

Standard Library

DEC 23 1924

November—December, 1924

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Record of Single Tax Progress Founded in 1901

The Single Tax and Nothing But The Single Tax

William J. Blech

My Conversion To Georgism

Felix Vitale

The Land Question In Recent British Elections

J. W. Graham Peace

Campaign Tour Of William J. Wallace

YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION \$1.00

SINGLE COPIES 20 CENTS

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET, NEW YORK CITY

LAND AND FREEDOM

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Published by

SINGLE TAX PUBLISHING Co., at 150 Nassau Street, New York
JAMAICA OFFICE, 72 Johnson Avenue, Jamaica, Long Island.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor

WILLIAM J. WALLACE, Pres. 491 Mt. Prospect Ave. Newark, N. J.

OSCAR H. GEIGER, Treas. 150 Nassau St., N. Y. City

GEORGE R. MACEY, Sec. 165 Broadway, N. Y. City

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico,
\$1.00 per year. Payable in advance.

Entered as Second-class Matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New
York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

NOVEMBER — DECEMBER 1924

VOL. XXIV

No. 6. WHOLE No. 127

SPECIAL CORRESPONDENTS

CANADA: Sydenham Thompson, 195 Hillsdale avenue, Toronto.

ENGLAND: J. W. Graham Peace

GERMANY: Adolph Damaschke, Lessingstrasse II, Berlin.

AUSTRALIA: Percy R. Meggy, Sydney, New South Wales.

NEW ZEALAND: Hon. P. J. O'Regan, Wellington.

ARGENTINE: Dr. Maspero Castro, Buenos Aires.

URUGUAY: Dr. Felix Vitale, Montevideo.

SPAIN: Antonio Albendin, Zamora.

DENMARK: Abel Brink, Copenhagen.

BULGARIA: Lasar Karaivanove, Plovdiv.

HUNGARY: Prof. Robt. Braun, Budapest.

PORTUGAL: Dr. Herrera y Reissig, Uruguyan Legation, Lisbon.

MEXICO: Prof. R. B. Brinsmade.

INDEX TO CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----|
| Current Comment..... | 163 |
| The Passing of the La Follette Movement..... | 164 |
| The Single Tax and Nothing But the Single Tax... <i>Wm. J. Blech</i> | 167 |
| My Conversion to Georgism..... <i>Felix Vitale</i> | 169 |
| Campaign Tour..... <i>Wm. J. Wallace</i> | 171 |
| Newspaper Publicity of the Commonwealth Land Party. <i>L. W. Tracy</i> | 172 |
| At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle..... <i>E. Wye</i> | 174 |
| Land Question in Recent British Elections. <i>J. W. Graham Peace</i> | 178 |
| Death of Robert Schalkenbach..... | 181 |
| Book Reviews..... | 189 |
| Correspondence..... | 190 |
| News Notes and Personals..... | 191 |

Commonwealth Land Party Notes

N. A. VYNE, of Camp Verde, Arizona, was, as our readers know, a candidate for State Senator on the Commonwealth Land party ticket. He sent out a circular on the eve of election from which we quote:

"My candidacy presents the most practical way of calling the attention of the voters, the real legislature, to what I believe to be the most vital and fundamental principle of human progress and as you discuss it among yourselves, you, yourself become the real legislature of Arizona. A legislature without axes to grind, without legislative graft and without ulterior purposes. Our only hope for progress lies in the decisions you come to after full discussion in your homes; in your community centers and casual meetings with your neighbors.

It is in the hope of your doing this and finally reaching common sense conclusions, that I am presenting the Single Tax and related questions to your attention."

VIRGIL D. ALLEN, Commonwealth Land party candidate for governor, made an active canvass and his vote of nearly 12,000 is a nucleus for organization. In a circular widely issued during the campaign, Mr. Allen said:

The old political parties have always evaded the land questions, though often urged to adopt it as an issue, chiefly, we believe, because their largest campaign donations come from men and organizations who are the greatest beneficiaries under the present unjust system. The Teapot Dome deal is an example in point.

FOLLOWING is an advertisement appearing in the *Manchester Guardian*, Manchester, England.

TOWARDS THE CO-OPERATIVE COMMONWEALTH

THE ABOLITION OF PRIVILEGE, MONOPOLY, AND TAXATION
OF INDUSTRY

RADICAL ANTI-SOCIALIST MOVEMENT

All those willing to work for the common ownership of the raw material of the globe, individual ownership of the product of industry, to establish an orderly State based upon justice and the sanctity of private property, towards an extension of voluntary co-operation and away from coercive and taxing Governments, with the two following principles as guides:—

- (1) All have equal rights to life, to access to the means of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness;
 - (2) All have exclusive rights to what they produce,
- are invited to send for further particulars to Box 49, Sell's Advertising Offices, Fleet Street, London, E. C. 4.

Land and Freedom

FORMERLY THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

VOL. XXIV

NOVEMBER—DECEMBER, 1924

No. 6

Current Comment

IT is of interest to record that Oliver McKnight states that he is informed through a correspondent that the late Democratic candidate for the presidency, John W. Davis, years ago gave a copy of *Progress and Poverty* to Arthur Hoopes, saying, "Arthur, here is a book you ought to read and I want you to give me your opinion of it." The reading of the book made Mr. Hoopes a Single Taxer. It would be interesting to learn from Mr. Hoopes, who is well known to Pennsylvania Single Taxers, whether the reading of the book produced any reaction in the mind of Mr. Davis himself.

WE are more than skeptical these days when it is whispered, sotto voce, "The Hon. Mr. So-and-so is a Single Taxer." It used to be said that President Wilson had a well-thumbed copy of *Progress and Poverty* on his desk. There was a long list of public men who it was stated had been converted to our doctrines. But as they remain quiet ever after this is not of the slightest importance. For it remains true that a Single Taxer is one who does something for the Single Tax. That John W. Davis would be a tower of strength to the movement no one will dispute. But we are not going to rejoice prematurely if it appear that he ended his work by making Mr. Hoopes a Single Taxer—however desirable an acquisition to the ranks that gentleman unquestionably is.

IN an address made in Philadelphia Mr. Davis touched on the question of taxation as follows:

And yet, uninviting as it may be, there is no subject in all the realm of politics that approaches it in importance; there are no questions that involve so much of human liberty, of governmental continuity, and of the principles of free institutions, as those which gather round the question of taxation. . . . There is no definition of human liberty from which you can omit the right of the individual to do as he will with his own. There is no freedom where men are not permitted to enjoy the fruits of their own labors; and there is no despotism equal to that which arbitrarily and without necessity subtracts from a man's accumulations what he is unwilling to surrender. When the government seeks to take from the citizen any portion of that which he owns, the sum of his rights and liberties is engaged in the justice of that subtraction. . . . That is the Democratic theory of government: that revenue may be collected solely for the support of the government, not to give privilege or advantage to any man, nor to confiscate the property of any man.

Mr. McKnight wrote Mr. Davis saying that only the candidates of the Commonwealth Land party had any right to use such language, and Mr. Davis replied: "Please allow me to thank you for your very interesting letter. I am deeply grateful for your appreciation of the speeches I made. I tried to state our principles simply and clearly and letters like yours lead me to believe that I have succeeded. In the addresses which I propose to make in the future I think you will find that I have made clear my position on the very important question you raise."

REV. Dr. S. Parkes Cadman delivers at the Y. M. C. A. in Brooklyn a sermon which is radioed every Sunday. At the conclusion he answers questions sent to him in writing. These questions cover every department of knowledge. The Doctor is very ready and his answers are clever. Sometimes they seem like clever evasions. What shall we say to this?

"Would the adoption of Henry George's philosophy, known as the 'Single Tax,' abolish the cause of most of our economic troubles?"

"There is no doubt that agrarianism does lie at the root of considerable difficulty. Although the changes have been very great in the agrarian situation in England, unemployment runs around a million at the present hour. I am inclined to pin my faith, as did Mr. George, upon no single remedy for this complex stage of economic difficulty."

Dr. Cadman knows, or should know, that the so-called agrarian question is only a part of the great economic problem for which the Henry George plan offers a solution. Included in the problem are the values of mines and forests and the incomparably greater values of city lots, the question of the return to labor and capital, the world-perplexing problem of the distribution of wealth. Dr. Cadman should try once more to answer the question propounded, and not do it too suddenly. For there is something suspicious of the sciolist in these "rapid fire" answers to questions with which Dr. Cadman regales the listening multitudes on Sunday afternoons.

CARL C. PLEHN is a professor of economics. He was once president of the American Economic Association. Yet if one should assume that because of this he knows anything about the subject of which he is a teacher that assumption needs to be revised. In a recent article in *The Nation's Business* he says, speaking of the tendency of voters to support any extravagance involving the expenditure of public money: "Here the explanation is

not far to seek, for it is safe to say that the taxpayers are greatly outnumbered at the polls by those who pay no taxes." Any school boy could have told the professor that everybody except the thief and the beggar pays taxes, that those who never see the tax collector pay most of the public revenue, city, state and national, and that the real taxpayers are the masses who do the labor of the world and vastly outnumber the other kind who go to the polls—those who do not labor and are therefore not taxpayers but taxgatherers.

PRESIDENT COOLIDGE in addressing the Association of Real Estate Boards which met in Washington, said: "You are in a very literal sense the sellers of America. You have sold it so well that it is recognized as the best buy in the world."

There lie in France the bodies of more than fifty thousand boys who died for this America that is being bought and sold. Few of them probably ever stopped to reflect that the land they fought for was an object of barter, that men were making money by dealing in parcels of this land for the security of which they were offering their young lives on the altar of sacrifice. How grim is the irony of it! Future and more enlightened generations will comment on the speech of the President as a curiosity of history. "Sellers of America, indeed!"—the land of the free and the home of the brave at so much per front foot! Hasn't the President any imagination?

A VALUED correspondent writes us that we are unjust to re-elected governor Donahey, of Ohio, in permitting our correspondent in that state to term him "incompetent." He defends the governor by saying: "Donahey is modest; he knows his limitations; he made no platform speeches during the campaign, and yet, although the Republicans swept the state with 700,000 majority, he was re-elected by nearly 150,000. There must be something to the man. His campaign was marked by the absence of money and bunk; the Democratic state organization is weak; it was not very friendly to him. Several Democratic county organizations were almost openly hostile. In this state the governor is cruelly hampered by the laws and system if he really wishes to conduct the state's business efficiently. But there has been an absence of scandals; he has shown commonsense in the conduct of affairs and humaneness in the treatment of prisoners. He vetoed 76 bills, and reading these veto messages I have been struck by their commonsense. As governors go, Donahey is pretty good." If we have done an injustice to the governor, as apparently we have, we apologize.

IN a speech delivered by Mr. La Follette in Brooklyn during the campaign that gentleman, with his usual recklessness of assertion, spoke as follows:

As long ago as 1908, according to John Moody, the greatest living authority on corporations, there were ten thousand trusts in the country, with a capitalization of \$31,000,000,000. Each of these trusts is a criminal trust.

It may be of interest to readers of *LAND AND FREEDOM* to know that Mr. Moody took occasion at that time to point out that the trusts he enumerated could be divided into two classes: those that had some sort of special privilege (ownership of natural resources, tariff advantage, patent monopoly) and those that did not have such advantages. And Mr. Moody further pointed out, that only those which had some such privilege could permanently charge the public more than actual competitive costs, and that all other trusts would either have to sell as cheaply as small competitors or go out of business. The history of the trusts formed during the craze twenty years ago has fully justified Mr. Moody's prediction. In none of the subsequent utterances of Mr. La Follette was there any recognition of the fundamental economic distinction between mere aggregations of capital and capital plus privilege.

The Passing of the La Follette Movement

IT needs little political acumen to predict the collapse of a party which has as its candidate for President a Republican (La Follette) and for Vice-President a Democrat (Wheeler) leading the Socialist Party and others of many persuasions (including a variety of unattached voters and Single Taxers whose philosophy is that of the natural order if they be really followers of Henry George) on a platform which is neither Republican, Democratic, nor Socialistic!

Perhaps there are analogies to this in the realm of comic opera. A Swift, a Samuel Butler, a Gilbert or an Anstey alone could do it justice but it has no place in practical politics. It is true that this Gilbertian party appears to have polled four million votes, but that would make no difference save to the undiscerning to whom mere numbers are curiously appealing symbols even when they stand for nothing. If it were ten million it would mean but little more.

Third parties have accomplished much in American politics. But only when they stood for some definite principle. The La Follette party stood for a lot of things—no two things alike. There was nowhere a cohesive principle. It was not even audible for the thing it was suspected of—government-owned railroads. It had no tariff policy, no land policy, no taxation policy, matters which are the elementary household affairs of government.

It was just a party against the two old parties! But why a third party? What mysterious healing forces for the ills of a nation lie in merely multiplying its political agencies—making them three instead of two? It is true

that Mr. J. A. H. Hopkins and his Committee of 48—which was the unrecognized and “submerged tenth” of the motley aggregation which went to its destruction on November 4—seemed for a time to cherish the delusion that a Third Party (in large caps) was a long felt want. So they kept modifying a platform to admit of everybody, like the man who constructed a dog house with two openings, one to admit the large dogs and another smaller one to admit the little puppies—anything to oblige and everybody accommodated! It seemed a fine thing to construct a platform for everybody to stand upon, but in 1920 this theory ran against a few stubborn facts, as theories sometimes will, at the Chicago Conference of the Committee of 48, and the amiable theorists got a few hard knocks, going back to New York sadder if not wiser men, for apparently it is not possible for them to learn wisdom.

As those familiar with the circumstances will recall, that attempt four years ago to be all things to all men resulted in the extremists going off by themselves to another part of the city and leaving the sponsors of the affair in their lonesome headquarters to muse upon the frailty of human nature and the tenuity of political theories based on wind!

All this is history. But when the La Follette movement came along they were again swept off their feet in the same crazy current that pointed nowhere. Again they hailed the advent of the new movement as promising a revolution in American politics. A goodly number of the followers of Henry George joined them. They at least should have known that there can be no real revolution in political thought that is not founded upon fundamentals. Mingled with the curious delusions of this motley aggregation was a sort of Messianic faith in La Follette, though an examination of that gentleman's career should have shown them that little could be hoped for him. It was the same unreasoning and almost reverential attitude that Bryan, famous jawsmith, once elicited from the same followers or the same kind of followers. Hero worship, doubtless, has its place, but the hero should have courage and a vision. No one, least of all the disciples of Henry George, will attribute vision to either of these very capable opportunists.

This makes the support of La Follette by Single Taxers so inexplicable a thing. We could have pardoned the support of Davis by those who found it impossible to vote for Wallace, the Commonwealth Land Party candidate, the only one standing in this campaign for the principles which followers of Henry George avow. Davis at least was a Jeffersonian Democrat; his campaign was conducted on a high plane. As far as speech went his appeal was to the verities; he is said to know our doctrine and is not hostile. Whether this be so or not, he came out of the campaign a bigger man than he went into it. It was not his fault that he led a party which itself is without a vision and as steeped in privilege as the party against which he was so valiant a crusader.

Who Are The Real Georgians?

A VALUED correspondent, John Hosey, of Brooklyn, writes us: “You are entirely right in your critique of Post's letter but to say that if there were no taxes there would still be many reasons for taking the economic rent of land, is not saying enough; doesn't *show* the reasons, which never have been shown enough. Only the 33rd degree initiated (not even a majority of Single Taxers, I'm afraid) will understand you.”

Is this true? Is it possible for one to come to our principles save by the way of perceiving that the values that are publicly created belong of right to the public? It may be true that many who call themselves Single Taxers have other reasons for doing so, but only those who are convinced that economic rent should be taken by the community for community purposes have a right to claim the name.

It may be that many who call themselves Single Taxers are influenced by considerations of expediency, or regard the Single Tax as a desirable substitute for more objectionable methods of raising revenue. It may be that they see in the taking of economic rent merely a reform in taxation.

Such men are not true Georgians. If men have a right to the use of the earth they have a right to the whole of the economic rent. Men must be wholly free, not partially free. No partial collection of the economic rent of land can make men wholly free. To the extent that economic rent remains uncollected opportunities for the exploitation of labor remain.

Work of Cleveland's County Auditor

COUNTY Auditor John A. Zangerle has undertaken the re-appraisal of all the land in Cuyahoga County, Ohio, which includes the city of Cleveland. The last appraisal was four years ago. Mr. Zangerle, whose excellent work in assessment of real estate is known favorably to officials throughout the country, says: (and this point is frequently overlooked): “Re-appraisal does not necessarily mean increased taxes. Re-appraisals deal only with equalization of burden. Tax-spending bodies only are responsible for the amount of taxes. . . . When real estate values change, with the growth or decline of sections of a city, or where the value of the dollar is reduced, the base of valuation becomes less than 100 per cent. Property-owners then find it difficult to make comparisons with neighboring assessments. Behind such inequalities and false base lurk favoritism and discrimination.”

Ohio is one of the few states which does not provide for an annual valuation of real estate, which results in many inequalities between individuals and between tax districts.

In connection with this re-appraisal, Mr. Zangerle is issuing land value maps showing the foot front values for different streets. The highest appear to be \$15,000 along Euclid avenue.

Horace Wenzel Awards The Prize

OUR readers will recall that Mr. Horace Wenzel, one of the interesting group that gather at "The Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle" conducted by E. Wye, said he would give a prize of twenty-five dollars to any reader of *LAND AND FREEDOM* who would send authentic information regarding the rumored Single Tax in Russia, or if that were impossible, some data that could be relied upon concerning the changes in the system of land tenure in that country.

In our July-August number appeared a communication from Mr. W. A. Warren, of Kemorova, Siberia, in which he said:

In regard to the land policy of the Russian Government, it is fully indicated in the provisional constitution adopted by the All-Russian Congress of Soviets on July 10, 1918. That the framers of the constitution considered the clause dealing with the land the most important part of the document is evident from the fact that it is placed immediately after the preamble and declaration of rights. The clause is as follows: "Chapter Two (a) For the purpose of realizing the socialization of land, all private property in land is abolished, and the entire land is declared to be national property and is to be apportioned among husbandmen without any compensation to the former owners, in the measure of each one's ability to till it."

And elsewhere in the same letter:

Until recently the peasants were required to pay a general property tax in addition to the land tax. At the last session of the All Russian Congress, a law was enacted known as the Single Agriculture Tax Law. As I understand it, this law relieves the peasants from all taxation except the land tax or rent. The city or town dwellers still pay the general property tax. The peasants constitute about 85 per cent. of the population, so it may be considered a pretty close approximation to the Single Tax. It is reasonable to expect that the city dwellers will soon make a demand to be placed on the same footing as the peasants.

And again:

One of the saving graces of the government here, is that it is not afraid to try experiments. There are no sacred business and vested interests that must be handled as carefully as bird's eggs. The eight hour work day is general and I have heard of no strikes of any importance since I have been in Russia. If a man is dissatisfied with his job he has the land to go to.

On recommendation of E. Wye, Mr. Horace Wenzel has awarded the prize to Mr. Warren. But he suggests at the same time that the Editor of *LAND AND FREEDOM* write to Mr. Warren acquainting him with his success and stating that one half of the prize, or \$12.50 will be forwarded him now, if he so designates, and the other \$12.50 be retained here to await another letter from him describing in some detail, if possible, the method pursued in Soviet Russia of determining and apportioning the land rent of agricultural holdings. This seems to be a necessary corollary of what he has already written.

This instruction of Mr. Wenzel has been carried out, and Mr. Warren in far off Siberia notified of his good fortune. We thank both Mr. Wenzel and E. Wye for their interest in this subject, Mr. Wenzel for his generosity in making the offer as well as the prompt award. Those who frequent the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle are now familiar figures to the readers of *LAND AND FREEDOM* who have enjoyed their animated discussion of social and economic subjects carried on with such delightful vivacity. We think of the Mermaid Inn and other literary resorts made famous by the choice spirits who congregated there. Hardly less inspiring are the forward-looking men and women—and some others—who gather at the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle, with E. Wye as the gracious and tolerant-minded host.

Reply to a Critic

IN the September issue of the *Institute News*, a periodical published by Professor Richard T. Ely of Madison, Wisconsin, whose disinterestedness in his studies of Land Economics has become a subject of discussion, if not of suspicion, there appears a critique of an interesting book by John S. Codman of Boston, entitled "Employment and Our Revenue Problem." The review is too long to quote in full, but the main objection raised by the critic may be put in the following words: "What inducement will there be to utilize land if the Government confiscates land values?" To this query the following reply was sent by one of our correspondents.

EDITOR, INSTITUTE NEWS:—

In the September issue of the *Institute News* appears what I regard as a very shallow criticism of an important book—Codman's "Employment and Our Revenue Problem." I feel sure that you will be anxious to call the attention of your readers to the unintentional error.

Your critic asks what inducement to utilize land will remain if the Government confiscates land values. In a city where 90% of the land is used by persons who do not own it, and where actual users of the land pay to the land owners an annual tax in the form of rent, which extracts every last penny of the annual land value, such a query verges on absurdity. If New York tenants can make a good living after the full rental value is confiscated

by the present owners, why should they cease to thrive, merely because the Government occupies the position which the land owners now hold. The cases are rare in this part of the country where the actual users of the land are permitted to appropriate *any* of the annual land value.

Not that Mr. Codman, if I understand him correctly, advocates government ownership of the land. The landlord, when kept in his place, can perform a useful service for the community, by acting as a tax-gatherer, even as the bee-keeper renders service in gathering honey from the bees.

The trouble with our present system is that the land owner as owner is allowed to appropriate too large a percentage of what he gathers, and hence, people are obliged to surrender their private property in the form of other taxes to make up for what he is permitted to keep. Like everyone else he is entitled to the value of services rendered, but not more. That he is deserving of a return for merely owning the land is not obvious, but he *is* entitled to the value of his improvements, if any, and to a commission on his collections. Such a system would convert him from a parasite into an asset, and would be much wholesomer for him, because he would have to indulge in more involuntary exercise.

There are other points in E. W. M.'s critique, which might be traversed. Until he learns the fundamental fact that the confiscation (dreadful word) of annual ground rent or land value does not diminish, but rather enhances, the returns to capital invested in utilizing the land, there is no use in discussing the subtler aspects of the matter."

Why Britain Wanes

RAYMOND TURNER whose work entitled "Ireland and England" contributed, at least to the extent of its circulation, to the misunderstanding of the Anglo-Irish problem during the war, is author of an article in the *Yale Review* on "The Future of Britain." It is gloomy reading to those who regard the downfall of the British Empire as a matter of regret. His forebodings justify the belief that the ultimate defenders of stern and unbending Toryism will be found in the American Universities. He shudders at the prospect that "Labor", which he seems to regard as synonymous with Sovietism, will exercise a powerful influence on the future of Great Britain. No comment is made on the justice of his political views, but his economic shortsightedness is deplorable. He points out that Britain has increased its population to such a degree as to be incapable of self-support by British produce, but he does not emphasize the important fact that this condition of affairs was brought about under the rule of the classes whose downfall he deploras.

England imports 80% of her food supplies and produces 20%. These figures might be reversed if her antiquated and outworn land system had not depopulated her rural

regions and driven her peasantry into mill towns to be turned into raw material for manufactures. Her upper classes pursued this policy with open eyes, because a factory hand could be made a more prolific producer of wealth than a peasant could. Dividends won in the fight with rents, and large areas of the rural sections of England today are as bare of population as some of the parts of Canada to which the population is emigrating. The blight of the landlord is over it all, and if the day should come which Professor Turner predicts when England shall be as "Niniveh and Tyre" it will be due to bloated aristocracy, which wallowing in the wealth of an exploited world, raised no hand to save its own race from extinction on its native soil.

The Single Tax and Nothing But the Single Tax

ARE Single Taxers, Single Taxers? Or are they sectarians holding a complex set of beliefs, all related in a way to each other, in which the Single Tax finds some place in the setting? These are questions not of minor, but of serious importance, as they serve to indicate the central problems of our propaganda work.

Let us define. There are two meanings to the word "Single Taxer." One refers to the man as an individual in which case the thesis of this article does not apply. As an individual a Single Taxer may hold one hundred beliefs as to the relation of the Single Tax to other situations, and as to the "philosophy" upon which it is based. Again the thesis of this article does not relate to the truth or falsity of the beliefs in question. All such discussion is, per se, irrelevant. It maintains that the Single Taxers *acting as such in groups* have but one minimum belief, and only one, viz: the Single Tax. This at once sweeps away all sectarianism as it allows the utmost liberty of personal belief consistent with adherence to the minimal dogma. It is true that the color of a movement is not derived from its minimal belief, but instead from the hundreds of accruals, which make up one's mental picture of a Single Taxer. But this color is interesting only from a literary viewpoint and not from an engineering viewpoint. We are social engineers, who have to do a certain job. Once we recognize this we will be more hospitable to heresy within the ranks. And the more heretics a movement has, the better. Human diversity being infinite, no one can hope to convert the mass of men to a set of one hundred propositions. But they can be converted to one proposition, with liberty to be what they will in aught else.

What is the minimal belief? It is this. The rent of land should belong to the people, because by this means a great improvement will take place in the condition of the overwhelming majority of mankind.

In other words if anyone believes that the consequences of enacting the Single Tax will be desirable consequences, then he is a Single Taxer, no matter how he arrives at this belief, nor whatever his cognate beliefs, nor whatever be his definition of the notion of a desirable consequence. He may be a wages fund believer, a Malthusian, a Communist, a Monarchist, an enemy of "natural rights," a worshiper of the economists, etc., but as long as he holds the Single Tax to be desirable, he is of our camp and welcome.

It would be thought to be a simple proposition to have Single Taxers insist only upon a man being a Single Taxer, and not also an individualist, a libertarian and what not; but no, this has been the one thing they have not done. The reason therefore (or rather reasons) are very complex and rooted deep in the nature of man. Perhaps it is the passion for like-mindedness which is the foundation psychologically for all group action; perhaps it is the feeling of superiority engendered by having learnt the one group of beliefs that differentiates one from the common run, but whatever the motives they have not been related to the primary question of getting the rent of land for the people. Hence it comes about that our movement has been rich in pussyfooters and political compromisers, but poor in men of liberal mind. We have compromised where we ought never to have compromised, that is in politics and propaganda, and failed to compromise on what we should have compromised on, viz., on all beliefs not strictly that of the Single Tax. *Hence our historic futility, which is undeniable.* We have reduced our numbers from a great historic movement into the four walls of a sect, and we have frittered away those sectarian energies in irrelevant political and propaganda channels. In the only critical sense of the term we have proved ourselves unfit to govern. With the advent of the Commonwealth Land Party, we have remedied one half of our troubles. Let us now develop plastic brains, and, recognizing our exact engineering position, decline to require any belief of any one, other than the Single Tax. And this means more than the matter of formal adhesion. The Single Tax clubroom should be a business office with only one subject for discussion, that is, how to achieve business success. In other words there is only one legitimate subject of discussion among Single Taxers, as grouped, and that is the discussion of ways and means. All theoretical discussions are academic and are matters of private amusement.

Once we adopt this attitude we will resemble a sound business institution which by appraising critically its possibilities, and working towards its goal within these appraised possibilities, is not likely to have a bankrupt's fate. It will then be possible for men who are not of our sect, but of our belief, to come to our meetings without feeling that they are in for a seance of pitting their wits against the embattled horde of superior and overweening dialecticians, that have hitherto been the "glory" (sic)

of our movement. A small group like our own will always have its surplus of superior persons, since it will always consist of those who have done a thinking job not done by the mass of men. Since it is inevitable that we will have always in superabundance this negative factor, let us not make it too easy for them to flourish. Let us concentrate on our job.

There are two objections to the foregoing treatment. One is, granted that the consequences of enacting the Single Tax are desirable, how does one arrive at the analysis which leads to the formulation of a principle having so desirable a set of consequences? And the second objection would be how do you differentiate your own therapeutics from that of contending social physicians, such as the Socialists. Surely not by virtue of the minimal principle, for that is already a conclusion? Then it must be by the use of principles "outside" of the conclusion, but needful for the validity of the conclusion.

To the first the answer is that the improvement we contemplate is that of the economic condition of mankind, and that the moiety of earnings, whether direct or disguised, are wages. The principle that the wages of labor depend on the margin of free land, is indispensable. We do not mean this in a crude statistical sense, but in this sense, that if the margin is raised, the average wage of labor is raised therewith. Then, if the margin is abolished, it follows that a great strengthening is given to the bargaining power of labor, such that no wage short of its specific contribution to value, can be given to it. This is the minimal reasoning to establish the principle that we would benefit mankind.

The second objection is met by pointing out that the Single Tax is not a competitor. If, however, our conclusion is correct, then it follows that our principle must be included in the other frameworks of society, else they will fail to "make good." Individualism has not achieved its aim in our time, because it has not had the Single Tax. Socialism likewise will not attain its aim without the Single Tax. A real analysis of the administrative weaknesses of the Soviet State, might show that their inability to equalize the rent situation by means of the Single Tax has nullified their socializing efforts. At any rate, we compete with nobody, but any possible social order must use our conclusions, if it is to be successful.

This does not mean to say that other aspects of the Single Tax have not great theoretical beauty, and that there are not hundreds of aspects, both in general and in fiscal economics of the Single Tax, which are not as yet cleared up and worthy of great study. It does mean that acting as a group, we have not this job, but one job only and that is THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE.

WM. J. BLECH.

THE law which determines what rent can be got by the owner is styled the law of rent.—HENRY GEORGE.

My Conversion To Georgism

Translated for LAND AND FREEDOM from *Revista del Impuesto Unico*.

TODAY the Georgists are forming in legions; the conversion is going forward. But when in our press there appeared some biographical data about our friend, Antonio M. Molina, among his meritorious labors for the cause the conversion of Dr. Felix Vitale of Montevideo to the Single Tax stood out as a conspicuous achievement.]

AMONG English speaking Georgists there still persists a curiosity to know how a Latin became converted to Georgism. The step from the current ideas to the knowledge and conviction of the doctrine called Single Tax is an event very similar to a change of religion. In Italy the works of Henry George are unknown. Even to this day there is no movement known for promulgating them. From London I asked of a learned professor, translator of "Social Problems," if the theory of the North American reformer were mentioned in the University. He replied to me that only two works translated into Italian form part of the library of any scholar. Considerable was the astonishment and delight on knowing that I was an Italian by birth, and by education, with many years residence in a South American republic. In reality, a Georgist who is convinced and enthusiastic even to the martyrdom imposed on those who create new ideas, new at least in form, must saturate himself profoundly with democratic sentiments such as George conceives them and inspires us with. Such as they are conceived by those who have received their education in societies really marching toward liberty and justice and which fear for the collapse for their rising democracy. In an Italian educated in monarchial and caste traditions, in these false South American democracies, the discovery of a Georgist appeared some years ago as a miracle of providence. The miracle of providence which longed to receive at last spread abroad such a glorious truth. Socialism which appears so much to stir the masses and some intellectuals was presented and is today presented to a formidable majority of English and American as a bureaucratic organization which would complicate social functions, greatly interfering with that individual liberty for which the Englishman professes a traditional devotion from the time of Magna Charta down to that pacific revolution which, though by a great war, is being realized throughout the whole British Empire.

I have often had to tell the brief story of my conversion.

Generally, when a radical change takes place in our ideas, we ask ourselves why so simple a truth does not progress more rapidly. The theories of George are more than theories deduced from experience; they are irrefutable facts. Is the increment of land values through the increase of population and social progress a theory? Is the fact that this value, instead of benefitting those who

create it, goes into the hands of the land owner, a theory? Is it a theory that, in large cities where land values are highest, the most humiliating poverty, the deepest moral degradation and the utmost corruption exist? Many of these theories could be cited which are facts. Tradition, nevertheless, produces a moral anasthesia in communities and gives to the simplest ideas the appearance of being utopian and impracticable. And the public? The public is its own worst enemy. The people that most needs redemption are precisely those that stone their redeemers. All for the people, nothing for the people, said Napoleon; and I was wont to repeat this to my friend as we walked up and down the avenues while he strove to convert me.

I had lived for ten years in a turbulent country where civil wars, called revolutions, followed one another at brief intervals. The presidents were elected by the armies, as the last Roman emperors were by the pretorians. An industrial crisis had followed an epoch of great speculations in land (a fact which no one recognized or denounced.) The consequent economic depression, which was so deplorable as to make us despair of the future of the country, was attributed to political uneasiness. The gold in the banks did not come out except to take advantage of the drop in values. A countless number of houses remained without tenants. The farms were bare of cattle and men. Discouragement invaded even the homes of the nabobs. Not one of the statisticians and professors of political economy mentioned an economic cause.

At this moment arrived two new works: "Young Europe" and "Militarism" by Guillermo Ferrero,—a great admirer of North American democracy and of its magnates, whom he praises for their generosity. Why not attribute this tangle of social misfortunes to the spirit of militarism which had invaded the whole environment, the education, the culture of the South American republics, when Ferrero had shown it as a fact in France, Germany and Italy?

Satisfied with having at last found an explanation of all the ills that afflicted these republics, I set out for England and then New York with the new ideas added to all that I had learned from Darwin, Spencer, Huxley, Lombroso, Ferri, etc.

I carried with me an introduction to Munn & Co., owners of an important review, *The Scientific American*; and there I was presented to the head of the Spanish edition, Antonio Molina, of Puerto Rico.

He was a man of 50 years of age, of Spanish type, penetrating eyes. Educated in Paris and New York, he was master of two languages. I soon learned that he had been a friend of Henry George; and his family, intimate friends of that of George. Gifted with great versatility of talent, he possessed the power of true eloquence. As enthusiastic as an Italian, as tenacious as an Englishman, no one could come near him without in one way or another absorbing the theories of our economic creed.

He invited me to a lunch; and in order that I should not miss my French cooking, he took me to a Swiss restaurant. I told him about my plans for becoming a millionaire in that country where millionaires were counted by the score. He did not discourage me, but he spoke to me of social ills, of the difficulties of earning a living, of the impossibility almost of making one's way, of bankruptcies, robberies, moral and political corruption, and finally of property in land.

I did not understand one iota of what he was saying to me. I thought that, with my own efforts, my will of iron, in a country described by Ferrero as an Eldorado, I could in a few years succeed in gaining the admiration of that writer as an Italian magnate made in North America. When relating to my wife my encounter, I described Molina as a very intelligent, very kind, very well educated Spaniard, but of very doubtful mental balance. This Spaniard had spoken badly of socialists and badly of anarchists. What political or economic ideas could he believe in?

In spite of my distrust of the man's mentality, I continued to associate with him. I felt the need of hearing him. Although his ideas appeared to me paradoxical, they attracted me.

He presented me with a copy of *Progress and Poverty*. As yet I had not mastered English; and after the first chapters, I stumbled into the law of wages and interest and could not continue. Then he presented me a copy of *Social Problems* and had the patience to translate what I did not understand. I finished the book and began to see something. But, beside the fact that, as a medical man, I did not consider land as my subject, Ferrero still overwhelmed me with his superficialities, which at that time seemed to me original and brilliant.

It is always a problem with English speaking people to select the first book for anyone who wishes to begin the study of economic subjects. The propaganda committees had edited a little work bearing two headings: *Natural Taxation*, by Shearman, and *Open Letter to Pope Leo XIII*. When I had finished reading *Social Problems*, the master handed me the above little work, without ceasing in his attacks on my Lombroso-Ferri logic. My conversion was ripening fast. Finally, after some months residence in New York, my knowledge of English progressed and I was able to approach the reading of *Progress and Poverty*. Who can refute that work? My conversion was now complete. The disciple of Molina became one of the most enthusiastic Georgists.

At once I began my active propaganda. I published in Italian newspapers articles on Housing in New York, the most densely populated city, where lack of air, of light, in spite of other conditions of comfort and a standard of living higher than in all other countries, caused tuberculosis and debilitating diseases to decimate the immigrant poor.

I had the opportunity—which I considered a good fortune—to witness a campaign struggle for the presidency. On the one side McKinley, with his program of Protection and the promise of the Dingley Tariff. On the other side Bryan, for the Democratic Party, with a platform of Free Trade and the free coinage of Silver in the ratio of 1 to 16. I could admire the political education of that people, in spite of the economic ideas of its first citizen not having yet opened a breach in established interests, which there assume monstrously vast proportions. In spite of the aberration in economic ideas, the oratorical struggle revolved exclusively about economic problems: protection or free trade; which of these would be of most benefit to the people? Is silver money advisable? And in this environment my faith and conviction in the sublimity of our doctrine was strengthened.

My poor friend and master died tranquilly over two years ago without a single hour's illness. Before dying, he knew that his disciple had done his utmost to proclaim the idea in the midst of silence, indifference and hostility. What a satisfaction if he could witness the battle of young Argentines, full of enthusiasm and courage, for the cause of the Single Tax.

FELIX VITALE.

History Repeats Itself

THE preamble to an Act in the British Parliament of 1534 was as follows:

"Forasmuch as divers persons, to whom God in his goodness hath disposed great plenty, now of late daily studied and invented ways how they might accumulate into few hands, as well great multitude of farms as great plenty of cattle, and in especial sheep, putting such land to pasture and not tillage; whereby they have not only pulled down churches and towns, and enhanced the rents and fines of land so that no poor man may meddle with it, but also have raised the prices which hath been accustomed, by reason whereof a marvellous number of the people of this realm be not able to provide for themselves, their wives, and children, but be so discouraged with misery and poverty that they fall daily to theft and robbery, or pitifully die of hunger and cold."

—"The Commonwealth," London.

NOBODY, said President Coolidge to an audience of radio men, will be allowed to monopolize the air. Calvin does not seem so greatly worried, however, by the efforts of a few men to monopolize the earth.

—Cleveland Press

THE distribution of wealth is a division of wealth. When the part of wealth that goes to rent is ascertained that part that is left goes to labor and capital in wages and interest.—HENRY GEORGE.

Campaign Tour Of William J. Wallace

NOMINEE TELLS OF HIS RECEPTION
IN MANY CITIES

DURING the closing days of the campaign I visited the Single Taxers in some of the cities of the central states. In several cities I was given the opportunity of addressing audiences and presenting to them the claims of the Commonwealth Land Party for their votes. These addresses were made at the Liberal Club, Chicago; Lions Club, South Chicago; Young Men's Hebrew Association, St. Louis; City Club and Single Tax Club dinner, Cleveland; Kiwanis Club, Youngstown; Henry George Club and Irene Kaufman Settlement; Pittsburgh. I also visited Springfield and Peoria, Illinois.

It was very pleasant to meet the Single Taxers in these cities and to feel their interest in the efforts of the party to make the Single Tax a campaign issue.

One of the questions asked at the meetings was, "What do you hope to accomplish by the party?" The reply was that we hoped to create a sentiment in favor of the public appropriation of land rent that would enable politicians to appeal successfully to the people on this issue.

It is a present day question that cannot be postponed without grave danger to civilization and to our democratic institutions. These are the advances from barbarism made by our fathers through ages of struggle which must be preserved by going forward to a complete recognition of justice in the public administration of the land.

The candidates of the Commonwealth Land Party were the only nominees who were permitted by their party associations to discuss the land question. This greatest, most urgent and most vital question was deliberately ignored by the Republican, Democratic and Progressive parties. The Commonwealth Land Party was the only one whose candidates were speaking the truth and it was refreshing to see the attention and the enthusiasm with which it was received, not only by those who glory in the name of Single Taxers but by the business men who listened to the addresses.

Our philosophy is a great promise of hope to them. It condemns the income and inheritance taxes, from which they suffer, as being oppressive and unjust. It shows the right way of preventing concentrated wealth and the evils that attend it. Wealth should not be unjustly obtained and its attainment should be prevented by making it impossible to divert publicly-created land values into private pockets. Our philosophy also shows business men how rents can be reduced by stopping land speculation, and how the wages of labor will be increased to many times their average present value. It shows that trade unions and legislative interferences with economic

freedom are both unnecessary and unwise. It shows how land mortgages can be utterly eliminated so that they will no longer be a burden to farmers, home owners or business men.

We must keep this great issue before business men and all others until they recognize its importance and become interested in its success. From my personal experience I believe that they will readily learn if it is presented to them at the proper time and in the proper way, which is to reserve nothing, conceal nothing and let them see it as Henry George showed it to us.

There has been too much timidity, evasion and concealment in the attempt to interest business men in this idea. Its advocates have protected themselves from criticism by befogging and belittling the issue, and escaped to the seclusion of other parties at every election.

The newspapers in many of the cities published interviews and gave quite full reports of the meetings, treating the visit of the candidate as an event of political interest. In this way the Single Tax, broadly stated, was brought to the attention of millions of people at a time when they were willing to give consideration to its claims.

I was favored with the company of the National Organizer of the party, Mr. James A. Robinson, for part of the time. In connection with the state organizations, he has done most effective work in carrying out the program of the national convention which was held in New York on February 8th and 9th of this year. We are most fortunate in having the services of such a devoted friend of the cause. He carries on his work with a cheerful and persistent activity which is the expression of his own earnest desire to secure the acceptance of our principles by the people and to have them enacted into law. It was with regret that I left him a few days before election so that he could return to Los Angeles and rejoin his family whom he had not seen for almost a year.

To those Single Taxers whom I met in all the cities I visited I wish to express my grateful appreciation of the kindness of their reception and the courtesies they extended to me. It was refreshing to meet them and to see their interest in our common cause. I hope, with them, that success will crown the efforts of those who have learned the truth and who are willing to work and pray for it.

WILLIAM J. WALLACE.

A PORTRAIT of General Gorgas appears on the cover of the *Revista del Impuesto Unico* (Official Organ of the Argentine Single Tax League) for the month of August. Four pages are devoted to an appreciative biographical sketch and a reproduction in Spanish of his address before the Business Men's Club of Cincinnati, September 1914. The *Review* contains 36 pages, of which five and one half are taken up with paid advertisements. The latter indicate practical support by the business community.

Newspaper Publicity For The Commonwealth Land Party

A RECORD has been kept at party headquarters of the notices which appeared in various papers throughout the country commenting on the activities of the Commonwealth Land Party.

In addition to notices with comments on or extracts from the Platform and reports of the National Convention sent broadcast over the whole country by the News agencies, a total record of 244 clippings have been received, some of these illustrated with pictures of the candidates.

In Arizona, though not on the state ballot, the sample ballot for Yavapai County received from Mr. Vyne proves that the existence of our party was made known to all those who saw that ballot in the newspaper which covers that section, and to all who read their ballots while voting. This is the most conspicuous instance we know of indicating the amount of publicity that can be obtained with the least possible achievement in the way of securing candidates, as there was but one name on the ballot—that of Mr. N. A. Vyne for State Senator.

In New York State, though not on the state ballot, we had several candidates in N.Y. City and these appeared under our party name in six papers on October 28 and in six on October 29. The eight papers that published these ballots included all the leading dailies of this city with an enormous combined circulation.

The short tour of William J. Wallace, our candidate for President, resulted in several of our best notices, conspicuous alike for position, space and matter, with some good pictures. The death of William McCabe, our candidate for Governor of New York, was reported in all the leading New York City papers and some outside; and all of them emphasized his candidacy and his early association with Henry George.

In Ohio where our work was more thoroughly organized and more generously supported with the assistance of Mr. J. C. Lincoln, our candidate for Vice President, than in any other state, there must have been many news notices which we have not received.

Of the individual achievements in newspaper publicity a notable instance is the splendid work done by C. Le-Baron Goeller of Union, N. Y., our candidate for Lieut. Governor, who composed a series of 7 uniquely interesting and convincing advertisements which appeared in twelve successive issues of the *News-Dispatch*, a weekly paper of Endicott, N. Y., in uniform spaces 6x10 inches. The first of these appeared August 20 and the last on November 5.

From a study of the clippings we believe that they represent less than a quarter of those published. The agency that issued Mr. Wallace's photo in a story with

all the other candidates sent them to several hundred papers, many of which doubtless made use of it and some of which failed to reach us. The "spreads" in Cleveland and St. Louis resulting from Mr. Wallace's visit to those cities were copied in smaller papers throughout other parts of Missouri and Ohio.

Such magazines as *Collier's*, *Woman's Home Companion* and *The Arbitrator*, all of which have corresponded with us; *Literary Digest*, *Public Opinion*, the weekly and semi-weekly editions of big papers such as *New York Times* and *Boston Evening Transcript*; and all publications that pretended to review the complete political situation, must have made some mention of our activities. So we believe that 1000 news notices, exclusive of advertisements and published ballots, is a reasonable estimate of the total publicity secured by the COMMONWEALTH LAND PARTY throughout the United States since its National Convention last February.

—L. W. TRACY,

A Criticism of our Colleges

(Gerrit J. Johnson in *Grand Rapids Herald*)

THE football games at our colleges and universities are a success. The University of Michigan has built a new addition to its stadium and still thousands are turned away. The Michigan Agricultural college just dedicated a new stadium. We all realize that athletics are necessary but should we not also realize that most of our taxpayers who have to pay the bills get plenty of exercise without stadiums?

One of the M. A. C. professors reports that thousands of children in Detroit do not get milk. The professor hastens to say that family income has nothing to do with it. Of course, that is what professors are supposed to say, but this professor does not say why the families of the well-to-do in Detroit all get milk. I think it safe to say that 80 per cent. of taxes that go to maintain our colleges come from the people who produce milk and from those who need more milk. May I ask why these institutions are so run that the man who produces the milk and the man who needs the milk are not enlightened as to why they are both starving to death? Reports from the American Bankers' Association show that at the age of 65, 54 out of every 100 American citizens are either in the poor-house or ready to go there.

What do our college students learn about life? What is being a sport? A sport is one who can sit alongside of another and slowly see him starve to death and then yell rah! rah! rah! This coming winter there will be thousands of Michigan farmers who will have to get along without the necessities of life and there will be thousands of workers in our cities who in zero weather will buy coal by the bucket. Yet in the face of this the University of Michigan puts a ban on politics. Can there be anything more

stupid? Everybody knows that there is something radically wrong with our body politic. Why not allow students to listen to all sides of political questions?

We taxpayers are all of different minds. Who gave our university management the authority to say which of us is right or wrong? Are we not sounder Americans for listening to people with whom we do not agree? Should we not remember that the birth of this nation was the result of disagreement? Anyone in this age who would control the avenue of thought has an illegitimate mind.

We taxpayers want professors to know that we are not building educational institutions as ornaments. Capital and labor are in trouble and we would have the professors' brains act as fertilizer to grow new thoughts and show us a way out. If our universities cannot help labor and employed capital solve its problems what good are they? Why not close them? Surely we do not need more of the professional class. Civilization is now getting top heavy and the crowd below is commencing to sweat blood. We do not need higher education as badly as just a little common sense.

The writer owned several houses in Detroit which he sold on the installment plan. These people pay \$50 to \$60 a month on their homes. Then there are street improvements, sickness, layoffs, and, believe me, there is nothing poetic about a stork that hovers over the chimney of a home that has a mortgage hanging over the fireplace. If some of our theorists could exchange places with those strugglers they would learn that family income and outgo had a good deal to do with the supply of milk.

In Detroit there have been untold millions of dollars of increased land values which were created by the people and rightfully belong to the people, but under our present tax system these millions have gone into the pockets of land speculators. Suppose we untax all improvements created by capital and labor and instead tax vacant lots and idle land the same as lots and land in use, according to location value. That would make land speculation unprofitable, and give young people the same privilege as the birds of the air, to build a nest in any place not in use. That would create a demand for wedding rings instead of handcuffs.

What do students learn about the struggles of life? What does the average graduate know about the power of taxation? Yet a system of taxation can make or break a nation. Taxation is as important to a nation as the breath of life to a new born-babe. I maintain it would be far better to close the doors of our state educational institutions and instead have all high school graduates serve one week in Marquette or Jackson prison, one week in the Kalamazoo Insane asylum, one week at the home for the feeble-minded at Lapeer and one week in the poor-house. Then they might not learn so many frills, but they would have a better understanding of human ills. I maintain that four weeks in those institutions would do more to open the eyes of youth than four years in a university.

Life In The Far North

IN the course of his lectures on the Far North Dr. Stefansson, the Arctic explorer, is reported to have said: "Raw materials were the property of everyone, but manufactured articles belonged to whoever had made them. . . . In civilized countries people strive for wealth to spend on themselves, and thus gain prominence. But the Eskimo hunts, fishes, and hoards food against the coming of winter to give it to less successful hunters and fishers. And the man who has the most to give away is the most prominent among the Eskimos. . . . White men whose work takes them to the fringes of the Arctic nearly always marry Eskimo women, and in a few more generations the Eskimo will have entirely merged with the white race."

Another traveller in the Far North, the Rev. A. F. Forest, writing of Metlakahtla, in Alaska, says:—"It is a Christian city—out and out—as no other city in the world. The Government consists of 30 men, popularly elected. It holds the land, and supports itself from the rental. Metlakahtla has no policemen and no poor law officer. They are not needed. There is neither crime nor poverty in the city."

When Henry George wrote "Progress and Poverty" he made an examination of all civilized countries to find out what there was common to all that would account for the poverty and degradation common to all amid increasing wealth. And what he found was that making private property of land (in its wide meaning, including all raw materials in a state of nature) was the cause of both poverty and degradation. That baneful act divided the people into two classes—one going in one direction and becoming increasingly wealthy, and the other in the opposite direction and becoming poverty stricken and degraded. And what a sad reflection this is on our boasted civilization and Christianity, that we should thus divide the people into two classes, to the enrichment of the one and the degradation of the other, while these semi-civilized people of the Far North acknowledge the equal right of all to the use of the earth and all that it contains, and only seek wealth in order to help the less successful members of their community.—*People's Advocate*, Adelaide, South Australia.

Robbing The City

THE Pasadena (Calif.) *Star News* says: Proceeds of the Civic Center bond issue, which will be voted upon next Tuesday, are to be used to meet the cost of the Civic Center buildings and their sites above the rough estimates made in advance by the City Planning Commission. A large part of this excess cost, as shown by the city's official statement, is traceable to the advance in real estate prices which necessitated paying nearly \$300,000 more for the land than was estimated.

At the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle

CONDUCTED BY E. WYB

OLD Michael Shea came in the other evening to warm up before our cheery fireplace at the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle. "I am growing that weary of it all," he murmured as he sank into a comfortable chair, "my time is almost come." "Come, brace up, old man," we said. "I was not able to attend the funeral of me frind, William McCabe, and that has grieved me. One by one the links are breaking. McCabe, do you mind, tho he looked more like a Maori chieftain than anything else, was half Irish, as his name indicated, and that made him the success he was—living to be eighty and the father of twelve children. We were frinds from the night he was our Grand Marshall in the great Hinry George torch-light parade preceding the eliction of 1886. "Are ye there, Mike?" cried he, imitating the Duke of Wellington. "I am," said I. "Then," said he, "let the procession go on." By me side in the ranks was Mike Murray, carrying with him his paving-hammer to honor the occasion. Oh, those were the days; I'm glad I was born to see them. No man could broil a steak to beat McCabe. One time at the Park (Merriewold Park—Bill was on the committee which discovered it and bought it) he let me into the secret of broiling a steak. By the Saints, how he handled that steak—with what science and precision! Searing it first to preserve its juices, watching it tenderly, turning it patiently, letting it brown to a turn—ah, I seem to smell it now!"

* * * * *

"I see," continued the old man, "that the Hon. George L. Record, do ye mind, that veterinary ex-warhorse of the Republican Party over in Jersey, was at it agin in the late eliction. They till me that he had a circus-tint and amused a limited number of voters with his solemnity. He wore tights, I'm told, with spangles (can that be true?) and landed a neat handspring onto the platform, crying, 'Ladies and gintlemen, and you dear childen of the coming gination, here I am agin!' And then, says me informant, he threw them some kisses. It seems (but perhaps ye know) that this time he ran for the United States Sinate as an Independent, giving his support on the side, do ye mind, to the late lamented La Follette—Socialist outfit. Ochone, Widow Machree! From the eliction returns it appears that the ladies and gintlemen he addressed in the tints largely forgot he was running. He got 57,000 votes out of a million cast. However, there's the dear children of the coming ginations to consider. Some of thim doubtless will be voting for this good man's mimory, just as many old Dimocrats are still voting for Andrew Jackson."

We ourselves have been at some pains to analyse Mr. Record's platform. He was good enough to send to the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle a copy of his election address, which was got up in a nice little pamphlet of 16 pages, with his picture on the first page and the following announcement: "A Candidate with a program to Reduce the Cost of Living. George L. Record, Candidate for United States Senator. Supporting La Follette and Wheeler. Election November 4, 1924. Tent meeting tonight, 8 p. m. Comfortable chairs for all." Thereupon is announced "The Great Issue." "The question is: Shall the United States be governed by and for the benefit of its people, or by and for the benefit of a plutocracy made up of a few rich individuals and corporations?" "Positive Action Demanded." "It is not enough merely to denounce plutocracy. We are in an age of reality. The men and women of today demand action. They are thoroughly sick of the empty generalities and unkept promises of politicians. They want something done to make life easier and to reduce the cost of living." "What is the Remedy?" "It is possible," hints the pamphlet cryptically, "that in the end the remedy may take a form or forms unforeseen at present." Cautious and rather pussyfootish. But listen. "Trust Holdings of Natural Resources must be Broken Up." Very good. "Where the Trust possesses lands containing the best deposits of coal and iron, which are held out of use to sustain its monopoly, we must break up this monopoly." Good again. Attaboy! But how? "One way to do this is to have the government acquire a quantity of these unused lands and lease them upon moderate royalties to competitors of the trust." In the name of the Prophet! Then follow a large number of paragraphs extolling the virtues of Government Ownership and Operation of Railroads and Oil Pipe Lines. Finally, Taxation. Any indication that Mr. Record adheres to his earlier pronouncements? "I favor," he says, "the restoration of the tax on excess profits. I favor increasing the tax on incomes over \$250,000, and the inheritance tax upon estates of \$500,000 or over." He concludes by calling his program an "American Program," and ingenuously adds, "This is not a complete program, but it is enough for one campaign." It appears to have been quite enough for the voters of New Jersey.

This little episode of Mr. Record's candidacy is but another illustration of the truth, which before long must begin to dawn upon the public, that there is absolutely no basic difference between Republicans, Democrats, Socialists and La Follette Progressives. They each and all favor governmental repression, interference and control. And one other thing is certain, they all of them differ

radically and diametrically from the Commonwealth Land Party, which is their only veritable antagonist. For in proclaiming that the Rent of Land belongs to the people and that the first duty of government is to collect it the Commonwealth Land Party throws down a gauntlet of challenge. All who are not with it are against it. And all who are against it, it will in time destroy. Although this country is probably a generation or more behind the rest of the world in the realization and the solution of this the most important of all problems, yet even here the atmosphere is growing clearer to the extent that politicians of Mr. Record's kind, who, lacking both sagacity and courage, have wasted their time in seeking alliances which lead nowhere, are now being shown up as political weaklings worthy of no more than a laugh. Better is it to be "counted" for something that counts and for something one believes in than to utter weasel words in trying to connect up, in the vain urge of opportunism, expediency and the itch for office, with others whom in the depth of one's nature one morally detests and intellectually despises.

* * * * *

Similarly, with genuine enthusiasm Editor E. B. Gaston in the *Fairhope Courier* of November 7 pointed out that La Follette carried Fairhope overwhelmingly. La Follette 138, Coolidge 63, Davis 53. Doubtless this victory was largely owing to the influence of the *Courier*. Brother Gaston saw a great light and guided his readers toward it. To our way of thinking at the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle this great light was a mere will-o'-the-wisp. But that's nothing with those eminent Single Taxers who have formed the habit of joining up with any political procession that comes along, provided it has a new flag and a big brass band. Variety, with such of our brethern, is their very spice of life—give them novelty or give them death! It is not going too far to say that there are Single Taxers (but why any longer call them Single Taxers?) who have voted in turn every ticket presented during the past forty years. Starting as stalwart Republicans or Jeffersonian Democrats they have been Henry Georgite and Cleveland Democrat, Weaverite and Bryanite, Mugwump, Moose and Farmer-Laborite, Progressive and Socialist. Observe, please, that the Commonwealth Land Party is not included in the above list. From such an abomination, good Lord, deliver us! Anathema maranatha! Index expurgatorius! Taboo! Yet how they do flop to the stranger that is within the land! Brother Gaston in the *Courier* printed the following in large type:

"SINGLE TAXERS ENDORSE LA FOLLETTE

A statement has been given to the press, signed by a large number of the best known Single Taxers of the country, urging support of the La Follette-Wheeler ticket.

It includes the names of such wheel-horses of the movement as Louis F. Post, Sam Danzinger, Mrs. Rosa Kiefer, Frank Stephens, Charles H. Ingersoll, Western Starr,

Otto Cullman, George Schilling, Frank Vierth, Frank W. Garrison, Peter Witt, Edmund Vance Cooke, Oliver Erickson, H. W. McFarlane, John B. McGauran, with many others, including a group of Fairhope Single Taxers."

We remember a year or two ago Editor Gaston made inquiries regarding the location of the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle and wondered whether the Single Tax Party (so called at that time) had come to stay. In those days Brother Gaston was pretty thick with his friends the Democrats. While the permanent home of the Sign of the Cat and the Fiddle lies probably

"On the sunset shore of Sometimeorother,
By the beautiful Bay of Bimeby,"

yet within our hearts at this time are its magic casements opening on the foam of perilous seas. Party affiliation? In spite of his present elation over the great La Follette victory in Fairhope Brother Gaston may before many years find himself compelled to choose between our little David of a party and agglomerated hosts shouting for Goliath—between us Land Restorationists on the one side of Jordan and your sleek, fat Philistines on the other—between us who strike for Land and Freedom and your regulators, socialists and controllers, your Progressives, pussyfooters and step-by-steppers, locking arms with your heavy-weight Tories, standpatters, Republicans, Democrats, Facisti and Bourbons, all of them united against little David! In the name of Henry George, stop, look and listen!

* * * * *

We take pleasure in reproducing for our readers extracts from a letter written from Europe in August of the present year by our friend Miss Bonnyclabber: "I left Andorra with infinite regrets. Fiske Warren, who is a prince of hospitality, made my visit most enjoyable. It must be remembered that our projected journey to San Jordi last year after the Oxford Conference had to be given up. This time there was quite a house party of us, the Alemanyans from Barcelona, Joseph and his three daughters, joined later by Mrs. Alemany, my old Southern friend, Yancey Cohen (the Yanceys of Alabama and North Carolina are relations of mine,) Mr. Warren and myself—in all just enough to fill Mr. Warren's mountain chalet comfortably. Built of squared stone and sensibly planned, supplied with running water, modern plumbing, electric light and an up-to-date kitchen, the manor house of the Enclave is a source of never-ending wonder to the Andorrans. The house is situated in the center of San Jordi, a tiny domain in a Lilliputian state, the whole of Andorra being about 17 by 18 miles. The Enclave lies between San Julia and Santa Coloma, ancient hamlets both, and beyond to the North is the capital, Andorra la Vella, at the end of the narrow valley. It is all very strange and unusual. The people talk Catalan, for one thing, and the ends of their sentences rise in a sort of vocal spiral, hard to describe. They are so few in number that every

one you see counts, and you want to stop and study him or her, there being only 6,000 in the whole Republic. Mr. Warren's house is the show place of the country, and when a crowd of neighbors come to visit him on a Sunday or Saint's day there is some runaway Catalan spoken, I assure you. * * * As to how or why Mr. Warren took up with the Andorrans, he says that here is a going republic, the only one in the world, where there is no army and no custom-house, and consequently there is a better field here for introducing Single Tax than anywhere else. I do hope he will succeed in carrying out his idea—it will be so interesting. * * * I naturally find myself with a tremendous *flair* for the history of the "Valleys." You know that at college I combined history with my economics and was trained in the "historic school." I have spent many hours here in delving into the famous documentary records which have given rise to so much controversy. Mr. Warren himself has been a studious examiner of the records, and one night we sat up till after 12 discussing the problem of the suzerainty of the Valleys—Mr. Warren adhering to the Counts of Foix, while my allegiance was given to the Bishops of Urgel. You may say that this was hardly worth while. But perhaps you have not felt the thrill which we students of economics and history find in undertaking solutions of ancient questions.

Well, when we got to the "Pareages" of 1278, if I do say it myself, I think Mr. Warren was ready to quit, while I was as fresh as a lark. In a word, as to my advantage in a discussion of this kind I feel that I may express it in the following way. There is a finality in history and economics which cannot be gainsaid; whatever happens happens—and considering history in the strictly scientific way in which I was trained, it is incumbent on us students of history (yes, and of economics, too) to consider them all as parts of a great whole. Who shall say that one writer's theory or system is of greater importance than another? Events to be sure have taken place, but are they forgotten? The cobwebs of the past are shot through with iridescent lights. Do I make myself clear? And so when I examined the documentary evidence concerning these controversies that have raged for centuries regarding the rival claims of France and Spain to the overlordship of Andorra, I just found myself in my element. The fact that France today collects a yearly tribute of 960 francs, while the Bishop of Urgel gets 460 pesetas, while perhaps of slight international importance, yet would seem to prove my contentions set forth above. * * * As I said in the beginning, I left Andorra with infinite regret. I cannot say whether what most I shall miss will be the continued study of the "Pareages," or many characteristic touches of present Andorra, such as Counselman Simon's Inn where we had our meals, the cooking of our food by his voluble good wife over the embers in the great black fireplace, the red wine from the leathern winebag and from the "perrone", the Gargantuan repasts,

the trout from the Valira, the blackberries by the roadway, the "Avenida Warren," the wonderful chestnut trees burdened with nuts, the views up and down the valley, the fine highroad built by the Bishop, the auto-bus lumbering in and out daily, the amiable inhabitants, the lovely old bell-tower of Santa Coloma, the well-cultivated fields of tobacco and corn, the washing of our linen in the horse trough, the destruction of our linen by the Sisters at Andorra la Vella, the twinkling of the electric lights over Las Escaldas at night, the full moon with its black majestic shadows—all these will lovingly linger in my memory of ten happy days at San Jordi.

Enclavially yours,
Adèle Bonnyclabber.

* * * * *

"Trouble at the Source," it may be, is a suitable term for describing an exoteric disease which is attacking with more and more frequency the richer nations of Europe. The diagnosis is rather well established. The symptoms, of which the late War was one of the most alarming, have been studied with great attention, but the root of the disease which has heretofore seemed baffling, is now making itself manifest. This root is traceable to distant ends of earth, like many other infections. It finds its breeding grounds in the so-called European "Colonial System," born with the discovery of America and developed during the succeeding 400 years, with all the arts of diplomacy and the chicanery of statesmen, with all the forces of militarism and all the greed of landgrabbers and profiteers. This System is now experiencing shock after shock. For at last the worm at the source is turning. Faraway debtors to Europe, whole races counted by the hundreds of millions, are beginning to ask themselves, why are we debtors and how did we become such? Ugly pages of history are being reexamined and rewritten. Patriotic leaders are springing up. There is revolt in the air in these distant dependencies. There is trouble at the source. And indeed, it seems to us that, granting this situation, great political and economic changes must be impending. Little will it avail, in our opinion, for British cabinets to seek to bemuddle the issue in India with efforts to rouse religious antagonisms—the spirit of the age is getting away from appeals to strictly religious superstitions.

Observe that in the Mahomedan world the Caliphate falls, and the heavens are not rent in twain. A "Christian general" in China pursues his profession without a mob of sectaries tearing him to pieces. Instead of the old time superstitions misguiding the world, a growing intelligence, mingled with a spirit of resentment and a yearning for self-determination and liberty, is astir, to the surprise and alarm of many a European chancellery. What does it mean? It means that if there is big trouble at the source, without the power to crush the trouble

in the old way, to nip it in the bud by force of arms, there is genuine reason for alarm. Has the Colonial System bit off more than it can chew? Indicia are not wanting. Russia is an example on a large scale of how the thing may work out. Turkey has proved more than recalcitrant. Egypt remains dissatisfied. Mexico is a hard nut to crack. India is a thorn in the side. The Spaniard in Morocco is driven to the sea. Is the jig up with the Colonial System? Even China is awake at last and seems disposed to defy her creditors to do their worst. Gentlemen may cry Peace, but there is no peace. Rotund privilege, still fattening off Colonial spoils, is content to play its golf. But who can say how long the stream of refreshing waters will continue to flow for such beneficiaries as these when there is Trouble at the Source?

Taxes And Land Rents

THE *Cleveland Press* in a recent issue contains this paragraph:

"County Auditor Zangerle says retail business properties will bear the increase in Cuyahoga County taxes in 1925. We don't like to contradict any statement made by the best auditor the county ever had, but we must tell you that the retail business properties will not do anything of the kind. They will raise the rents and the retailers will raise prices and the consumer will continue to be the goat."

Commenting upon this item Mrs. Charlotte Smith says:

"When Mr. Zangerle says that 'Retail business properties will bear the increase in Cuyahoga County taxes in 1925 he was discussing the reappraisal of land values in Cuyahoga County, and he meant that the increase in taxes would be paid by the land owners in the down town district. If this increase in taxes had been on the stock of goods that retailers handle or on any of the industries, the selling price of the commodities would increase and the consumer would pay.

But a tax on land values cannot be passed on like a tax on industry. Instead, it absorbs that land rent. If the land rent of a parcel of land is \$40,000 and the tax amounts to \$10,000, the \$10,000 comes out of the \$40,000. Therefore retailers will not have to raise prices as the tax will come out of the rent they are already paying and the consumer will not be the goat.

What is land rent? If you go far enough north you can get land for nothing. There will be no rent. As you approach the centers of civilization rent will appear. Here is an acre of land that will rent for one dollar. Why? Because it will produce one dollar more of wealth (corn, wheat, chickens, etc.) than land you can get for nothing or land at the margin of cultivation. Here is a parcel that rents for five dollars. It will produce five dollars

more of wealth than land at the margin of cultivation. "Rent is the excess of wealth over the yield at the margin of cultivation."

Ricardo's Law of Rent is: "The rent of land is determined by the excess of its produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use."

This law of rent applies to manufacturing and exchange. And so when you reach the land in the down town district where the most wealth is produced, there you have the highest rent. Here is a parcel of land that rents for \$35,000. It will produce \$35,000 more of wealth with the same amount of labor than land at the margin of cultivation."

Where The Value Goes

"SPEAKING of railroads," said a Cleveland man as he sat in the City Club there, "the Van Sweringens have an idea that is almost revolutionary. They know that it is transportation that creates land values. If they own the land as well as the railroads, they can afford to carry the public for next to nothing, and still make money. From my own amateur viewpoint, I think that is the secret of their amazing career. That, of course, is the way they began—they bought the Shaker Heights real estate sub-division here, and then bought a transportation line to reach it. I don't think they have ever netted much from their transit properties out there, but they cleaned up enough on the real estate to go into the railroad business on a real scale. And I think they're going on with the same policy. If I'm not mistaken, you can expect them pretty soon to open up a great deal of short haul traffic. They haven't quit buying land, by any means. They are acquiring that, just as they are acquiring railroads to carry people to it. Under such a system they wouldn't have to worry even if the railroads pile up a deficit every year."

—*Commerce and Finance.*

Wisdom From Henry Ford

THE fate of the Bull Moose attempt to float a third party taught us two things: first, that an individual's candidacy is not sufficient basis for a party, however useful and popular that individual may be. This is not due, as many think, to the lack of political organization in such a movement, but to the ingrained desire of our people to vote on principles. That the Bull Moose party was launched solely in the interests of one man was proved by the facility with which that man deserted it when it failed to advance his political fortunes.

Henry Ford in *Dearborn Independent.*

WHEN land is purchased the payment is rent capitalized.—HENRY GEORGE.

Land Question In Recent British Elections

“IN spite of all the advances towards the taxation of land values since the days of Henry George, the great liberating movement to which he gave such an impetus has moved but slowly. George himself, it seems to me, is partly responsible for the time and effort that has been wasted on trivialities, since he advocated a somewhat timid advance along what he mistakenly described as the line of least resistance. . . . The poor showing that the followers of Henry George have made in the United States is largely due, I believe, to efforts wasted upon half measures and indirect attacks.”

FRANK W. GARRISON, in *The Commonwealth*, August 11, 1923.

The “poor showing” is, unfortunately, not confined to the United States. Here in Britain, after 40 years devoted service in earnest, if mistaken, educational effort along that same line of supposed least resistance, it cannot honestly be claimed that the showing is any better. There is no good purpose served in blinking the fact. It were more courageous to admit the mistaken tactics, and more honest. What is the reason for this lack of progress? Mr. Garrison, in the article which we have quoted, goes direct to the point. “The driving power of the Anti-Slavery movement,” he says, “came from the demand for ‘immediate and unconditional emancipation.’ This uncompromising attitude made the assault on the slave system formidable; it left no opportunity open to politicians who would have used the movement for their own purposes, and gave no opening for those who would entangle it in a mass of subtleties.”

• It is recorded in Johnstone’s “History of the Working Classes in Scotland” that “2,000 men joined the Land Restoration League at the conclusion of a meeting at Glasgow addressed by Henry George, who had toured Scotland and fired masses of men with his passion and eloquence, and among those whom he most influenced was James Keir Hardie, the young leader of the Lanarkshire miners.” Unfortunately, the Cause fell into the hands of the politicians. The Land Restoration League became in time the League for the taxation of Land Values, and the great moral issue raised by George, and which was the inspiration of the “passion and eloquence which fired masses of men” who heard him, was soon obscured in a wrangle between Liberal and Tory politicians over a paltry town rate. The Scottish Liberals were quick to use the movement for their own purposes, and, with the assistance of their English brethren, soon had it completely entangled in a mass of subtleties. Indeed, it came to be regarded as an item of Liberal policy (one of many), and this prejudiced its consideration at the hands of all of those who were not of that party. But for this tragedy it is possible that when, in 1893, the Independent

Labor Party was formed by Keir Hardie, Robert Smillie and other earnest radicals, it would have been founded on a definite land restoration basis, with results vastly different from those we now know.

To that mass of subtleties is due the fact that Smillie was prevented until late in life from seeing the cat. Speaking at Newcastle, Staffordshire, in October, 1921, he made this confession: “Late in life I have realized, what I failed to see in the early days, that the root of all social problems lies in the land. So long as land is withheld from free access to men, anxious and willing to utilize Nature’s bounty, just so long will you have a crowd of men at the factory gate waiting for jobs. The key to the anomalies we are all endeavouring to solve is the land problem.” This discovery yet remains to be made by the vast majority of the politicians. These are ready to render lip-service to the land values proposal as a means of catching the votes of a number of “faddists,” as they think, but without for a moment realising that behind this “wrong name for the right thing” as Col. J. C. Wedgwood, M.P., calls it in his recent book, is the greatest revolutionary idea that the world has ever been invited to accept. Presented as a mere fiscal issue—a matter of of variety in taxation method—it cannot inspire that religious fervour and moral enthusiasm which leads men to give their lives for a cause. It was not of the taxation of land values that George wrote that oft-quoted passage “The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it; suffer for it; if need be, die for it. This is the power of truth.”

LIBERATION: NOT TAXATION.

“While we were discussing taxation, instead of liberation,” again to quote Mr. Garrison, the moral principle behind the movement lost its hold upon us. The reason for the lack of progress is in the timid and mistaken policy of step-by-step. “Immediate and unconditional emancipation” was the demand that won through in the case of the chattel-slaves, and it is the only cry that will win through in this far greater struggle for the freeing of the wage-slaves of the present. In view of the triumph of the forces of reaction in the recent elections both in Britain and the United States, it behooves each and every sincere follower of Henry George to ask “Where are we at”?

THE POSITION IN GREAT BRITAIN

Here in Britain we have just passed through the third successive General Election in less than two years. After 40 years of propaganda for the Taxation of Land Values, the Land Lord Party is now in power with a majority, only slightly less than that which the Liberals, led by Sir Henry Campbell Bannerman, secured in the political land-slide of 1906. So little did Mr. Stanley Baldwin and his advisers fear the step-by-steppers, that he boldly

announced in his manifesto to the electors that "We are opposed to land nationalization, the taxation of land values, and all schemes of spoliation." For the first time all three parties mentioned the subject in the official pronouncements.

LABOR LAND POLICY

The Official Labor Manifesto promised "the taxation of land values, and such a dealing with agricultural land as will secure its maximum productivity, and with urban land and building sites as would protect the occupying tenants and secure its best use." For further light on the precise meaning of this passage we turn to the official leaflet No. 70, issued from Labor Headquarters (published in full in *The Commonweal*, June 28th, 1924) and entitled "The Land for the People," in which we read that "The Labor Party stands for the Taxation of Land Values. That means a tax on the Landlord's Rent. The Landlords get their rent, whether they are employed or unemployed; and they have no tax to pay on what they draw from the People's Land. The Labor Party would tax the Landlords' rent."

Of course, land yielding no rent, however valuable, would be unaffected by this brilliant proposal! The precious leaflet goes on to ask, "Why should the landlord always get something for nothing?" and without answering this pertinent question, says, "If there were a tax on land values, such as the Labor Party proposes, the landlord would pay part of his unearned income for the good of all, Land would be cheaper, there would be more and cheaper houses—and the Nation would have the money to buy out the landlords and give the Land to the People." The smaller wing of the Labor Party, the I. L. P., has a "Land Policy" of its very own. Adopted by the Annual Conference of the Party at York last April, it is called "Socialist Land Policy," and contains the same purchase notion. "Land value taxation should be regarded as a means of collecting the economic rent for the community" we are told, "and when funds are required for purchase . . . they should be raised as far as possible from land revenue as follows: the taxation of land values." It is a queer way of "collecting the economic rent for the community" to propose that it should be given back to the Land Lords in purchase from them of the community's land.

The timidity that fears to challenge a wrong is responsible for these proposals. Never once is the claim of the Land Lords to "own" the People's Land contested. On the contrary, it is admitted by the proposal to purchase it from them. Instead of freeing the slaves, Labor's "tax-and-buy" policy would merely change the form of their bondage. The rent-paying slave of today would be the interest-paying slave of tomorrow—but still a slave. The Land Lord who today gets "something for nothing" and calls it rent, would be the Bond Lord of tomorrow, getting the same "something for nothing"

but calling it interest—but it still would be "something for nothing."

LIBERAL LAND POLICY

Bearing the signatures of Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd George, the Liberal Manifesto declares that "Liberalism," in pursuance of its historic role of giving equal opportunities to all classes and of creating the fundamental conditions of economic and social freedom, has a great responsibility for promoting and carrying through great policies of land reform." That this is true of "Liberalism" we readily admit, but it should be remembered that the Liberal Party is not necessarily synonymous with Liberalism.

"The Liberal policy is to liberate farmers from the restrictions of an out-of-date Land system; to liberate agricultural laborers from poverty and lack of opportunity; and to make the best use of all the land of the country in the interest of the whole community." So much for agriculture. For the towns, "Land values, created by the activity and expenditure of the community, must be made to contribute to the expenses of maintaining the conveniences, utilities, and amenities of the town." The "experts" who are advising the Liberal leaders should know that the land values of the country-side are similarly created. Why are they not also to be taken? After a reference to "wiping out" the slums, we find that leasehold enfranchisement is promised.

As a signatory to the present manifesto, Mr. Asquith may be interested in the following expression of opinion on this subject. Speaking on May 18th, 1911, he said, "There is a movement in this country and in Parliament in favor of a scheme of leasehold enfranchisement, but I have always regarded that proposal, not as a solution of the land question but as a great imposture, which, so far from securing to the community the increased value of land, would merely transfer it to a new body of landowners." Since the effect of this proposal would be the same today as when he uttered these words, are we to understand that Mr. Asquith is now deliberately advocating this "great imposture"?

As, with the Labor Party, the interests of the Land Lords are to be protected by provision for Land Purchase, so the Liberal Party stands committed to the same unjust proposal. The muddleheadedness is not confined to any one party.

In amplification of their manifesto, the Liberal Party have issued two special Land Leaflets. No. 2674 is addressed "To All Who Live on Land." "Farming is a business," we read. "It can only be conducted successfully, freed from the restrictions and burdens of ornamental persons and of profit-takers who do not earn their profits." "Under this new Land Policy the State will help to make into cultivating owners all Farmers who are farming well."

"Landowners" (ornamental persons who do not earn their profits) "will be compensated on the fair terms of

receiving for themselves and their heirs the annual payment of their present net rents." "Farmers who are held by competent local experts to be inefficient will be retired." The Cultivating Owner will pay the equivalent of his present net rent. "Farmers who own their land" will be interested in the following remarkable proposal. We are told that "many of these farmers are terribly handicapped. They have to bear heavy annual charges due to having bought at high prices and borrowed at high interest. The State will be ready to buy out such occupying owners *on the basis of the price paid by them.*" After this amazing statement the authors of the leaflet go on to assert that the "Liberal policy of Cultivating Ownership is fair and just to Landowners, but does not burden the nation with the cost of buying them out." This is an Election lie, as foolish as it is false: since any scheme of State purchase must throw the burden of its cost upon the nation. The Leaflet concludes: "In the interests of National welfare, it is imperative that the Land Question shall be grappled with immediately, firmly and boldly." Those responsible for this leaflet should be *bold* enough for anything.

The second of the two leaflets, No. 2673, is addressed "To All Who Live in Towns and Cities." We have supposed that these, too, lived on Land, but let that pass. Under the head of "Land Values" we are told that "The high value of town land has been created not by the landowners, but by the activity of the people of the town as a whole." This is not quite correct. The people living in the remote country districts have contributed to give to the land of London its value ranging up to £6,000,000 per acre. These values, we are told, "should go to the community, and, primarily to the towns which directly produce them." This is quite a mistaken idea, and would, if carried out, perpetuate the present inequalities. London with its very high values, would be in receipt of a large income, while country districts where land value is low would be unable to meet their expenses from the local land value fund. The C. L. P. demand, that all the economic rent (or land value) shall be collected into a common fund and allocated to the municipal authorities on a population basis, is the only just method of distributing this fund which all help to create and maintain.

Agricultural land is to be excluded. But its value is just as much a community created value as that of any town land. The arguments for taking the one apply equally to the other. It is difficult to understand what is meant by the statement that "The continuance of a rise in land values, is, however, against public interest." What *is* against public interest is the taking of this value by private persons. Since the value is created by the presence and activity of the people, it follows that, as their numbers increase and their activities are enlarged, Land Values will rise, and no silly proposal such as the authors of the leaflet make, borrowing the idea from the I. L. P.,

that the present value be "established," will have the slightest effect. It were an easier task to stabilize the weather!

CANDIDATES CONFUSE ISSUE

Such were the official declarations of policy made by the leaders of the three parties. Turning to examine the addresses of candidates we find the same confusion of contradictory statements on the subject among the few instances where the land question is mentioned. In the vast majority of cases the candidates would not appear ever to have heard of land. A Front-bench Liberal standing high in the councils of his party is content to remark, near the end of his address:—"We propose to give the cities the fullest possible opportunity of buying land, clearing slums, improving transport and reducing rates on improvements and houses by taxes on the land which contributes now nothing of the values which the Cities themselves created." He was not returned. Another Liberal, prominent in Land Values circles, relegates the subject to the fifth place in his address, where he says:—"The unemployment problem is primarily a land problem. The Liberal industrial policy starts off with the Rating and Taxing of Land Values," and he leaves it at that. He, too, was not returned. A Labor man, also unsuccessful, remarks quite casually, three fourths of the way through a very lengthy address, that "A measure for the Taxation of Land Values is being prepared." These are typical of the many election addresses we have seen, and, taken with the party manifestoes, they reveal a depth of ignorance that is appalling.

Much is sought to be made in some quarters of pledges in favor of the Taxation and Rating of Land Values received from some 515 candidates. In the light of the foregoing it is evident that these are of little worth, since the average politician will pledge himself to anything he considers likely to catch votes. Actually, in the case of the two opposing candidates at Paisley, Mr. Asquith, (Liberal) and Mr. E. R. Mitchell, (Labor) we had two "recognized advocates of the taxation of land values" fighting each other to the death. Mr. Asquith was defeated, and we suppose that this will be regarded as a victory for the policy he advocated. The fact is that after the extremely bitter fight between Liberals and Laborites, whatever co-operation may have been possible between these two parties in the past is now at an end. In these circumstances, only the wilfully blind will believe that the restoration of the land will ever be achieved through any of the existing political parties.

MODERN ANTI-SLAVERY MOVEMENT

The "poor showing" that Mr. Garrison deplors in his own country, and which we have to admit on this side of the Atlantic, is undoubtedly due to the unfortunate manner of presentation. The driving power of the unpromising demand for immediate and unconditional

emancipation was lacking, and consequently, the cause has become the plaything of rival factions, concerned only with questions of party advantage. To exhibit the moral principle behind the movement is the privilege and purpose of the Commonwealth Land Party everywhere, hence it is presented not as a fiscal issue, but as the modern Anti-slavery movement.

—J. W. GRAHAM PEACE.

Florida Moves a Long Step Ahead

THE meeting of state governors recently at Jacksonville, Florida, focused public attention on Florida because we learned, as a result of this meeting, that the state of Florida has, in its constitution, banned two kinds of tax—state inheritance and state income taxes.

"We want people with money to come to Florida and live and die here," one of the state's legislators is quoted in explanation of the action against a state inheritance tax.

In other words, Florida intends to make things comfortable for the most desirable classes of citizens—not for the very rich only, but for the average man and woman who have saved a competence for old age and would spend the rest of their years in peace.

Taxes in Florida are fairly high, due to the many public improvements being made throughout the state. Most of these improvements, however, are of public benefit and do not consist of handsome public buildings but rather of good roads, sanitary drainage, good water supply, the fight against insect pests, fruit diseases, etc. Florida people get something worth while for their tax money, and they are not taxed half a dozen different ways for the same thing.

—EDNA K. WOOLEY in *Cleveland News*

Discovering An Entirely New Tax

A RECENT instance of this variety of capitalizing the foibles of people has been shown in a law passed by the town council of Amsbach, Bavaria, placing a tax on all foreign words used in any sort of advertising. A special commission is to prepare a list of words to be considered "foreign," and either the words must be replaced by some good German synonyms or else the owners of "American bars," French "coiffeurs" and other such fashionable establishments must pay for them at the rate of one rentenmark for every letter in the word.

—Lorraine (Ohio) *Journal*.

RENT refers to the value of the bare land. It does not include buildings or other improvements.

—HENRY GEORGE,

Death of Robert Schalkenbach

ROBERT SCHALKENBACH, life-long Single Taxer, died suddenly at his residence in November of this year. He was president of the Manhattan Single Tax Club in 1897 and always a generous contributor to the movement. He became a convert to our doctrine in 1884.

He was born in the old Chelsea District of Manhattan on June 15th, 1856. After an elementary education, he was obliged to become a breadwinner at the age of twelve, first working in a silk mill, then as errand boy for a jeweler and finally learned the printing trade in the establishment of Isaac J. Oliver, New York City's first steam printer. He worked his way up from the position of "printer's devil" to the foremanship. At the age of thirty, he became associated with Mr. John C. Rankin, former Mayor of Elizabeth, New Jersey, and succeeded him about twenty years ago as head of the John C. Rankin Co., printers.

He had seven brothers and sisters, but his is the first death in the family in sixty years. His widow survives him.

The funeral services to our friend were largely attended; practically the head of every great printing establishment in New York and vicinity being present. Following are the names of Single Taxers who attended: James R. Brown, John J. Murphy, F. C. Leubuscher, John H. Scully, Joseph H. Fink, A. C. Pleydell, Hon. Edward Polak, Sylvester Malone, James MacGregor and Charles H. Ingersoll.

The ceremonies concluded with the reading of the last chapter of *Progress and Poverty* by John J. Murphy. Our departed friend attended the funeral of John S. Crosby where Mr. Murphy read that chapter and expressed to his wife the wish that if he passed away before him, Mr. Murphy should perform a similar service at his funeral.

Frederick C. Leubuscher made an address which epitomizes so well the fine qualities of our departed friend that we refrain from adding to the eloquent and feeling tribute of which the following is an imperfect abstract:

ADDRESS OF F. C. LEUBUSCHER

Five years ago I made the address at the funeral services of my brother. It was, of course, difficult to make a fluent speech. I am laboring under much the same disability this afternoon, for our friend was to me as a brother. Our friendship runs back thirty-eight years. In 1886, I met him in the famous political campaign in which Henry George ran for Mayor of this City against Abram S. Hewitt. We were both interested in the success of the "prophet of San Francisco," for we had several years before become convinced, through reading his immortal book, "*Progress and Poverty*," that "the earth belongs in usufruct to the living." In other words, we were Single Taxers. It was this philosophy that colored and guided the greater part of Robert Schalkenbach's mature life, for he was a very young man forty years ago. I seriously believe that the high-minded, generous, forbearing and patient Bob Schalkenbach that

we all knew so well and so long, was the fruit of his economic belief. To him, the Single Tax was a religion. He wrote in his will that he was "firmly convinced that the principles expounded by Henry George in his immortal book entitled 'Progress and Poverty' will, if enacted into law, give equal opportunity to all and tend to the betterment of the individual and of society by the abolition of involuntary poverty and its attendant evils." He enjoyed the personal friendship of the great philosopher and of his charming family, and a quarter of a century after he first supported the candidacy of the father, he supported the son Henry George Jr., when the latter ran for office.

Bob graduated from the woodyard in which he was first employed to the position of "printers' devil" in the employ of a commercial printer. This proved to be his life's vocation. He rose rapidly in his chosen field until, over twenty years ago, he became the President of the John C. Rankin Co., one of the largest printing establishments in this City. In such high esteem was this sterling man held by his confreres that for many years he was chosen by them to be the President of The Typothetae, as the association of employing printers was called. I see before me now the heads of many large printing establishments, who are mourning the passing of Bob as though he had been a brother.

Yesterday, I learned from members of his family that even as a boy, he always had something for mother out of his meagre earnings. And, as the years dispelled the mists of poverty, his brothers and sisters always felt they could look to Bob to help them over the rough places of life, not only with money, but with sage counsel.

His sturdy uprightness was so well known among his family, friends, associates, employees and business acquaintances, that "his word was as good as his bond." Indeed, he stood up so straight that he sometimes leaned backward. I recall an instance some years ago when I was retained by him to defend a law-suit, in which his associates had, by their actions and correspondence, bound him. As was my duty, I showed him how the claimant had made a technical error in his case, and that if I took advantage of it, we could win. He refused to allow me to do so, however, stating that if he could not win on the merits, he did not want to win at all.

Another instance may be recalled to his everlasting credit when he advised some of his friends to invest in an enterprise which turned out unfortunately through no fault of his. While neither legally nor morally responsible, for the investments could have brought no benefit to him, he insisted on paying the losses of his friends to the last penny.

In social life he shone. We all visualize today that tall, well-built figure, which the advancing years had not bowed, the beaming face, the kindly eye. We hear his low-toned, cultivated voice using perfect English, and showing no signs of the lack of early education. To be his guest was happiness; to have him as your guest, was a favor.

I have said that to him the philosophy of Henry George was a religion. He did not believe in any creed. Not that he was an atheist, for to him one who dogmatized on this subject was as presumptuous as was the lowliest savage kneeling before a hideous idol. He believed, with Thomas Paine, that "the world is my country, to do good is my religion." In 1888 I had the great privilege of listening to Col. Robert G. Ingersoll (another Bob), when

he delivered the oration at the funeral of Courtlandt Palmer. Last night the thought occurred to me that much of what Col. Ingersoll said on that occasion was applicable to our departed friend; and I will now read to you from that great address.

I have left for last mention the one that was nearest and dearest to Bob. He had no children of his own, and perhaps that is one reason he sought to better the condition of the children of others. Childless, his affections concentrated on the helpmate of a quarter of a century. It was easy for her to love such a loveable man.

"Life is a narrow vale between the cold and barren peaks of two eternities. We strive in vain to look beyond the heights. We cry aloud, but the only answer is the echo of our wailing cry. From the voiceless lips of the unreplying dead, there comes no word. But in the night of death, hope sees a star, and listening love can hear the flutter of a wing.

Farewell, dear brother, the world is better for your life. Farewell, we loved you living, we love you now."

Highest Price For Land Ever Paid In This City

ANNOUNCEMENT of the purchase this week by the Harriman National Bank of the lot adjoining its property at Fifth avenue and Fourty-fourth street reveals that ground in that neighborhood is just about the most expensive to be found in the world. The price is said to have approximated \$304 a square foot, the highest ever paid in this city.

Probably no other plot in the city affords a clearer story of how real estate values have appreciated in this city through the years. As it stands today, fronting ninety-six feet on the avenue and running back 105 feet, it is valued at \$4,000,000.

Along in 1825 it was all farm land. For many years thereafter the section witnessed little development. A picture made in the late 1840's shows a frame house, a few shanties or sheds, and open fields all around. Small patches were used for truck gardening, the produce being sold in the city.

In 1853 the whole corner now owned by the Harriman Bank, and probably additional ground to the south of it was sold for \$8,500.

In 1905 the corner was valued at \$2,000,000; so it will be seen that it has doubled in value in nineteen years. By 1909 it was estimated as worth \$2,900,000. These values are, of course exclusive of the buildings.

The "Delmonico corner" has shared the growth in value of the rest of the section. Above it, or from Forty-fifth to Forty-eighth streets, is what was a portion of a fifty-five acre tract which Thomas Buchanan bought from the city in 1803 for \$7,537. The same property probably could not be bought today for \$30,000,000.—*New York Evening Telegram.*

THERE is no occupation in which labor can engage which does not require the use of land.—HENRY GEORGE.

Peace With Injustice.

THE most amazing exhibition of humbug and hypocrisy of recent years has been the award by the Woodrow Wilson Foundation of a prize of \$25,000 to Lord Robert Cecil, for his "meritorious services tending to establish peace with justice." It is almost incredible that a jury of 100 more or less eminent persons should have made such a monstrous decision and still more amazing that on that jury was Miss Ida M. Tarbell, who professes to be a believer in the Single Tax. For this Cecil person was for many years one of the foremost of the British defenders of the monstrous wrong, the immemorial injustice of the great British landlords, whose estates were taken from the people by force or by fraud. This is the same Cecil who denounced the futile attempt of Lloyd George to impose a small tax on the enormous incomes derived by the British nobility from royalties on mineral lands, and rents paid by working farmers. An open and avowed champion of the fundamental injustice of the world, this man is now hailed as a worker for "peace with justice." A defender of landgrabbing on a wholesale scale by British peers, he has the effrontery to pretend to be opposed to landgrabbing by other nations, now that Britain has the largest share of the earth's surface. And Americans professing to favor peace endorse this precious humbug, this canting fraud, as an apostle of peace and goodwill!

It is no wonder that the pitiful puerile minds that pretend to be carrying out the high principles of Woodrow Wilson have made so little impression on American public sentiment. It is no wonder that the American people distrust and reject Lord Cecil's appeal to them to bring the United States into the League of Nations. Witness the British refusal to allow the League of Futilities to pass upon the Egyptian situation. What is Lord Cecil and his peace League doing to prevent Spain making war on the people of Morocco, who are bravely defending their own territory?

Cant, Humbug, Privilege for Aristocracy, Robbery of the poor by Landlordism, this is what Lord Robert Cecil stands for! And the United States votes him \$25,000!

Two Ways of Acquiring Wealth

SOCIALISM, communism, bolshevism, La Follettism and all such, are impossible and should cause us no concern because they go still further than we have now gone in depriving men of individual freedom. I predict that we have seen the high water mark of Socialism and that the future tendency will be to the end of the highest individualism—as Franz Oppenheimer puts it, in his great little book, "The State." we shall attain to a "Free-man's Citizenship."

When laborer, mechanic, or professional or business man gets from employer or customer, by slacking, by trickery, by misrepresentations or in any way, more than his economic wage for the service rendered, when a Carnegie or a Rockefeller grows rich by railroad rebates or any special privilege, when a man takes possession of and appropriates the natural resources of the earth, created by God for the use of all men equally (and natural resources include every foot of land and water on the earth's surface) all such men, though they act under the law, under the prevailing economic system, are robbers (we all do it) and a government that maintains a system that permits such things is aiding and abetting robbery. This is not extreme or inflammatory language but a plain statement of economic truth. As Dr. Oppenheimer says, there are two ways of acquiring wealth,—the economic way, and by robbery, and whatever is not acquired in the economic way is Robbery, by whatever name you may call it or however the law may look at it.—From an Address by G. F. Kelly, before the Rotary Club of Scottsdale, Pa.

Is Florida Headed for the Single Tax?

IT must have sent shivers down the spine of William J. Bryan, now for several years a resident of Florida, when the people of that commonwealth adopted by an overwhelming vote a constitutional amendment forbidding the taxation of incomes or inheritances. The majority was seven to one. Shades of the Spirit of '96!

So many fortunes have been made in Florida real estate that the amendment thus written into the organic law of the state is something more than a mere gesture. The people of Florida evidently believe in encouraging people to increase their incomes and fortunes. Few taxes are as inoffensive as income and inheritance taxes, and their vogue has greatly increased within the present generation.

Florida is in a rather exceptional situation. A great many people of more or less fortune spend a part of the year there and are in a position to adopt a legal residence within the state if there are sufficient inducements. If they do make it their legal residence some of them will be apt to become more closely identified with the state, so that there is a real opportunity for the state to strengthen the bonds with its colony from the north. Incidentally it robs death of some of its terrors for its own normal citizens.

The closing of these doors of revenue may direct the attention of the people of Florida to the peculiar character of a large part of the state's tabulated wealth. Much of the assessed valuation of the state is in the form of land "values," which are manifestly not real wealth but the capitalization of the right to exact a price for the use of a part of the surface of the earth. The entire land

values of the state might be written off and the assessment rolls would still show all the actual wealth in the state.

While the extraordinary increase in real estate values goes on, advertising the state as it does and inducing vast numbers of people to come there, it is not likely that the legislature will look favorably on the increased taxation of land values. Florida is not at the present moment a fertile field for the Single Tax. But it may well come about that the whole question of the taxation of land values will be taken up in Florida before many years have passed. The state presents a striking instance of a vast available source of revenue created by the community as a whole and by the bounty of nature. There are only one or two states without an inheritance tax. With this familiar source of revenue closed and with her extraordinary increase in land values in the true economic sense Florida may prove a pioneer state in scientific taxation.

A tax on industry retards industry and to that extent is self-destructive, but a tax on land values does not tend to destroy the value. It merely appropriates it to that extent to the state. A tax on buildings makes the erection of buildings less attractive in competition with other possible enterprises to which one contemplating building may turn. But if residential property along the sea coast commands a high value because it is swept by ocean breezes that value would be unimpaired by a tax on the land.

A land tax would discourage development by real estate promoters, and without such development much potential value would remain undiscovered. The ultimate value to a community of such development is a subject that has not been adequately surveyed. It is a pity that Henry George himself did not give it consideration. It presents practical angles on which there is much to be said on both sides.—*Commerce and Finance.*

New South Wales

THOSE interested in tax problems will find food for thought in the fact that in New South Wales, where all the councils now raise their ordinary revenues from a tax on land values, there is a strong agitation to get the water and sewerage rates levied on the same basis. According to *Melbourne Progress*, fifty-nine progress associations have also petitioned Parliament for such power to be given to the councils. Also in 1923 more than 130 petitions were presented to the New South Wales Parliament in favor of rating on land value only for water and sewerage. *Melbourne Progress* also states that, while opponents of rating on land values for municipal purposes never tire telling of councils which have adopted the new system going back to the old one, in reality, when examined, these tales are found to have no foundation.

Christian Science Monitor.

The Land Question In Mexico

WHEN Cortez first brought the flag to Spain to fly over the palace of Montezuma he found the original Mexican, the aborigine, the Indian, holding land in common. After the conquest the Spaniards continued this communal way of life by granting to the Indian villages an area of land right outside the town to be owned and worked in common. These communal holdings were called "ejidos."

The republic inherited this policy and continued it for one generation.

But when the republic had existed for one generation it realized that something was wrong, something was sick within its body politic. This republic so carefully made up from the best republican formula was not thriving—it was sick, very sick, and it made the same diagnosis then as it is making now—"land for the Indian"—not the Indian himself, be it remembered, but his economic status. It was felt that his community existence was the cause of his backwardness, and that once given the stimulus of responsibility and private ownership he would immediately acquire initiative, industry, enterprise, dependability, and whatever other qualities it was found were the crying needs of the moment for a citizenry of the republic.

So, in 1856—Mexico's independence dates from 1820—a law was passed (Mexico is not alone in seeking a cure-all in the passage of laws) providing for the distribution of the Indian community lands, the ejidos, among individual owners in small lots of the value of no more than from 200 pesos down.

* * * * *

Before the Madero revolution the famous holdings of General Luis Terrazas, given to him by President Diaz, composed over 5,000,000 acres. Another Mexican gentleman, Jose Escandon, owned a piece of land as big as the whole country of Costa Rica. Three companies in Lower California owned a single area bigger than Ireland. The entire State of Morelos, when Zapata went to "work" belonged to only thirty-two men.—Sophie Treadwell in *New York Herald-Tribune.*

PROSPERITY Riches Pour Into Metropolitan Realty—Fifth Avenue Leads With New High Prices for Land, is the heading of an article on the Real Estate Page of the *Sunday World*. New High Prices for Land are an evidence of prosperity to the few, but they are a tax on prosperity levied for the benefit of the few. Why is the obvious so hard to discern?

THAT part of the produce which goes to the owner of the land is rent, (net rent).—HENRY GEORGE.

Single Tax Not a Tax on Land

IT may be well to call attention to the fact that a tax on land values is not a tax on land. They are very different things, and the difference should be noted because a confusion of thought as to them may lead to the assumption that a tax on land values would fall on the user. A tax upon land—that is to say, a tax of so much per acre or so much per foot on all land—would fall on the user, barring such effect as it might have on speculation. For such a tax falling equally on all land—on the poorest and least advantageously situated as fully as on the richest and best situated land, would become a condition imposed on the use of any land, from which there could be no escape, and thus the owners of rentable land could add it to their rents. Its operation would be analogous to that of a tax on a producible commodity, and it would in effect reduce the supply of land that could be used, since no land could then be used that would not yield sufficient to pay the tax. But a tax on economic rent or land values would not fall on all land; it would fall only on valuable land, and on that in proportion to its value. Thus it would not have to be paid upon the poorest land in use (which always determines rent), and so would not become a condition of use, or restrict the amount of land that could be profitably used. And so the land owners on whom it fell could not shift it on the users of land. This distinction, as to nature and effects, between a tax on land and a tax on land values, it is necessary to bear in mind.

It is necessary to bear in mind that the value of land is something totally distinct from the value of improvements. It is a value which arises not from the exertion of any particular individual, but from the growth and progress of the community. A tax on land values, therefore, never lessens the reward of exertion or accumulation. It simply takes for the whole community that value which the whole community creates.

—HENRY GEORGE

Former Prime Minister MacDonald on Economic Rent

“NOW, it is from the land that we derive all the primary raw materials. It is the soil which the agriculturist needs, it contains the ores and the minerals of all our vast mining, quarrying, smelting trades; upon it must be built our factories, our warehouses, our houses; it is still, with the exception of the high seas, the foundation of our transport industry. If it were closed against us, every industry in the country would be paralysed and we should die. Upon this fact, income from land depends. ‘I can prevent you from working, from building, from mining, from living,’ says the landowner. ‘From the pro-

ceeds of our labor and our skill,’ reply the rest of the community, ‘we are willing to pay you to allow us to work, and build, and mine, and live.’ And so rent is paid and the land owner gets an income. It was Adam Smith who wrote: ‘Rent is not at all proportioned to what the landlord may have laid out upon the improvement of the land, or to what he can afford to take, but to what the farmer can afford to give.’ (*Wealth of Nations*, chap. xi.)

The differences in the quality of land and in its natural advantages determine where towns are to be, where different kinds of food are to be grown, where there are to be factories, where there are to be mines, where there are to be green fields, where there is to be a Black Country. This in turn determines that rents are to vary. But however much they vary, they are all of the same economic nature. They are the price paid to the landowner by the community—for it is really the community of consumers that pays and not the individual—to induce him to allow his land to be used at all.

“The owner of land is thus in the position of a man who holds the keys of life, and he consequently can exact a maximum toll as his price. He does so. Rent therefore tends to absorb every social improvement that can be turned into an advantage in the exchange market.

“The amount of rent is determined by the capacity of the community to buy, not by the value of the services rendered by the owners. It is a measure of monopoly. That a community which has improved its streets and educated its people should allow the possessors of its land to secure for themselves the financial counterparts of these benefits can have no justification either in reason or in morality, while from the point of view of economy it is waste.

Old Rome and Now

IN the seventeenth chapter of his history of Rome, Gibbon tells of the merciless taxation imposed by the emperors, and says: “The honorable merchant of Alexandria, who imported the gems and spices of India for the use of the western world; the usurer, who derived from the interest of money a silent and ignominious profit; the ingenious manufacturer, the diligent mechanic, and even the most obscure retailer of a sequestered village, were obliged to admit the officers of the revenue into the partnership of their gain; and the sovereign of the Roman empire, who tolerated the profession, consented to share the infamous salary of public prostitutes.”

It is doubtful, however, if the Roman taxes were meaner and more numerous than are our taxes today. Not long ago, in cities of the United States, and it still may be done in some, it was the annual custom to arrest all known female prostitutes and fine them heavily, not as a corrective measure, but merely to fill the public treasuries. The enforcement of prohibition is now coming to be used for the same

purpose. Small cities, villages, and townships near Cleveland have raised more than \$1,000,000 in a short time by arresting and fining bootleggers. Some of these municipalities have put up town halls and bought fire fighting apparatus with the proceeds of such administration of the law. The aim of public authorities seems not to be so much to enforce the law as it is to get money out of it. Dry law enforcement in many sections is degenerating into a mercenary business to replenish public tills and provide salaries for more justices of the peace and constables. The occupation tax is now boldly urged for school purposes, and the legislature of Ohio has recently passed a bill imposing a license fee of 50 cents on any one who casts a line and hook into the water to catch a fish.

—*Cleveland Press.*

Bold Words From The Bishop of Woolwich

ANOTHER form of property is land. This again is not a possession, but a trust. Those who use land for cultivation, for building, or for the production of things which are vital to the very life of the community are fulfilling a most valuable function and rendering true service.

But the possession of land for selfish aggrandisement is contrary to Christian ethics. We need to test certain practices which obtain today and ask whether they are consistent with the true ideals of Christian conduct. A person owns land; by causes for which he is not responsible the land increases in value, tenants by their industry develop trade and erect valuable buildings, leases run out and are renewed at largely increased rental. The landlord is at times enormously enriched by such increments which he himself has done nothing to earn, and for which he performs no corresponding function. Is this consistent with the teaching of our Lord and with Christian practice?

Similarly, mineral wealth is discovered under somebody's land. The owner may do nothing to develop it, but yet a certain sum is paid to him as royalty for every ton which is extracted by others from underneath his ground; or a certain wayleave is demanded for minerals drawn through his property.

The earth is the Lord's and He has stored within it all that mineral wealth for the use of the children of men. Those who toil in the mines should receive the fruit of their labors, but is it consonant with Christian practice that those who do not toil should be enriched at other's expense?—Rt. Rev. W. W. Hough, D.D., Bishop of Woolwich, at the Church Conference, Oxford, September 30, 1924.

WHILE each individual owner tries to get all he can get there is a limit to what he can get which constitutes the market price, which varies with different land and at different times.—HENRY GEORGE.

Greatest Problem In Medical Service Is Now Economic Not Medical

IT is so unusual to find an article in a medical journal evincing the faintest suspicion in the mind of its writer that there is such a factor in human affairs as economic law, much less that such law has any remotest connection with the problems the doctor must meet, that the remarks of the editor of *The American Physician*, anent the proposal of Dr. Remy for regulation of the small hospital, comes like a breath of mountain air across the stagnant fog of a swamp. If every doctor could be got to comprehend the truth of your statement that "*economics* is a more fundamental factor in human affairs than medicine," could be got to realize that a medical education no more equips him with economic judgment than a course in economics equips him with the skill of a physician, we would be well on the way toward an intelligent solution of such questions as that raised by Dr. Remy, as well as of a multitude of others that perplex us.

ABILITY TO PAY

This question, like every other relative to the securing of needed service by the people constituting society, resolves itself, finally into the very simple one of ability to pay for such service. No one need worry about the hospital facilities available to those who have the ability to pay for such; no one need worry about the hospital service available to any community whose constituent members have such ability. But just as nothing is gained by assuring the victim of carcinoma of the stomach that everything is all right, so nothing is gained by blinking the fact of economic inability; and the fact is that the average rural community cannot have "city" hospital facilities for the simple reason that it is not able to pay for this service.

But just here an incongruity presents itself to one who really attacks this problem with a determination to solve it; attacks it in the same spirit in which our medical scientist attacks the problem of physical disease. This medical scientist allows no preconceptions to carry any weight in determining the direction his investigations shall take; so soon as he can prove an hypothesis to be true, he frankly accepts it and allows that fact to determine what shall be his next point of attack. So soon as he can prove any belief false he discards it no matter what his former views have been, and he allows no traditions, no matter how sanctified by time, to divert him from the pursuit of truth, for he knows that truth is its own authority. The whole current of history of medicine is but an account of the activities of men who are exhausting the resources of science in the search for the cause of the various disorders to which they have devoted their talent.

When this has been isolated, to an attack upon the disease *through its cause* which they very well know is the only vulnerable point of attack.

But in what spirit do these selfsame men approach an economic problem? Is it too much to say that the moment any problem reaches the realm of economics the average doctor lapses from the high standards of science and espouses the psychology of the herd? Even when the employment of the very measures they themselves have shown to be vital to the control or eradication of the evil to which they have devoted their whole thought becomes a matter of economics, do they not too often appear content to see their whole program shelved from want of means to carry it into effect without even inquiring whether this obstacle is insurmountable, turning the matter over to the politicians as though it were no longer any concern of science?

And who are these politicians to whom we so complacently resign these economic problems? Real estate agents, petty lawyers, stock brokers, a sprinkling of farmers—men who have devoted their whole lives to a pursuit of the main chance; whose talent, if they have any talent, lies in the ability to manipulate a crowd of place seekers in a convention. Men who not only are destitute of scientific training, but unconscious of the inescapable authority of scientific method. And when we reach an economic impasse we calmly vacate and *implore such an "authority" to pass a law!*

INCREASED PRODUCTIVITY OF LABOR

In his Thirteenth Annual Report, the Commissioner of Labor of the United States tabulates twenty-five articles of general consumption, comparing the labor power absorbed in their production in 1895 with that in 1795. These articles were chosen as being fairly representative of the whole range of articles consumed by the American people. The item showing the smallest increment of advantage in production at the later date over that of the former is boots, of which 100 men could in a given time produce nine times as many pairs. The highest multiplication of effectiveness is given as 4098. The average of the twenty items was 321. That is, any given number of men could, in 1895, produce in a given time 321 times as much goods such as we all consume as could the same number in 1795. Now, submit this data to any scientist in the world with the request that he plot the price curve of these articles—illustrate the range of prices that would necessarily result from this increased power of labor in the production of these articles (by price, of course, is meant the quality of goods of one kind necessary to secure a given quality of other kinds, not money prices). Would he not confidently submit a curve that dropped steadily with progressive acceleration? What has actually happened would be represented by an irregular line indicating an average steady advance in prices.

Remember that producers of all kinds of goods had during the century in question, had their productive power multiplied 321 times, but in spite of this, by the testimony of a reliable Government Bureau, an individual armed with this vastly augmented power, who was pouring into the general fund of wealth his contribution in the form, let us say, of clothing, was unable to secure from that fund as great a quantity of goods as could produce only 1/321 the quantity of clothing. This disparity between potential and actual results being all the more inexplicable from the fact that each workman producing any particular form of goods he desired had had his power multiplied in a like ratio. And if we should desire to bring this illustration down to date, does anyone doubt that the past twenty-nine years have worked an augmentation of labor power at least equaling in rate that of the previous 100 years?

Now my contention is just this: if any such incongruity could be demonstrated as between results scientifically predicable from those actually attending the employment of some improved technique in the domain say, of surgery; if coincident with the inauguration and perfection of antiseptics in surgery, of sanitation as affecting typhoid fever, of antitoxin in the treatment of diphtheria, not only had not the death rate been vastly lowered in those fields of our science but had it actually slightly risen as compared with the pre-sanitary epoch in practice, there is not a doctor in the world who would supinely assent to the inevitability of such miscarriage of effort. Every man worthy the designation *physician* would be chafing at so patent a reversal of results rationally to be expected from the employment of these measures. Not only so; the leaders of our profession at least, would be devoting their whole talent to the solution of this paradox. But we are practicing medicine amongst people who have had their powers of production multiplied in such a degree that their present labor power would have seemed nothing short of miraculous to their ancestors of 100 years ago and despite this fact finding them unable to take full advantage of the sanitary measures medical science has made possible, *because of the inability* to secure the margin of goods over the necessities of life necessary to provide sewage, hospitalization, etc. And we seem to detect no incongruity in this situation. A considerable per cent. of the clientele of the average doctor can pay their bills only by the exercise of a severe degree of self-denial. I am practicing in one of the richest agricultural districts in Iowa, yet I was told a few days ago, by an agent for a collecting agency, that a physician in the county seat of an adjoining county had just recently turned into this agency 900 accounts for collection.

We are in daily contact with problems that can be solved by one of two methods; either by a more general diffusion of wealth or by state charity. And we see no incongruity in the fact of a people equipped with a power of produc-

tion incomprehensible to men of a short century ago faced with such a problem.

Surely men with scientific training cannot much longer ignore so patent, so absurd a miscarriage of purpose as this. Surely in this most fundamental factor of the life of every man, the economic relationship of men, a discrepancy so patent, so universal between the potential status of men armed with the wonder working improvements of the past century-and-a-half and that actually achieved will attract the attention of every mind entitled to the designation *scientific*. For this disparity is no less glaring than would be that of a physician of today making a drive of ten miles in his 1924 model car and uniformly consuming more time in doing so than was required by a yokel of 1750 in dragging a grist of wheat the same distance with a yoke of oxen.—Dr. T. J. Kelly in *The American Physician*.

A Prayer for Landlords

IT is not generally known that at one time there was a special prayer for landlords. It was in the Liturgy of Edward VI., and dealt with the equitable disposition of land within the country. A prayer of a similar nature is needed at the present time to direct the attention of the public to the injustice of land monopoly. We reproduce for the information of our readers the prayer, which reads as follows:—

The earth is Thine (O Lord), and all that is contained therein; notwithstanding Thou hast given the possession thereof unto the children of men, to pass over the time of their short pilgrimage in this vale of misery; we heartily pray Thee to send Thy Holy Spirit into the hearts of them that possess the grounds, pastures, and dwelling places of the earth, that they, remembering themselves to be Thy tenants, may not rack and stretch out the rents of their houses and lands, nor yet take unreasonable fines and incomes after the manner of covetous worldlings, but so let them out to other, that the inhabitants thereof may both be able to pay the rents, and also honestly to live, to nourish their families, and to relieve the poor: give them grace also to consider, that they are but strangers, and pilgrims in this world, having here no dwelling-place, but seeking one to come; that they, remembering the short continuance of their life, may be content with that that is sufficient, and not join house to house, nor couple land to land, to the impoverishment of others, but so behave themselves in letting out their tenements, lands, and pastures, that after this life they may be received into everlasting dwelling-places: through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

This prayer, which has marginal references to the various portions of Scripture quoted in it, is one of "Sundry Godly Prayers for Divers Purposes" given in "A Prymmer or boke of private prayer needfull to be used of al faythfull Christianes, which boke is auctorysed and set fourth by the Kings Majestie, to be taughte, learned,

redde, and used of al hys lovyng subjectes." It was published in London in 1553, and the above is taken from the reprint of it, referred to by Sir John Benn, at p. 458 of a volume of Liturgies, etc., of Edward VI., published by the Parker Society at Cambridge in 1843. The copy of the original "Prymmer" from which the reprint was made is in the Bodleian Library, Oxford.

Notice To Our Readers

A PLAN of intensive circularization will be started early in the coming year to secure new readers for LAND AND FREEDOM. We want lists of names sympathetic to our movement. Let every reader of the paper get busy and send us in names. This request is addressed to every one who may know of persons in his locality who are likely to take an interest in the presentation of the Georgian philosophy, and the news of progress. What we want are names, names, names of promising persons up to a hundred thousand. We want to hear from every subscriber.

How To Meet The Cost Of Roads

I OWN a farm fifteen miles from my downtown desk. I paid \$600 an acre for it. If I couldn't reach it by automobile over good roads I wouldn't have paid \$250 an acre for it; nor would anyone else.

If I had to travel even the last two miles over an unimproved road the value would be discounted at least \$100 an acre.

Land rises in value in proportion to its accessibility. The combination of automobiles and good roads has put more money into the pockets of owners of farm land near cities than all the crops they ever raised.

Good roads have also added a large percentage to the value of the crops grown by all farmers, due to the decreased cost of moving the crops to market.

A fleet of motor busses runs from the city limits to within a couple of miles of my farm. I hear people say that the owners of these busses should pay for the upkeep of the road. I don't see the reason. Every foot of land along the road on which these busses run, and for two miles back on each side, is worth at least \$50 an acre more because of the transportation service which is provided. The owners of this land can well afford to pay for the upkeep of the roads, and they should.

The right place to put the cost of public roads is in the price of the land. When you buy the land you'll find the cost of building the road is in the price, with a nice profit added. The charge will be there whether the landowner was taxed for the road or not.

—From a pamphlet printed by the Lawrence Paper Manufacturing Co., Lawrence, Kansas.

BOOK REVIEWS

A GREAT SINGLE TAX NOVEL*

Some years ago in the columns of this paper Lewis H. Berens, joint author with Mr. Singer of the "Story of My Dictatorship," reviewed appreciatively, even enthusiastically, the novels of M. P. Shiel. Alfred A. Knopf, of this city, now republishes one of these, the *Lord of the Sea*, and in a letter introducing it to the reviewers of the country, says:

"The startling simplicity and effectiveness of the Single Tax program, when allowed to function without hindrance, was never more remarkably demonstrated than in a recently published novel. Most sensible people have known all along that novelists and poets were far better economists than the gentlemen in colleges who practise the profession. M. P. Shiel's work in *THE LORD OF THE SEA* is a case in point."

There is an introduction by Carl VanVechten, and he tells us that in the copy sent him by Mr. Shiel the latter has written: "To my mind there are three supreme wits, all scientists—Galileo, Spencer and Henry George, George lacking the exact training of the others, but probably born the most penetrating of men: seeing which I have always felt it my business to discover some new demonstration of his demonstrated theorem: this being one such attempt." And Mr. VanVechten adds: "Progress and Poverty then is the father of the Lord of the Sea."

Mr. Shiel, after being long neglected, is now coming into his own. Such critics as Hugh Walpole and Arthur Machen have written his praises. H. G. Wells has dubbed one of his novels, not this one, "a colossal achievement." And the present reviewer believes that he will widen his circle of readers very rapidly now that he is introduced to the American public.

It is by far and away the most powerful novel called forth by the inspiration derived from the movement set in motion by Henry George. It is full of thrills. I shall let the publisher describe it in the circular letter previously quoted from:

"Young Richard Hogarth, through a series of strange but not outlandish adventures becomes the Lord of the Sea. This he accomplishes by building great steel "islands," or floating fortresses powerfully armed, and placing them at strategic points on the world's trade routes. He is thus in a position to levy a "sea tax" on all passing ships. A naval struggle follows in which the great forts turn back the fleets of the world. Once he has been able to dominate the nations, he sends out a manifesto pointing out the folly of men in taxing one another so wildly and haphazardly and stating that "Nature cannot be owned, only wealth. The taking of anything from Nature makes that thing wealth; and planets are presented to their inhabitants, who, by taking things from them, i.e., by moving something, change Nature into wealth, and own things."

It may be worth while to call this novel to the attention of William C. deMille. It would make a great "movie", similar to *The Sea Hawk*, one of the latest successes. Besides it could be made to teach our doctrine and thus to reach multitudes with our message.—J. D. M.

**The Lord of the Sea*, by M. P. Shiel 12 mo., clo., 229 pp. Price \$2.50 net. Alfred A. Knopf, New York City.

"THE ECONOMICS OF FREEDOM"

Once more there has come out of San Francisco a work on economics which is likely to be the cause of much cogitation, though of an entirely different kind from that which was provoked by "Progress and Poverty." Here we have the scientist, rather than the humanitarian. The author sets himself to offer a remedy for social evils by proffering a solution of the land problem and the currency problem, and out of much verbiage we extract the fact that he desires to regulate land holding by just taxation, and establish a currency which would make "land-area, gaged in terms of population-density, the basis of certified value or currency."

The author evidently dreads identification with the "Single Tax;" so much so that he deems it incumbent on himself to break a lance with some of Henry George's fundamental propositions. At this point it might be well to quote a paragraph from his chapter, entitled, "Single Tax and Other Epithets."

"It was undoubtedly with a perception of our desire for simplification, and moved by the aggregate miseries of mankind, that Henry George stepped boldly into the field and endeavored to reduce to final simplicity all our difficulties and all our remedies. The response to his teaching has been so eager that it seems almost ungrateful to question whether the cost, in terms of ultimate advantage, is not too great to pay for sheer simplicity. It would be callous indeed to ignore the earnestness of his effort. "Progress and Poverty" should be read, with the utmost sympathy, by every student of the economic situation."

Strangely enough the principle which he attacks is the statement "that men seek to gratify their desires with the least exertion." He seems to find this in conflict with another passage from "Progress and Poverty," which reads "Short-sighted is the philosophy which counts on selfishness as the master motive of human action." Here we see the strict application of a principle, early set down, wherein Mr. Atkins criticizes a passage in Professor Ely's book, "Outlines of Economics," by saying "it may seem a little unkind to mention it, but there can be nothing either ethical or politic about a science."

To him the "Single Taxers" are romantic economists. He finds fault with their terminology; but shows a certain charity towards them because of the fact that usually they had not the advantage of an engineering training.

There is a measure of truth in the implication which runs through the book that most of the writers on economics have not been scientific in the meaning which Mr. Atkins attaches to the word.

Whether we agree with it or not, the book will well repay a most careful reading. That the author is a man with a sense of humour and a faculty for satire and irony crops out continuously throughout the book. It is rare that a work holding out to be strictly scientific creates the impression of the reader that the author might be a desirable person to know, but that is the outcome of such a cursory reading as this reviewer has been able to give it.

In spite of the fact that he disagrees with Henry George upon important points, if "Progress and Poverty" had not been written "The Economics of Freedom" would hardly have appeared. When he says in his conclusion.

"Our vaunted democracy is no more than the raising of the standard of Freedom over a region of economic disorder. The exterior manipulation and the gross interior maladjustment from which we suffer are both largely unrealized, and consequently all the more difficult to deal with."

and when he says,

"Leaving detail for the sake of a larger view, the change in our basis of measurement, from gold to census-area, would eliminate a very dangerously contracted passageway in our arteries of flow. This passageway is permitted to remain contracted because we blindly support a chaotic device for arbitrary measurement which has no better justification than a tradition of autocratic bad faith. Our economic logic is distorted by an ancient injury."

he states what many of us believe.

There is the material for a great book in "The Economics of Freedom." Perhaps Mr. Atkins is too scientific to write it, because the public is too lazy to make the continuous effort necessary to digest his theories or understand the argument which he makes. Nevertheless, we hail the book with pleasure as a substantial contribution to the discussion of the most important problem that confronts humanity.—J. J. M.

Duffield & Company, New York City.!

A NEW PAMPHLET BY JOHN HARRINGTON

We have received from Mr. John Harrington, of the State Tax Commission at Madison, Wisconsin, a pamphlet entitled "The Single Tax for Wisconsin." We quote the opening paragraphs as an example of the style of the work:

"It is probable that no one understands the real philosophy of the Single Tax until he sees clearly the soundness and truth of a single economic proposition, as follows:

The land owner makes no return to society in goods or services or otherwise for the net ground rent which he receives as compensation for the use of land, but is a parasite upon society to the extent of the value of such net ground rent.

It is possible that this proposition can be stated better, more clearly, or more simply. To some it may seem more simple to say: The land owner is a burden or pensioner upon society to the extent of the net-ground rent which he receives.

The proposition may be stated in numerous other ways. But the formula of words is less important than the truth of the proposition which they seek to express."

Mr. Harrington points out the inadequacy of the name Single Tax and concludes his valuable pamphlet as follows:

"And he who once sees that ground rent is tribute exploited from the earnings of the people for which no return is made by those who take it, can never again look on poverty nor suffering with the same eyes."

CORRESPONDENCE

A PLEASANT COMMENDATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I always find your magazine most interesting and able, but I am perfectly delighted with your synopsis of the progress which the Single Tax theory has made in your July-August number. The questions that it answers are often put to me, and I have to dodge by murmuring incoherent nothings about what Pittsburg tried, or Australia and New Zealand, or certain German cities did before the war, etc. But never before have I found in succinct form this information, which is of such immense value, because most people are like the man from Missouri.

New York City.

EMILY E. F. SKEEL.

EXPLAINING THE INERTIA

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In a recent issue of LAND AND FREEDOM, Whidden Graham asks: "Why is it that the sound and self-evident proposition (land value taxation) makes such slow progress toward general acceptance?"

I am sure that I can explain this inertia in part. I was born in a slum district of Chicago and ran a saloon for 25 years. Ninety-five per cent. of my customers were wage earners. Whenever the chance offered I would talk Single Tax. After explaining it as best I could, nine out of ten would conclude that it was a favor to the rich. The more intelligent would ask me this question: "Why, John, you would exempt the Marshall Field estate from taxes on their five million dollar building and five million dollar stock." When I said that Single Tax would do that, they would tell me that they did not think that was right. That it was granting to the well-to-do an opportunity to keep money in their pockets that should go into the public treasury.

Some of the men I argued with were intelligent enough to hold positions of prominence in their labor organizations. It was not a venal reason that made them differ with me, but an honest and sincere one. I therefore came to the conclusion long ago that while the wisdom of the Single Tax is self-evident, as Whidden Graham declares it to be, it is beyond the comprehension of many sincere and altruistic men whose votes are in a tremendous majority. My conclusion was that this intelligence was like the latent power of a fast horse, that it needed to be trained and moved along until it could reach the ulti-

mate goal. For a long time I have confined my arguments to the plea for the exemption of savings accounts, workers' tools, personal property in workers homes, etc., to the value of \$5,000.

With those to whom I have made this plea I have been one hundred per cent. successful. It is an entering wedge upon which the real foundation may later be built. Let some of your members make a test among groups of workmen in large cities and they can easily verify the truth of my statements. In order to attain his ends the grafter resorts to the lowest and most shameful and cunning strategy. Who will deny to the altruistic doctrinaire the privilege of an honorable diplomacy to attain a just end?

Chicago, Ill.

JOHN W. MASKELL.

FROM A WALLACE SUPPORTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I am one of those who voted for Mr. Wallace at the last election and am proud of it. Have been a Single Taxer since 1889. Have read all arguments against Single Tax that I could get hold of with an unprejudiced mind and could find no argument that could break down our contentions. I cannot understand why honest business men do not favor it more than they do. I am only a leather splitter working in a tannery.

Yours for the Single Tax.

Newark, N. J.

S. S. SCHNEIDER.

FROM A REAL FIGHTER

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Well, the campaign is over and the *Arizona Single Taxer* is out again after a Summer rest—1000 copies mailed over this County. The best I can do—tied up here with a bunch of milch cows, picture show, small ranch and water route supply the camp with drinking water.

When nearly 75% of the necessary signers required to put the party name on the ballot had been obtained, I found the party deserted by co-workers when too late to repair the damage, but got the party name on the County ballot and my candidacy beat the democratic candidate for State Senator. Beaten? of course I was, but for the first time politicians took notice of it, made a hot fight on my candidacy and cut down my vote of two years ago, but the cause gained enormously, for it ended in a newspaper controversy which was worth even more than the Commonwealth Party name on 10,000 ballots and hundreds of sample ballots, and that is going some.

Until the Commonwealth Party organizations, we had been mendicants and time-servers in other parties and deserve the contempt which, at times, was ill-concealed. Time-service in the big parties got us nowhere. We were contemptuously given berths in the hay mow and then cussed for carrying Single Tax matches if the barn accidentally and often through their own folly caught fire. We got nowhere except that an occasional Single Taxer was elected to office and promptly shut up on fundamental questions. Newspapers said: "Oh, that is the Single Tax, nobody cares about that now" and times without number, people asked me: "What's become of the Single Tax, I never hear about it any more?" That is over in Yavapai County and it would have been over in the State of Arizona if Single Taxers were not afraid of belonging to the "contemptibles." And those who followed the Socialist-controlled La Follettes tell us that a Single Tax party will only go to show the contemptible few in number in the U. S. This certainly does not come in good grace from them for they help materially to bring about this condition themselves.

There is something greater than numbers. It is the posture and address of those representing a cause, that unexplainable something in a man or cause that earns respect even when defeated, the fighting edge that calls on every last ounce of reserve force, that refuses to count the cost. Single Tax will never win without heroism, for not one out of twenty will ever understand it, but even those who will not understand will cheer the fighter. The prize ring demonstrates it every day, and that is the cost of keeping the people awake to the Single Tax.

It cost me just \$3.45 to get the party designation on the 10,000 ballots. My own time and work, of course, must be added, but that only took spare time, and did not take me a moment from my ranch business and the *Arizona Single Taxer* was eagerly read where otherwise it would remain often unnoticed and thrown into a waste basket.

Well, I guess we are all ready for the next "scrap" and I am not going to "pull my blows" hereafter for fear of offending Rotarians, Kiwanians and Chamber of Commerce, or disgracing those who help to keep respectable.

Camp Verde, Arizona.

N. A. Vyne.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

THE need of much further education in our principles is emphasized by the defeat of a resolution for Single Tax presented to the New Jersey State Grange, at Atlantic City, on December 4.

THERE are many Single Taxers of the East who will recall Rev. John G. Hallimond, Superintendent of the Bowery Mission of this city for twenty-five years. He was a believer in our doctrines and was, we believe, a convert of James R. Brown. On our principles he spoke with magnificent fervor and understanding. It was through Dr. Hallimond that Mr. Brown was able to make many an effective talk to the "down and outs" who sought refuge at the Mission under the kindly helpfulness of Dr. Hallimond.

Dr. Hallimond's passing was hastened by grief at the death of his son who enlisted with the Canadian forces at the opening of the World War and was lost with one of the regiments almost annihilated at Ypres. Despite the machinery set in motion by President Wilson in German hospitals and prison camps, no hint of the fate of young Hallimond was ever received. In Dr. Hallimond's death there passed one who chose the better part and whose love for his fellowmen was expressed in a life-long devotion to the poor and unfortunate.

REV. JOHN F. SCOTT writes us: "Shall I say that I was sorry to learn from current issue of LAND AND FREEDOM that Billy McCabe has passed over? As far as the silencing of his physical voice, and the loss from among us of his splendid personality are concerned, we who have known him do feel that we and the good cause are going to miss him much. But I should be sorry indeed were I forbidden to trust that wherever he is now, the Master has use for his big and generous manhood."

ON September 30, the wife of our old friend Billy Radcliffe passed away. She had been ill for a long time, during which time Billy had devoted himself assiduously to her every want. They were a happy couple, always great pals. The sympathy of his many friends will go out to him in his loneliness.

AN admirable article entitled Property vs. Privilege from the pen of J. B. McGauran, appears in the *Denver Labor Bulletin* of Saturday, November 8.

THE Minnesota Historical Society at St. Paul wants back volumes of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW. Will some of our friends who have copies and may wish to dispose of them get into communication with Mr. Jacob Hadnefield, head of the Accession Department of the Society.

ADAM LEHR who died in Cleveland on November 30 was one of the oldest and best known artists in that city. Former Congressman William Gordon delivered the address at the funeral. He instructed his sons that his tombstone be marked with the simple inscription: "Adam Lehr, Single Taxer." He was seventy-one years old.

THE University of California at Berkeley is in need of all numbers of LAND AND FREEDOM (formerly the SINGLE TAX REVIEW) since vol. 22, No. 6. Perhaps some of our readers having copies will communicate with the librarian of the University.

HON. GEORGE FOWLDS calls attention to an error of ours in the article "Has Single Tax Made Progress?" in which we called Sir George Grey—not Gray—the first governor of New Zealand. He was not the first governor—Captain Hobson was.

DR. C. VILLABOS DOMINQUEZ, of Buenos Aires, General Secretary of the Georgist Liberal Party there, writes: "We are delighted to know that we are not the only political Georgist party, since two already exist, the British Commonwealth Land Party and your own."

STATEMENT of the Ownership, Management, Circulation, etc, required by the Act of Congress of August 24, 1912, of LAND AND FREEDOM published Bi-Monthly at New York, N. Y., for October, 1924. State of New York, County of New York, ss.:

Before me, a notary in and for the State and county aforesaid, personally appeared Joseph Dana Miller, who, having been duly sworn according to law, deposes and says that he is the Editor of LAND AND FREEDOM and that the following is, to the best of his knowledge and belief, a true statement of the ownership, management, etc., of the aforesaid publication for the date shown in the above caption, required by the Act of August 24, 1912, embodied in Section 443, Postal Laws and Regulations, to wit:

1. That the names and addresses of the publisher, editor and managing editor and business managers are:

Publisher: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau St., New York City.

Managing Editor: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

Business Manager: Joseph Dana Miller, 150 Nassau Street, New York City.

2. That the owners are: Single Tax Publishing Co., Inc., William J. Wallace, Pres.; Oscar H. Geiger, Treas., 150 Nassau Street, New York City. None but Joseph Dana Miller own one per cent. or more of stock.

3. That the known bondholders, mortgagees, and other security holders owning or holding 1 per cent. or more of total amount of bonds, mortgages, or other securities are: none.

4. That the two paragraphs next above, giving the names of the owners, stockholders, and security holders, if any, contain not only the list of stockholders and security holders as they appear upon the books of the company but also, in cases where the stockholders or security holder appears upon the books of the company as trustee or in any other fiduciary relation, the name of the person or corporation for whom such trustee is acting, is given; also that the said two paragraphs contain statements embracing affiant's full knowledge and belief as to the circumstances and conditions under which stockholders and security holders who do not appear upon the books of the company as trustees, hold stock and securities in a capacity other than that of a bona fide owner; and this affiant has no reason to believe that any other person, association, or corporation has any interest direct or indirect in the said stock, bonds, or other securities than as so stated by him.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER,

Editor.

Sworn to and subscribed before me this 25th day of September, 1924.

[Seal]

LOUIS D. SCHWARTZ, Notary Public.
New York County