

## RELATED THINGS

### CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

#### BRYAN! BRYAN!!

##### The Cry of a Nation.

For The Public.

Say, Billie Bryan, you know how  
Old Cincinnatus quit his plow,  
And left behind the joys of home,  
To save the destinies of Rome.

Well, Bill, old boy, they've grown in tricks  
Since that great fight in Ninety-six;  
Their swaddling-clothes they have outgrown;  
The parasites infest the throne;  
They've hogged each thing in mortal ken,  
They've subsidized most every pen;  
They have "the Smokes," the Oil, the Steel,  
The Iron now is on their heel;  
They have the Coal within the Mine;  
The thrall is now on mine and thine;  
They have the Courts—they read the Laws—  
Suspended is "effect and cause";  
They've checked the law of gravity;  
The will of man no more is free.  
Their King is, lo, "A Man of Straw!"  
It's just the very thing you saw  
In those old days of "Cross of Gold,"  
When we in superstition sold  
Our kith and kin, our birthright fair,  
For noxious G. O. P. hot-air.

Say, Billie Bryan, you know how  
Old Cincinnatus quit his plow,  
And left behind the joys of home,  
To save the destinies of Rome.

ROYD EASTWOOD MORRISON.



#### FOUND SOMETHING GOING ON.

Ed Howe in the American Magazine for February, 1912.

So little that is really exciting or worth while has happened in my life that I am greatly interested in Jim and Dan Ayers, who run a restaurant in the town where I live. Something really happened to them once upon a time, and when I go to their restaurant I enjoy hearing them tell about it.

When they were boys, they lived on a farm in Virginia; I have heard them say their postoffice was Sudley Springs. One Sunday morning, their father started them to Sunday school, and after they had loitered along the way a mile or two Jim Ayers remarked a commotion over beyond what they called the Big Woods.

"What's that?" Jim asked, stopping.

It was getting late by this time, and Dan replied:

"I don't know, but we'd better hurry up and get to Sunday school, or we'll get a whipping."

Then they hurried on, but the commotion over beyond the Big Woods broke out again, faintly, but it was very unusual, and Jim stopped and listened. He had never heard anything like it before, although he was a big boy twelve years old, and, after listening a while, he said:

"I'm going over there."

"Better not," Dan said. "You know father whips hard."

But the strange commotion continued, so Jim said he was going, whipping or no whipping. Dan followed, but kept saying they would catch it when they returned home.

They walked and walked and walked; all the time the commotion over beyond the Big Woods became more pronounced, but they couldn't tell what it was. They forded streams, and were chased by strange dogs, but kept on from ten o'clock in the morning until three o'clock in the afternoon. They had nothing to eat, and they didn't know that they could ever find their way back, because they were in a country strange to them. But they kept on, and a little after three o'clock, as a reward for their perseverance, they walked into the battle of Bull Run. I never before heard of boys going anywhere and finding anything as great as they expected.



#### LAND VALUES TAXATION IN THE CITY.

From "The City As a Socializing Agency," by Fred-  
eric C. Howe in The American Journal of  
Sociology, of March, 1912.

The cities' economic foundations control the distribution of wealth. Poverty is largely a social rather than a personal thing. The city creates the pauper as well as the millionaire. There is a single family in New York whose fortune has grown from \$20,000 to \$450,000,000 by the growth of land values in that city. The total value of the land in New York city is \$4,500,000,000. This is almost exactly \$1,000 per capita.

In four years' time speculative land values in New York have increased by \$1,000,000,000 or at the rate of \$250,000,000 a year. These are the official figures of the Commissioners of Taxes and Assessments. In Cleveland, Ohio, land values increased \$177,000,000 in ten years' time. The population during the same period increased by 172,000. Here too, land values are at the rate of \$1,000 per capita. In almost every city where land values are accurately valued they aggregate from \$800 to \$1,000 per capita. Every babe that is born, even the ignorant immigrant coming to the city, adds this value to the land and to the land alone. He produces wealth by his coming,

and then is charged an annual rent for that which he himself has produced. This is one of the paradoxes of society. The wealth the worker creates is given to another who in turn levies tribute in the form of land rent from him who produces it.

Is it not clear that the city is a wealth producer on a colossal scale? Is it not obvious that here is a source of revenue far in excess of the needs of any city? Is it not equally obvious that the city levies tribute on its people and passes it on to a few who have done nothing to create it? City ground rent increases the cost of city living. It is the heaviest burden on city life. In New York City ground rent amounts to an average of \$250 per family. The ground rent alone of a miserable two-room tenement on Grand street amounts to \$90 per year, almost as much as the rent of a comfortable cottage in a small town. This is a social burden imposed on people by the failure of the city to control its economic foundations in the interests of the people. It is one of the principal causes of poverty.

The private monopolies which supply transportation, light, heat, and power are another cause of poverty. They collect such tribute as a corrupt alliance with the city sanctions. The city of Cleveland reduced the burden of car riders by \$2,000,000 a year when it cut the rate of fare from five cents to three cents. It saved its people this substantial sum. But this is the least of the costs which the private ownership of the public utility corporation involves. They are operated for monopoly profits. They should be operated as a public service, for the relief of housing, for the promotion of decent living conditions, for the health, for cheap rent, for cleanliness and comfort. Our failure to recognize the plumbing of the city as a public rather than a private function is another of our costliest errors.

Poverty could be reduced to the vanishing point if the city thought in public rather than in private, in social rather than in personal terms. If the city took in land taxes, what the city itself creates, it could abandon all other taxes; it could supply many services at no cost whatever, that are now privately exploited. With this abundant revenue the city could acquire public utilities, could widen education, could build slaughter houses, markets, and cold storage plants; it could furnish many kinds of recreation and amusement, now denied to people.

But more important by far than the fiscal gain, the taxation of these increasing land values would relieve the housing problem, it would reduce rents and distribute people far out in the country. For the taxation of vacant land compels owners to use it, to build upon it, to cultivate it, and that is the great gain from this reform. With a heavier tax on land values, opportunity would call men to work, to build, to cultivate. Then speculators would be punished for their idleness rather than

rewarded for it. Then too, new wealth would be created, prices would come to a competitive basis and those monopolies identified with the land would be destroyed. For the taxation of land values would open up nature to use by man, it would offer him a place in which to live, and to labor. It would create new opportunities. It would relieve poverty by the creation of more jobs. It would lead to a more equitable distribution of wealth.



## TAXING LAND VALUES—CAN THE TAX BE PASSED ON?

By Henry George.

. . . That taxes levied upon Land Values, or, to use the politico-economic term, taxes levied upon rent, do not fall upon the user of land, and cannot be transferred by the landlord to the tenant, is conceded by all economists of reputation. However much they may dispute as to other things, there is no dispute upon this point. Whatever flimsy reasons any of them may have deemed it expedient to give why the tax on rent should not be more resorted to, they all admit that the taxation of rent merely diminishes the profits of the landowner, cannot be shifted on the user of land, cannot add to prices, or check production.

Not to multiply authorities, it will be sufficient to quote John Stuart Mill. He says (section 2, chapter 3, book 5, "Principles of Political Economy") :—"A tax on rent falls wholly on the landlord. There are no means by which he can shift the burden upon anyone else. It does not affect the value or price of agricultural produce, for this is determined by the cost of production in the most unfavorable circumstances, and in those circumstances, as we have so often demonstrated, no rent is paid. A tax on rent, therefore, has no effect other than its obvious one. It merely takes so much from the landlord and transfers it to the State."

The reason of this will be clear to everyone who has grasped the accepted theory of rent—that theory to which the name of Ricardo has been given, and which, as John Stuart Mill says, has but to be understood to be proved. And it will be clear to everyone who will consider a moment, even if he has never before thought of the cause and nature of rent. The rent of land represents a return to ownership over and above the return which is sufficient to induce use—it is a premium paid for permission to use. To take, in taxation, a part or the whole of this premium, in no way affects the incentive to use or the return to use; in no way diminishes the amount of land there is to use, or makes it more difficult to obtain it for use. Thus there is no way in which a tax upon rent or Land Values can be transferred to the user. Whatever