiliaries—Tools" are termed capital

to differentiate it from "land" and "labor"; since it is therefore necessary to make a distinction in the terms of the factors, it is equally important that the *earnings* of the factors bear distinctive names.

Matter, and the forces of nature, comprehended in the term "Land" are not only active before and while labor is operating with them, but in some cases continues to produce increment even after they are changed, modified, separated, combined, etc. by labor, and converted into exchangeable "goods." The competition of various commodities, some of which continue to grow in value, while others remain stationary or depreciate gives rise to a value determined by the value of the depreciating commodity, analogous to the "No rent" land in the phenomena of "rent."

Rent attaches to a place, but after land has been disassociated from its fixed condition and directed on its way toward satisfying human needs, the unearned increment that before attached to *the place* will now be added to *the product*, a store of wheat will increase in value with the lowering of the margin of cultivation.

Advancing civilization will, if past experience is any criterion, make the production of a "good" an easier task; what now requires ten days' effort to produce, may in a week or a year be produced by nine days' work, during the same time that other "goods" are being produced with even a greater saving of labor, while concurrently some things will require no less exertion than before. This variation will, in deferred rewards of enjoyment, be naturally distributed by the play of competitive interest.

If I loan, for a year, the work of ten days, represented, for example, by a barrel of flour and at the expiration of the time when payment is to be made, a barrel of flour can be produced with nine days' work, should I, in justice, be paid the then value of a barrel of flour or the prevailing value of ten days' work?

I believe that interest is natural and necessary to average this advancing gain and distribute its advantages equitably.

This problem of whether interest is natural and therefore persistent, is not to be solved by legislation. Right conditions will bring its own settlement of the question, and Mr. Berens aptly sums up the situation in the conclusion to his chapter on "Interest." He says: "It is, therefore, not natural and equitable, but unnatural and unjust."

Many earnest Social Reformers may, however, still remain of the opposite opinion. It is, therefore, a matter of congratulation that differences of opinion on this somewhat abstract, if not merely academic, question cannot be any real cause of antagonism or separation between any who are seriously desirous of establishing justice, and of securing to mankind the fruits of jus-

tice. All can unite to attain this end; and when it is attained, then if "interest" continues, we shall know that it is both natural and just; whilst if it disappears, we shall know that it was unnatural and unjust; that it was, in truth, but one of the fruits of privilege and monopoly, of that unjust social system which produced poverty in the midst of plenty, and which conferred advantages and privileges on the few, at the cost to the detriment of their "disinherited" fellow-citizens.

The exposition of value could be clearer. There is an implication at least that "value" is a "ratio" and cannot therefore be increased or decreased as a total. No single which has been so completely demolished by Henry George in the 'Science of Political Economy.' But the book is altogether a good contribution to the growing literature of the single tax.

The historian will some day trace out the development of an established right order of society from such writings as Mr. Berens' and others who have been inspired by the great genius of Henry George.

BENJAMIN DOBLIN.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

Chicago, Ill.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Regarding your request for opinions on the matter of a national organization and a national organ, I would say that I think the organ must precede the organization. It is easier to get people to subscribe for a paper than to contribute to the support of an organization concerning the doings of which they are not being kept regularly informed.

To make the paper attractive enough to draw subscribers for other reasons than merely a sense of duty, I would suggest that all long propaganda articles be barred from its columns. Very few read these articles, so that there is nothing gained by publishing them. Something on the order of the short and sharp comments on current events, by means of which the Appeal to Reason has succeeded in building up an enormous circulation, would be much better. The Appeal to Reason has achieved success because it can be appreciated and enjoyed by non-socialists as well as socialists, and consequently has attracted thousands of the former class to its support.

I think also that, if possible, the various struggling single tax papers, such as *Why*, the *Detroit Commonwealth*, etc., might be induced to consolidate. The combined subscription lists of all these papers may be enough to make one paper self-sustaining.

S. DANZIGER.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I have watched with a great deal of regret the many attempts that have been made in the past to establish and place upon a solid financial foundation a national organ that would be worthy of the cause, for the only question in connection with the building up of a strong organ has been the one of money. I do not consider that my opinion is of any value upon matters of this kind, but I have always felt from the time I was connected with the *Single Tax*, some sixteen years ago, that among the first essentials to the early success of our cause was the establishing of a national organ upon such a scale as would command the respect and attention of intelligent people throughout the world, besides being the means to keep *Single Taxers* informed of what was being done, and of the progress of the movement everywhere. This tends to keep up the enthusiasm, without which success is out of the question, and we have but to go over the past few years in the history of the movement to prove conclusively, I think, the truth of the above assertion. I can truthfully say that the only thing that has ever caused me to feel in the least discouraged in the early success—that is, say, in our lifetime—of the cause is their lack of interest or indifference of *Single Taxers* generally in a national organ. Nor can I understand why it should be so, especially when I see how enthusiastically the Socialists support, not one, but a half dozen or more of party papers, to say nothing of numerous other publications which are daily growing in circulation.

W. W. WILES.

Beaver, Pa., Feb. 5, 1903.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I notice in the last issue of the *Single Tax Review* that Booker Washington denies the published statement of Brother Bailey, that he is a *Single Taxer*. At this I am not surprised. Mr. Washington, in his lectures, reveals a shortsightedness of economic questions that is foreign to single taxers. He no doubt feels kindly toward the single tax movement, and perhaps has a notion that he is a *Single Taxer* himself, but I feel quite certain that he does not realize the full import of the George philosophy. I have a friend quite intelligent and well read who tells me that he believes in the single tax philosophy, not because he understands it himself, but because he believes in the men who are single taxers. Might not this be Mr. Washington's dilemma? And thoughtlessly he pronounces himself a single taxer.

Yours fraternally,

CHARLES R. ECKERT.