

humanity but wants them to come from him. When he reaches the point where he begins to see there is infinite good, which religionists call God (the Saxon word for "good"), he finds there the perfect answer. The speaker closed by quoting Ernest Crosby's poem ending with the line "Then we'll talk of the life that he lived—never mind how he died."

Jackson Ralston of California, who happened to be in Washington on a visit, was a welcome guest at the banquet and spoke in place of Honorable David John Lewis, who had found it to be impracticable to be present. Mr. Ralston recounted the fight which he and other Single Taxers, including Mr. Mooney and Mr. and Mrs. Ogle, waged years ago to give the people of Maryland the right to exempt improvements and tangible personal property from taxation whenever they had the sense to take advantage of it, and several of the towns had already done so. Mr. Ralston then reviewed the campaign in California where he had been in the forefront of the battle for the Single Tax amendment, whose enemies had appealed to the Supreme Court of the State to prevent the measure from being submitted to the people, thereby confessing their fear that it would succeed. He believed, however, that this amendment stood a somewhat better chance of passage now that the sales tax had been tried out and proved so unpopular.

Mr. Mooney of Baltimore, Mrs. Adelaide Johnson, the sculptress of the marble busts of suffrage leaders in the Capital, and Mr. Charles E. Fairman, Art Curator at the Capital, also spoke briefly in response to requests from the toastmistress.

—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

## Correspondence

### SINGLE TAX AND MACHINERY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The letter from Rev. John Haynes Holmes to Mr. Burger, which is quoted in Mar.-Apr. "Comment and Reflection," holds that "Single Tax handles the land question—Socialism handles the machine question."

Mr. Holmes is a very outstanding example of the great mass of earnest and intelligent thinkers who see that Single Tax will free workers from the burden of supporting idle owners of land but insist that they must also be freed from supporting idle owners of wealth (machinery). They naturally condemn Single Tax as a *complete remedy* because its advocates themselves allege that it will continue this latter "burden" as actual "earnings of capital."

Evidently "thinking through" on the matter of machinery is important to Single Tax progress, notwithstanding that the actual (natural law) outcome cannot be affected by beliefs about it.\* And to this end your "Comment" clearly notes that "machines can be multiplied many fold"—that the owner "cannot charge more for their use than his competitor demands"—that with labor free to apply itself to natural resources wages "cannot be less than what a laborer could earn if he owned the machinery."

This should help Mr. Holmes to "think through"; and *Single Taxers also*. For does it not apply equally to *all* tools helpful to labor? Does the fact that certain capital tools (animal and vegetable) carry God-given aid to production, affect the fact that *they also* can be multiplied and competitively owned just as other machinery is,—or the fact that output from *their* use (as calves and wheat) must be sold competitively just as output from other machinery is?

If Single Taxers "think through" on this matter,—and on the naturalness of workers agreeing with the dictionaries that *only human beings* can really "earn"—then the present harmful antagonizing of honest and able thinkers like Mr. Holmes may be avoided. The fair assumption that their honesty and intelligence about equal ours seems clearly essential to our successfully passing on the blessing of "seeing the cat."

Reading, Pa.

WALTER G. STEWART.

### RENT AND PRICES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Both sides are right.

If rent did not enter into wages and prices, there would be no use for any one wasting time with Political Economy.

But, generally, there is no higher price of commodities where the land-value is higher.

Wages and Prices are the Siamese twins of Political Economy. A person with a scientific mind cannot think of one without thinking of the other.

An interesting study: Note the prices for parking in the downtown area of big cities. There the prices are higher where the land-value is higher.\*

Let us all re-affirm and continue to re-affirm: No taxes, but the collection of ground rent in lieu of taxes.

Peoria, Ill.

ALBERT HENNIGES.

### RECALLS DR. BRAUN AND ALEXANDER HÖR

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Sorry to hear of the passing of Dr. Robert Braun, of Budapest at such an early age. In 1893 I had an intimate acquaintanceship with a young Hungarian Jew, Alexander Hör (Hör Sandor). He was eighteen and descended from a long line of Rabbis. I can see him now, when he jumped up from the floor in my store in Waco, Texas, and exclaimed: "I see it now!" (the cat). He later aided me in establishing a dozen or so of the boiler-plate SingleTax papers published in as many Texas cities, at the instigation of Percy Pepon and Sheridan Webster, of Western Newspaper Union, St. Louis. Also with the lecture tour of Louis F. Post in the State in April, 1894, and of Dr. Longstreet's lectures (about 6 months in Texas and a couple of weeks in New Mexico) in 1895. When I bought the circus tent, to which Tom Johnson contributed \$100, and gave it to Dr. Longstreet and paid its expressage to Delaware for the long campaign there, young Hör followed. After the campaign there ended in autumn of 1896, Hör returned to Hungary and entered the National University of Budapest. He organized a Henry George Club with a membership of sixty students. His most promising member was a young medical student, Braun Robert (Robert Braun) of Vasachely, Eastern Hungary—afterward Dr. Robert Braun of Budapest, who later translated some of George's works. Hör thought that the faculty of the University were impeding him in his studies—holding him back, and, not knowing but that more severe punishment awaited him for his activity in our cause, he thought to play safe by returning to America—which he did, foregoing his educational ambitions.

Early this month Hon. John C. Stevenson, recently County Commissioner and candidate for governor, spoke nightly for a week or so over station KOL on Single Tax, at the conclusion of each talk urging his auditors to read "Progress and Poverty!" As Stevenson is the most dominating personality in the state and also its best radio speaker, having had years of experience, daily; his final acquisition, after years of uncertainty, is appreciated. I did not have the pleasure of hearing him, but heard of the talks from many who did hear them.

Seattle, Washington.

A. FREELAND.

### SOCIALISTIC MISCONCEPTIONS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Thus, the fact that wages are low, that the laborer does not receive the full value of the product he has created, sent George in search of the cause of low wages, whereas, according to the followers of George, the same phenomenon sent the socialists hurtling against the very concept of wages. This was the prime fallacy of socialism—the habit of seeking no further than the obvious.

Wages are paid by the capitalist to the laborer; they are there-

\*But this is pure rent—not the price of a commodity produced on the location.  
—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.



fore the chain of bondage that fetters the laborer to the machine. Laborers compete with each other and drive wages down, therefore competition is the cause of poverty.

The worker is dependent upon capital; he does not own it and he is poor. The capitalist controls the tools of production; he therefore employs the worker and he is rich. Therefore, the ownership of capital is the source of industrial exploitation.

Such propositions, the Georgeist argues, are the essence of traditional socialism, and they illustrate the refusal to dip beneath the superficial.

Columbia, Mo.

GEORGE RAYMOND GEIGER.

### PUBLIC OWNERSHIP

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Will you kindly permit a few remarks upon the much mooted problem of public ownership of public utilities? The orthodox position of Single Taxers has, I believe, always been that while the force of competition automatically provides minimum prices to the consumer in ordinary business transactions, this protection is absent with natural monopolies, and that therefore public ownership and operation of public utilities is the only alternative. But the enormous growth of governmental activities in the direction of State Socialism during the past few years combined as this has been with unprecedented use of the spoils system has given us a far greater evil to contend with than could possibly result from private ownership and operation of these utilities. In such an emergency it becomes the part of wisdom to favor the lesser of the two evils and to reduce that evil to the minimum.

There is no doubt whatsoever as to the greater efficiency and economy of administration of private operation as compared to public operation of public utilities or any other business enterprises. The waste and the inefficiency in the public service and particularly in the newer branches filled with political appointees and all too often regardless of fitness or qualification is everywhere recognized, but fair minded criticism will give credit to intelligent effort of conscientious men in both private and public service. Volumes of testimony are available to support both sides of the dispute.

In view of recent events in our nation's history above referred to, I am constrained to state that were I to publish a second edition of my book, "Prosperity," I would omit entirely chapter VI, Public Utilities.

Wichita, Kas.

HENRY WARE ALLEN.

### THE CALIFORNIA CAMPAIGN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

For this number California has little to report. We are, as it were, between hay and grass. The legislature is in session and until its adjournment we cannot announce the details of the constitutional amendment covering taxation which will be submitted at the next general election. In substance it will run along the lines of the amendment taken from the ballot last summer by the State Supreme Court. And in saying this much we have to thank the State Senate. While the lower house voted about five to one to remove sales taxation from food stuffs sold in restaurants, the position of the Senate has been hostile to such action. Thus we are given the same wide appeal we would have been able to make at the last election.

This leads me to remark that in any except the Initiative and Referendum States (and for various reasons not all of these) the Single Taxer who desires his ideas adopted in any substantial degree must wait probably scores of years. Legislatures are not democratic. In practically every state they are representative not of the people, but of the real estate interests which in truth control our politics. This is ordinarily true in larger degree of State Senates than of the lower house, but their veto is very effective. We can to a certain extent educate numbers in cities, but the areas in the country dis-

tricts are another thing. And this remark as above illustrated holds good of California as of any other state. Here our only chance of progress rests in the fact that we have the initiative.

In LAND AND FREEDOM some four years ago I pointed out that the three states offering the best opportunities for progress in the United States were Massachusetts, Michigan and California, and in about the order named. Today, of course, the best is California, and this because we have taken the lead—not because we were theoretically the best, by that meaning the easiest. Now we want again to point out, as we have in the past, that progress in California means progress all along the line and the moving of a new spirit upon the face of the waters. We expect to succeed but we want the help of every dollar and every influence our friends all over the United States can bring to our aid.

Our friends throughout the Union have not yet thoroughly waked up to the situation, although I am hopeful that light is coming. In the east they do not yet realize that they are bound hand and foot through not having the initiative and that in California they can do more for the cause than they can hope to accomplish at home. We on the battle line are looking for better things from them in the future.

Our Henry George Schools of Social Science are growing, but of course more slowly than our impatience would dictate. Good as they are, we may remember that people are being born and coming of age more rapidly than education can inform them. We need to make the wide appeal to the masses offered by elections. These are addressed to the imagination and emotions as well as to the intellect.

Having made a recent trip east, meeting sympathizers in Boston, New York, Washington, Detroit, Baltimore and Chicago, I have to thank them for fine courtesies.

Palo Alto, California.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

### INTEREST AND RATE OF INTEREST

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

There is but one interest and that is the increase which labor produces when it uses capital over the same labor not using capital. We confuse interest with interest rate, with rent, with risk elements in loans, etc. To more clearly understand interest we must keep to our formula, viz., that wealth is produced by the application of labor to land or by labor assisted by capital.

For brevity I use two illustrations. One: Consider ten men of equal productivity applying labor to land of the same desirability and fertility, and the product (x) is wealth. Of these ten men five (group A) use tools (capital) and for my purpose each uses the same kind of tool or tool equipment. The other five (group B) have the tool equipment but do not use it.

At the end of any working time, an eight-hour day or a forty-hour week, the product of group B (without tools) is 10 x per man, that of group A, 40 x per man. The difference 30 x is the extra productivity obtained by labor using the tool, capital. This is *interest*, qualify it if necessary, call it economic interest, commercial interest, gross or net interest, or miscall it money interest, it is a quantity or volume of production as above and nothing else.

The wages of group A are the entire product 10 x per man. The wages of group B are 10 x plus 30 x per man less the mortality of the capital, viz., the tool.

For illustration two: Consider the same conditions as in one except all now use their tool equipment. The product is now 40 x per man for both groups. Each user gets 30 x (interest) by having used tools (capital) as each owns the tools he uses, there is no borrowing demand and no lending supply. Therefore the rate of interest is and must be zero. One man becomes ill and can't use his tools, the supply of capital now exceeds the demand which is zero, and the rate of interest is still zero. But another worker breaks his tool. He must now replace or borrow or return to the 10 x product if he works, or lose time and wages. The unused tool of the sick man, a labor product,