

earned incomes, Ch. I, § 3, and Ch. II, §§ 2, 3, 4, 5]. But if they are equally taxed no matter what they go into, they will not therefore be driven out of the woolen cloth production—for they can do no better—nor will the cloth become scarcer and higher in price. The people in the business—including their employees—will simply have to take smaller returns. In other words, such taxes *simply subtract from earned incomes*. Likewise, any *inability* of the woolen cloth industry to stand alone against foreign competition, would be equally great, *even if all taxes on earned incomes were removed*. Woolen cloth making would, then, yield larger income than before. *But so would the business of making bridge material and all other kinds of business*. It follows that men could no more afford to produce woolen cloth in the one case than in the other and that, therefore, *in either case*, protection to the woolen cloth industry would divert men from a line in which the country was relatively efficient to one in which it were not. [See my Principles of Commerce, Part II, Chs. I, II, IV]. Such a tariff would put a new burden upon the better industries, *in addition to the undesirable internal taxes already levied*.

To conclude, if I may be permitted thus to attempt to mediate between the editor and his critics, I should say the editor is right if and so far as discriminatory taxes are meant; while his critics are right if the taxes under discussion are general and not discriminatory against any business as such, however undesirable these taxes may be in themselves.

HARRY G. BROWN

REASONS FOR OPENING THE FIGHT IN OREGON.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have thought much recently of the probability of a successful fight for the Single Tax in Oregon, on a campaign devoid of pussy-footing, apology and subterfuge.

I think best to deal with the phases of the matter in the following order:

General reasons are: (1) We have the Initiative and Referendum. (2) The State is not as large as nor as expensive to handle as California. (3) The population is much smaller and therefore requires less effort. (4) The majority of the population lies over a much smaller area, I believe, than in any other I & R State. (5) Independent political action has advanced beyond any state except N. Dakota.

Particular reasons are:

The first campaign, (one of unqualified education), secured endorsement of nearly one third of the vote of the State. (2) This vote remains and is a substantial foundation. (This vote fell off as a result of pussy-footing schemes. Conviction remains.). (3) Vote can be depended upon for a straight-forward Single Tax issue. (4) The leaven of that campaign has automatically increased to a noticeable extent. (5) The general world movement to restore the land to the people is bearing fruit to a noticeable degree. (6) Increase of conviction among farmers. (7) The Non-Partisan League has started the farmers of this State mulling. (8) The interests have loaded taxes on to the people until they are mad. (9) Labor will stand back of us solidly as will all radicals. (10) The farmers vote has been and probably is still the deciding vote and the bulk of the farmers are within easy reach. Four counties would positively decide the issue. (11) Disposition to argue against the Single Tax has practically passed, the people listen, looking for a way out. (12) Soldiers have been offered stump lands while tillable lands lie idle on every side. The result is a widespread disgust and altered opinion regarding landholding. (13) Rent profiteering, which has been excessive, has developed hatred of landlordism. (14) In about eighty per cent. of the cases the reply to my question "Don't you think land monopoly is responsible for the conditions?", was either "Yes" or, "partly". (15) A ridiculously small amount of money has accomplished all that has been accomplished in this State. The large sum spent by the Fels Fund was as injurious to the cause as if it had been contributed and disbursed by and under direction of special privilege. The first campaign did lasting and efficient work. The work remains a tribute to the unashamed and perfect truth.

Portland, Ore.

A PRIVATE of the First Oregon Campaign.

THINKS WE ARE UNFAIR.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

In opening your latest issue the first thing that catches my eye is your comment on Secretary Baker's article in *Everybody's*, which I must say I think is unfair. I have not read the article in full, but there is certainly nothing in Mr. Baker's wonderfully effective career to indicate that he is untrue to Single Tax principles, which he has announced as publicly as you or I have.

The extract you quote is plainly meant for thought along our lines, and there was nothing Henry George insisted on more than that it was not half so useful to our purpose as to what men should believe in as to how to lead them along right lines for themselves.

Taken in conjunction with your criticism of Secretary Lane I cannot help thinking that it is simply part of a partisan attack on Democratic officials simply because they are of the democratic and not of the unborn Single Tax party. We all know that Mr. Kitchin's tax schemes are the crudest and most unscientific possible, but they were the best he could get through Congress in a most critical and immediate emergency.

New Brighton, S. I.

E. J. SHRIVER.

REPLY.

Mr. Shriver ignores the fact, or perhaps does not know of it, that Mr. Baker some time ago, while confessing a belief in the Single Tax, said he was not in favor of its application. So that disposes of one point in the controversy. We will have to insist, too, that deriving his inspiration from Henry George, a fact known to most of us if not to the general public, his appearance as the author of a magazine contribution in which one contention of Henry George is presented in a diluted form, he might, if he desired to give prominence to our doctrines, have named the source of his inspiration. Mr. Baker, who owes his start in political life to espousal of the reforms inaugurated by Henry George and Tom L. Johnson, could have done no less were he actuated even by that spirit of intellectual loyalty which lesser men are supposed to share. We invite comparison of Mr. Baker's literary effusion in *Everybody's* with that of Dr. Crane who advises Kitchin and his fellow congressmen to read Progress and Poverty. Dr. Crane owes nothing to the Single Tax; indeed he makes his living by newspaper writing for employers who may be inclined to look askance at the Doctor's boldness.

We cannot help it if Democratic office holders (former preachers of our faith) confirm by their conduct and policies the arguments for independent political party action by Single Taxers. When we find those whose conduct offers no such argument we shall be glad to give credit where credit is due.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

LAND VALUES AND POPULATION.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Does site-rent result from any cause except population?

Public improvements and services seem to create "site-rent". Logicians know that two things may exist together and one not be the cause of the other.

Where a cause is assumed, the effect claimed should always result. Now, I have seen streets laid out, graded, planted and drained, but after forty-seven years the site-value is less than at first. Population did not move that way. In San Francisco after the earthquake, public improvements and public services were nearly nothing; yet the price of sites were even higher than before.

Perhaps both rent and public services are results of population. This is evident: Rent will increase before public services are furnished if population presses upon a location. And if population declines for some local reason, all improvements and service you can supply will not keep up site rent.

When an increase in site-rent in Vancouver resulted in the "boom" that location seemed attractive to labor, and rent increased; but it must have been at the expense of the locations from which the laborers came.

So when improvements attract population, it may be only a shifting, not a creation of "site-rent".

The "One Hundred Reasons," by Emil O. Jorgensen, perpetuates a fallacy in reason 5, that the rent tax permits private property in land. The writers quoted mostly dispute Henry George, who said private property in land is a "bold, barren wrong," and "we must make land common property." Then he afterwards proves beyond doubt that land is not private property, and cannot be property at all; (see quotations on page 141.)

This is but error in terms, often found in the growth of a theory.

As land possesses no quality necessary to property, and is simply the source of property, it is of itself not property. Somewhere George says that he, by his illustration, "lets in a flood of light" on economics. I have a flood of light to let in on this seeming inconsistency. Change the above quotations to read:

"Private property in land-rent is a bold, bare, enormous wrong."

We must make land-rent common property.

Land rent, being a part of the product, is property; and taking it as the public fund makes it common property; and everything is clear.

Page 403, Progress and Poverty, proves that land is not private property. "Let them continue to call it their land. Let them buy and sell and devise it." That is, his rent-tax will not change the nature of possession. Yet he says this change will make land common property. Then he proves it was a common possession at first:

"We already take some rent in taxation. We have only to make some changes," etc. The right to take rent proves dominion over the land.

If I pay even a trifling rent on a piano, this is proof that I do not own it. The only wrong element in the terms by which we now hold land is that the tax is too low, and the so-called owner, in reality a tenant of the State, can make a large profit by subletting. Sometimes the tenant of the State-tenant, sublets at a profit. This tenant does just what the "owner" does—makes a profit from renting.

Certain Single Taxers hope to avoid giving alarm to "owners" by saying that their "ownership" will not be disturbed. Why not tell them the truth, that their title is not that of ownership? They really know this thoroughly; that when they fail to pay to the State the small site-rent called tax, they are ousted, just as they, the "owners", oust their tenants if the larger, or full rent, is not paid.

All this Henry George realized later, as when he quotes Herbert Spencer in Perplexed Philosophy, page 75: "In law every land owner is held to be a tenant of the Crown—that is, of the community."

And in Pol. Ec. page 461, he says the "real basis of property" (that of the producer) "cannot be made to cover property in land." Hence land is not property, private or public; only a possession, for use. If the word Property as defined by Henry George cannot cover land, then he cannot deal with land as property. Had he written Progress and Poverty after Perplexed Philosophy, he could not have used the words private property in land.

Chicago, Ill.

C. F. HUNT.

A PROPOSED MEMORIAL TO LUKE NORTH.

Hardly was Luke North's work begun when death, armed with a scythe made keen by malice and ingratitude, deprived humanity of a sorely needed leader. A few more years and his almost single handed struggle with the giants of greed would have been won—not for himself, for he was too big of purpose to want success, but for the the squalid slaves of modern civilization.

The fight did not kill him. His was a spirit that thrived on a struggle where the object to be obtained was an ideal. He died of a broken heart—broken by the calumnies of false friends, broken by the abundance of criticism and the paucity of help from those who claimed to be interested in the same ideal.

Perhaps his death, like his life, was not in vain. Perhaps it points out the lesson that we of the Single Tax faith needed—the lesson that we must organize our energies not only against the common enemy but also against the enemies within. Perhaps Luke North died that the Single Tax might live.

For, shall we permit it to be said of him that the good he did will be interred with his bones? Shall we allow the fight he so nobly waged to be lost by default? Was it not our fight? Do we want the Single Tax any less than did Luke North?

The Great Adventure for the Single Tax, begun by Henry George in 1886, halted and led into a maze of dark alleys by false leaders for several decades, revived by Luke North in 1916, shall be continued until the goal is reached. We had better not let it lag now, lest of inaction it die out completely.

Some memorial, some fitting recognition of his great services for the Single Tax is due to Luke North. And what would be more fitting memorial than one which, could he but tell us, would be his own choice? I propose a Luke North Memorial Fund to carry on the Great Adventure for the Single Tax in California.

It is not only because we Single Taxers owe to the memory of Luke North this token of our esteem for the work he so courageously and successfully began, but also because we would be recreant in our duty if we failed to continue the fight, that this fund should be inaugurated and subscribed to. Therefor, as soon as willing workers have been found to take up the plan interrupted by death, the National Great Adventure Committee should immediately authorize such a memorial fund and issue a call to the Single Taxers of the country for subscriptions.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

FRANK CHODOROV.

A GENTLE DIG FROM BOSTON.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

As a loyal Single Taxer of many years standing I dislike to criticize the REVIEW, but as a long-time real estate "operator" who, despite (or perhaps because of) his nefarious calling, sees the light; and, above all, as a Bostonian running true to form, I must express my regret that in your reply in the Jan.-Feb. number to Charles F. Cushman's inquiry as to the probable effect of the Single Tax on mortgages, you make what would otherwise be a very complete and satisfactory answer to his most pertinent question read like sheer nonsense by a curious confusion of terms in your repeated use of the word "mortgagee," when it is obvious, from the sense, that you mean mortgagor.

You say for instance, "the mortgagee is clearly placed by the operation of the Single Tax in a better position to meet his obligations;" again, "the capacity of the mortgagee or of the property to produce;" and later on, "a mortgagee may fail and forfeit his land."

The popular impression is that theoretically at least, a mortgagee has no obligations, he does not have to produce, and he cannot fail. It is supposed to be the mortgagor who suffers all those disabilities.

Had the error occurred only once, it might have been put down to a slip of the pen, or even charged to the compositor, but how account for its repetition except upon the well-nigh incredible assumption that illuminating and informing as your article otherwise is, you do not know the difference between a mortgagee and a mortgagor, and that the suffix "ee" always means the one to whom anything is given, sold, rendered or referred.

Mr. Cushman must have been somewhat muddled until it dawned upon him, as it finally did upon me after several readings of some of the sentences, that you were mixed in your terms. However I accept your apologies, and offer mine for being captious.

Boston, Mass.

WILLIAM J. MACY.

REPLY.

We appreciate the correction, which can only be explained by momentary inadvertence. The terms were unfortunately transposed in the article entitled "Mortgages and Mortgages". The terminological error will not, however, obscure the important fiscal and economic distinctions which it was the purpose of the article to make clear.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

PROFESSOR BRINSMADE FOR SINGLE TAX PARTY ACTION. EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I am heartily in favor of the Single Tax party and believe it to be