ing up or preserving of organic tissue finally resulting from the act, and the tearing down the tissue involved in the effort of production." He then states the matter physiologically, and in other ways. While Diagram No. 1, "Let the distance from O to a point T in the line OT, represent the time spent," etc., etc., is to assure us that whatever it is he is maintaining, the argument is clinched. However, we who are not alumni must, like the participants at a seance when the materialization speaks in Greek, and "the *evidence* is of things not seen," have a receptive faith in the medium. The article ends with a partial synopsis of it, 3 pp., 15 numbered items. I give only the first and last.

No. 1. In any act of conduct of any organism the utility of the time spent in the act depends upon catabolism and environment.

No. 15. When the quantity of capital borrowed is controlled by the consumer, the distribution of the loanage between the consumer and the possessor is determined by the rate of interest which corresponds to that quantity of capital affording a maximum income, to the rate of interest, to the consumer of the capital.

Prof. Blue, and other quarterly economists, are regardless of Paul's warning, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air" because they know that to be reputed an oracle in the colleges one must *not* write to be understood.

Ask we for what fair end the Almighty Sire,
In mortal bosoms wakes this gay contempt,
These grateful stings of laughter, from disgust
Educing pleasure? Wherefore but to aid
The tardy steps of reason.

Benignant Heaven,
Conscious how dim the dawn of truth appears
To thousands; conscious what a scanty pause,
From labors and from care, the wider lot
Of humble life affords for studious thought,
To scan this maze of "Logic," therefore stamp'd
The glaring scenes with characters of scorn;
Obvious and broad e'en to the passing clown,
Had he but time to look.

—Adapted from AKENSIDE.

The enemies of Tom Johnson claim that he didn't keep his promises. They neglect to add that it took thirteen injunctions to prevent him from keeping them.

Johnstown *Democrat.*

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS OF C. B. FILLEBROWN AT BANQUET OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, HOTEL VENDOME, BOSTON, APRIL 13TH.

GROUND RENT.

I. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF GROUND RENT?

As defined by Mr. Thos. G. Shearman, GROUND RENT is, in its nature, "a tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." It is found operative in every civilized country, automatically collecting "from every citizen an amount almost exactly proportionate to the fair and full market value of the benefits which he derives from the government under which he lives and the society which surrounds him." It is a tribute, "a tax, just, equal, full, fair, paid for full value received." "It is not merely a tax which justice *allows;* it is one which justice *demands.* It is not merely one which *ought* to be collected; it is one which infallibly *will be* and *is* collected. It is not merely one which the State ought to see collected; it is one which, in the long run, the State *cannot prevent* from being collected." . . . "Seldom has there been a more beautiful illustration of the wise yet relentless working of natural law than in the proved impossibility of justly collecting any tax other than upon ground rent. It shows that Nature makes it impossible to execute justly a statute which is in its nature unjust." This definition of Mr. Shearman is offered as one difficult to be improved upon or further condensed.

Such, it may be added, is the nature of rent—gound rent that all the public and private improvements of a community today are reflected in the land values of that community. Not only this, but the value of all those ideal public improvements conceived of as being possible under Utopian conditions would be similarly absorbed, as it were, in the ground, would be reflected in its site value. For illustration: Suppose you stand before a big mirror, you see your image perfectly reflected before you. If you are a man scantily, shabbily clad, so is the image in the glass. The addition of rich and costly attire is imaged in the glass. Load yourself with jewels and fill your hands with gold, in the mirror, true to nature, is the image and likeness of them all. Not more perfectly, nor more literally, is your image reflected in the mirror, than are public improvements reflected in the value of the land.

Digitized by Google
Original from NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
Generated for Alexandra Wagner Lough (University of California, Irvine) on 2017-09-22 19:11 GMT / http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433022371367
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google

One peculiarity in the nature of ground rent to which we urge your attention, is the subtle relation existing between ground rent, this natural income, and the artificial outgo of the public taxes, a relation not unlike that of cause and effect, of identity or continuity; by which the wise expenditure of the tax finds its resultant expression in ground rent.

Simple illustrations may help to open the mind to a judicial consideration of whatever may seem novel or strange in the re-statement of a familiar truth. For instance: The cook turns the crank of her coffee mill; the whole coffee that was in the hopper comes out ground coffee, but it is coffee just the same. The Minneapolis miller lets on the water that turns the crank of his flour mill; the wheat that goes into the hopper comes out flour, wheat in a more subtle form. The people turn the crank of a great tax mill; the taxes that go into the hopper come out ground rent, no tax quality lost, no missing rent ingredient added.

Or again: The myriad springs and rivulets of the great Mississippi are continually delivering themselves in one great river to the sea. Suppose that some day you should read in the weather bulletin that nature had decided to suspend the regular return of these waters in clouds and rain and dew to their point of departure, how long would it before the Mississippi Valley would be as parched and dry as the Desert of Sahara, or the North End of the city of Boston, or the East Side of the city of New York.

Or more pertinent still, because more vital, the constant round of taxes and ground rent is the blood circulation of the body politic. When the heart throws out the life blood through the arteries, if that blood does not return through the veins the patient dies, not of heart failure, but from loss of blood. When this public heart charges the arteries of the land with ground rent, if that ground rent does not return, the body politic is prostrated or enervated by loss of blood. The Boston body politic to-day is like a man with a ravenous appetite, cleaning his plate of all the seventeen or eighteen million a year that he can earn, and mortgaging the future for nearly as much more, always eating, yet always hungry, and simply because the best part of his forty million dollars worth of arterial life blood instead of coming back to the public heart ebbs rapidly away through severed blood vessels in the private appropriation of ground rent.

These illustrations of the miscarriage of a beneficent provision seem to us to hint strongly at the true nature of ground rent, as waiting to be naturally developed under a natural law, and as a natural SOCIAL PRODUCT.

II. WHAT IS THE OPERATION OF GROUND RENT?

Your critical consideration is invited to whether Mr. Shearman's statement is true, that the operation of ground rent is to exact from every user of land the natural tribute which he ought to pay in return for the perpetual public and social advantages secured to him by his location, a part of which natural tribute goes to the State in the form of a tax, and the remainder to the landlord in the form of rent. Objection to monopolies and special privileges is that they participate in the private appropriation of an undue share of this natural tribute, and while recognizing that in the end all *quasi*-public, as well as all public service, should be at the least practicable cost to the people, it is held that meantime whatever monopoly *is* enjoyed, should be obliged through taxation to repay to the public a full and fair equivalent for the privilege conceded to it.

The monopolies and special privileges which it is here thought should properly share with land values the burden of taxation, may be partially enumerated as follows, viz.: the private appropriation of natural resources such as gold, silver, copper, iron and coal mines, oil fields, and water powers; all franchises of steam and electric railways, all other public franchises, granted to one or several persons incorporated, and from which all other people are excluded, and which include all "rights, authority, or permission to construct, maintain, or operate in, under, above, upon, or through any streets, highways, or public places any mains, pipes, tanks, conduits, or wires, with their appurtenances for conducting water, steam, heat, light, power, gas, oil, or other substance, or electricity for telegraphic, telephonic, or other purposes."

The reforms contemplated by the single tax would leave the State and the individual to deal together exactly as individuals deal with one another in ordinary business. Parties desiring special privileges would rent them from the State or the municipality, exactly the same as they have now to rent them from individuals and corporations, and on similar terms fixed from year to year. When paid for in this way, the special privilege feature would be eliminated. Then there really would be no special privileges, and there would be need of no other taxation. Hence, we say, the least, the public can do is to tax and collect upon these special privileges, including ground rent, a sum sufficient to defray all public expenses.

The value of these special privileges is held to be economic rent, or ground rent, which in turn is held to be very largely, if not entirely, a SOCIAL PRODUCT.

Digitized by Google
Original from NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
Generated for Alexandra Wagner Lough (University of California, Irvine) on 2017-09-22 19:11 GMT / http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433022371367
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google

III. WHAT IS THE OFFICE OF GROUND RENT?

The true office of ground rent is that of a Board of Equalization, equalization of taxation, of distribution, and of opportunity. The tendency of an increase in the tax upon ground rent is not only to equalize taxation and distribution, but to equalize the opportunity of access to what is erroneously called the land, which of itself, even in a city, would be of little or no use if it had a perpetual fifty-foot tight board fence around it. In this clear distinction between land and land value, which cannot be too critically noted, may there not be found an explosion of the notion that a man has a right to the private appropriation of ground rent, because his father bought and paid for the land fifty or one hundred years ago. The question is, When he bought the land fifty or one hundred years ago did he buy and pay for the land value of to-day? A company having five shares and five stockholders bought in 1686 a lot of land in Philadelphia for $5. The same company, with its five shares and five stockholders, has just sold the value of the same land for $1,000,000. Does it sound reasonable to say that for one pound sterling in 1686 these five men bought and paid for the $1,000,000 land value of 1900, with its ground rent of $40,000 a year? Would not such a sale in 1686 of goods to be delivered two hundred and sixteen years later be dealing in futures with a vengeance? True it is that the land sold to-day is the same land bought in 1686. It is also true that its value to-day is not the value of land itself, but is the value of the rights and privileges pertaining thereto, and exterior to the land itself. The demand which enhances land value is not for land, but for the command of these same rights and privileges.

Land value, being a social creation, and its rent a social maintenance, equal access to the rights and privileges pertaining to the land can be promoted by the taxation of ground rent alone, and by this means alone. Ground rent, the natural tax feeder, extracts from the user of land the exact measure of his advantage over other men in his exclusive enjoyment of rights and privileges pertaining to his own location, and the whole tendency of the taxation of ground rent is to equalize participation in these common rights and privileges by commuting into dollars and cents, which can be divided, those indivisible advantages of location, which can only be enjoyed individually. Whatever of rent goes into the public treasury tends to a fairer distribution of produce in wages earned. Whatever of taxation is transferred from other wealth to ground rent, leaves so much more wealth to be distributed in wages.

Again, it is submitted that the true office of ground rent is to offer a communal inanimate shoulder suited to bear all the burden of common needs, by a continuous self-supporting round of taxes and ground rent, leaving "produce"—current wealth—to be distributed, as fast as produced, in wages and interest, the total volume of which will always be increased by the amount of rent appropriated through the taxation of whatever of economic rent there is in special privilege.

If the private appropriation of ground rent is a special privilege, is it not because ground rent is a SOCIAL PRODUCT?

IV. WHAT CAUSES GROUND RENT?

The dimension, as well as the continuous character, of the contribution made by the people to the growth and volume of ground rent is seldom measured,—by many persons it is hardly suspected. Almost anything else, except land, which he owns a man may appropriate, destroy, tear down, burn down, remove, consume, change its form, wear it out. To the land itself he cannot do any of these things. The value of its use is ground rent, an annual value, which is all that the owner of land can consume each year. The land value itself survives, and usually intact. People speak of owning land, because they or their fathers have bought and paid for it. A simple illustration may not unfairly indicate how a disproportionate reliance may be placed upon this argument, considered in the light of all the causes contributing to the value of land. Suppose, for instance a vacant lot was bought fifty years ago for $1,000 and to-day it is worth $10,000. When the purchaser paid down his original $1,000, the chances are that the people, in one capacity or another, paid for the same year $50 to maintain that purchase value, and for forty-nine years thereafter the people have paid in annual arithmetical progression up to $500 for the present year. The purchaser paid $1,000 down in one payment. The people have paid during the fifty years an average of $250 a year to maintain this value. On the part of the people it has been not unlike a continuous purchase in the proportion of $250 a year of the people's tax money to $50 a year of the purchaser's interest money.

In addition to whatever income the purchaser has received, he possesses to-day $10,000 worth of land, and the people—the mere right to tax, for the reason that the people possess nothing except an outgo of five per cent. in maintenance to an income of one and one-half per cent. in tax. Such an inheritance would usually be counted worse than nothing. Is it not reasonable that the community should derive profit from its part in this transac-

Digitized by Google
Original from NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
Generated for Alexandra Wagner Lough (University of California, Irvine) on 2017-09-22 19:11 GMT / http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433022371367
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google

tion, by appropriating to its own use the one-half of that ground rent which is manifestly created by the simple expenditure of its taxes? Why should not taxes, *all of which are spent upon the land,* be taken from the land?

In particularizing its sources, let it be said that ground rent must be the direct effect of at least three distinct causes: 1. PUBLIC EXPENDITURE; 2. QUASI-PUBLIC EXPENDITURE; 3. PRIVATE EXPENDITURE.

FIRST. PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

Nothing, it would seem could be more self-evident than that all wise public expenditures are the direct feeders of ground rent. Nothing could be clearer than that streets, lights, water, sewerage, fire and police systems of Boston, her schools, libraries, museums, parks, and playgrounds, one and all, by making it so much the more desirable to live in Boston, contribute directly to the appreciation in the value of her land, a corresponding depreciation in which would instantly follow the abolition of any of these systems. If forty two millions is a fair estimate for the ground rent of Boston, then this first cause, Public Expenditure, may, it would seem, easily account for at least one-half of this forty-two million.

SECOND. QUASI-PUBLIC EXPENDITURE.

It is scarcely less clear that steam and electric railways, gas and electric lights, telegraph and telephone companies, subways and ferries, are contributors to the value of land. This fact is not altered by the other fact that the people who pay for the use of those things get, in return, full value received. No one would deny that the Subway has added all the millions that it cost to the value of Boston land.

THIRD. PRIVATE EXPENDITURE.

If the contribution from this source is not as self evident as are those from public and *quasi*-public expenditures, will it not appear upon a little closer analysis that churches, private schools, colleges and universities *surely stand in the relation of cause and effect,* that all private and public buildings, well appointed apartment houses, stores and office buildings unquestionably add to the value of the land?

This question of what are the causes of ground rent is the hinge upon which the single tax must turn. The endeavor has been to omit no contributor from the enumeration. Population is the cause often first named, but a *passive* population gives little value to land. The activities of such population are what create the value, and it is the listing of these which is here attempted, and the help of our guests is besought in making good any omissions.

Thus, while it is now generally conceded that, as a matter of *fact,* ground rent is what land is worth for use, as a matter of *economics* it is of far greater importance to understand clearly what is the source of ground rent, and especially to what extent it may be regarded as practically a SOCIAL PRODUCT.

V. WHAT MAINTAINS GROUND RENT?

As the cost of streets, lights, water, sewerage, fire, police, schools, libraries, museums, parks, playgrounds, steam and electric railways, gas and electric lights, telegraph and telephone companies, subways, ferries, churches, private schools, colleges, universities, public buildings, well appointed houses, stores and office buildings is what constitutes the cost value of the land, so the maintenance of all this public or social service, if not in a literal sense, is in an all sufficient common sense, the maintenance of ground rent.

A simple illustration may help to an appreciation of the absurd absence of a true economy in Boston's family tax affairs to-day:

A landlord owns a factory which requires steam power, and which is useless and worthless without it. Another party owns a steam plant, and furnishes steam to factories at so much per horse power. The man who hires and uses the factory pays factory rent to his landlord, who furnishes the factory, and steam rent to the party that furnishes the steam, and would smile if you should talk to him about paying his steam rent to the landlord who does not furnish it.

In vivid contrast with this sensible performance, another landlord owns a store which requires public service and convenience, and which is useless without it. The municipality owns and runs a public service plant, and furnishes public service at a cost of so much per thousand dollars' worth. The man who hires and uses the store pays store rent to his landlord, who furnishes the store, but, by some perverse obliquity, he pays his public service rent to the same landlord, and the chances are that he will resent it if you even talk to him about paying his public service rent to the public that furnishes it.

Inasmuch as all these contributions to its maintenance, so far as enumerated, are from the treasuries of the people, what can ground rent possibly be, if it is not a SOCIAL PRODUCT?

VI. HOW MUCH IS THERE OF GROUND RENT IN BOSTON?

A dense skepticism, and indeed a denser ignorance, seems to obtain even in regard to the simple fact that there is such a

Digitized by Google
Original from NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY
Generated for Alexandra Wagner Lough (University of California, Irvine) on 2017-09-22 19:11 GMT / http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433022371367
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google

thing as ground rent, and yet much more in regard to what is the VOLUME of ground rent. Especially in reference to the ground rent of Boston, doubt has been expressed by experts whether it would, under the single tax with the accompanying shrinkage in speculative values, exceed to-day five per cent. on the assessed valuation of land ($573,000,000) or $28,000,000.

ONE HUNDRED AND TWENTY SALES.

In a systematic attempt to dispel these clouds of ignorance and skepticism, now to be found in surprisingly high places, and to demonstrate beyond a reasonable doubt about how much ground rent there is in the city of Boston, actual sales and actual rentals have been consulted and collected, and are herewith submitted. One hundred and twenty pieces of real estate in various sections of the city are shown to have been sold at prices averaging one-fifth higher than their assessed valuation, indicating that at least in these one hundred and twenty cases the valuations were less than five-sixths of the selling price.

(Here follow tables, which included in this address may be obtained of the Massachusetts Single Tax League, 68 Essex street, Boston, Mass.)

NOTICE TO OUR READERS.

AN ENTERPRISING POPULIST ORGAN.

On May 14th the Nebraska *Independent*, of Lincoln, Neb., the foremost Populist paper in America, will publish a single tax edition, devoting its 16 pages to that subject.

It wants contributions on all phases of the subject from single taxers everywhere.

It will give symposium wide circulation and later invite criticism and thus start a general discussion.

The *Independent* also opens an Independent School of Political Economy, and will circulate works on Political Economy. It already has several single tax works in circulation, and will put out more as fast as they are donated.

Orsa, in Sweden, has in the course of a generation sold $5,750,000 worth of trees and by means of a judicious replanting has provided for a similar income every thirty or forty years. In consequence of the development of this commercial wealth, there are no taxes. Railways and telephones are free and so are school houses, teaching and many other things.

Swords and Plowshares

A New Book of Verse by
ERNEST CROSBY

Author of "CAPTAIN JINKS, HERO," "PLAIN TALK IN PSALM AND PARABLE," etc.

"The work of a strong pen and the expression of a strong heart."—*Milwaukee Journal.*

"Much of power and inspiration."—*St. Paul Despatch*

"Indisputable poetic gift."—*Saturday Review of Books and Art of the New York Times.*

"It is not out of place to say of the book, Who touches this, touches a man."—*Literary World, Boston.*

PUBLISHED BY

The FUNK & WAGNALLS COMPANY NEW YORK

Price, $1.00 Net

Digitized by Google

Original from
NEW YORK PUBLIC LIBRARY

Generated for Alexandra Wagner Lough;Alexandra Wagner Lough (University of California, Irvine) on 2017-09-22 19:11 GMT / http://hdl.handle.net/2027/nyp.33433022371367
Public Domain, Google-digitized / http://www.hathitrust.org/access_use#pd-google