

we may come to it. We may yet see a new army of government employees—whom we shall have to pay out of our taxes, of course—snooping around, making notes of every aerial they see. We may have them ringing the doorbell and showing their official authority for inspecting the house to discover any hidden radio set where there is no outdoor aerial to tell the tale. And then, when they find Johnny's oatmeal boxes wound with some wire, and a homemade loop, tucked away in some corner, won't it be worth the tax hound's salary to confiscate it because Johnny didn't declare it for taxation?

Of course nobody thinks this is possible. But we have seen so many "impossible" things come about in recent years that we are getting nervous. Nobody thought prohibition would work out the way it's been doing, and nobody suspected that the income tax would ever become the burden it is—we all thought the latter was a splendid idea when it was first discussed, you know. It was intended to "soak the rich," as most of our other taxes were supposed to do. But the taxes are much like rain which falls alike on the just and the unjust—the trouble being that a few have good umbrellas to fend off the worst of it while the majority get soaked as they trudge along.

THE Woman's Committee for Political Action, with headquarters at Washington, among whom we note the names of Carrie Chapman Catt, Zona Gale and Julia Marlowe Sothern, have issued a Statement of Principles. This advocates in declaration number I, "Public control and conservation of natural resources, secured by taxation on all land values." Number V. reads: "Government revenue to be raised, not by tariffs but by (a) taxes on large incomes and inheritances; and (b) on land values; and (c) profits on government banking; (d) savings from reduction of armaments."

Miss Grace Isabel Colbron has called the attention of the Woman's Committee to the incongruity of these declarations, pointing out that a tax on land values would meet all the legitimate expenses of government if the cost of armaments be omitted. The Woman's Committee may plead political opportunism for these conflicting demands, but it is to be regretted that they think it necessary to make this concession to prevailing error. The thanks of Single Taxers are due to Miss Colbron for pointing out to these ladies, to whom she is well and favorably known for her dramatic and literary criticism, that their programme leaves a good deal to be desired.

THE *Dearborn Independent* (Henry Ford's paper), of March 22nd, published a full page article by the editor of LAND AND FREEDOM, under the title, "Has the Single Tax Theory Made Progress?" At the request of the editor of the *Independent* this was confined to a record of achievement, which is usually more convincing than purely academic argument.

Mr. Harry H. Willock, of Pittsburgh, has generously undertaken to reprint this article in neat pamphlet form for wide distribution. The first edition will be twenty-five thousand copies. Mr. Willock has placed them at the disposal of

the Single Tax Publishing Company, and they will be sent free to those who can distribute them effectively and will send the necessary postage with their requests for copies.

We are sure that all Single Taxers will join with us in our acknowledgement to Mr. Willock for this handsome contribution to the movement.

## Professor Laughlin Muddles the Issue

THE argument made by socialists against "capitalism" are only a little less defective than the arguments made by the defenders of "capitalism" against socialism. In a recent number of the *Yale Review* Professor J. Laurence Laughlin, in an article entitled "The Logic of Capitalism," assumes that the socialists abandon their case in that while they inveigh against capitalism they contend for state control of capital. By a curious inversion of logic the Professor assumes that this at once disposes of the arguments of our socialist friends.

It is sometimes not very clear what socialists mean by "capitalism." As we understand it, however, it is the private control of capital. That is at least understandable. If Professor Laughlin had confined himself to showing why private control of capital is preferable to public control, instead of endeavoring to prove that socialists are guilty of inconsistency, he might have made a better job of it. Defenders of socialism are guilty of no such absurdity as the Professor implies.

The Professor's article is worthless as an indictment. It is equally worthless as clearing up a misunderstanding. Private control of capital is defensible enough, but such private control works differently under different conditions. Of this the Professor evinces no apprehension.

The inherent fallacy of all such discussions pro and con regarding capital is that it goes on with an important factor left out. Capital can produce nothing without land. In all production there is an ill-assorted partnership consisting of laborer, capitalist and landowner. If Professor Laughlin has ever heard of the last named he does not mention him. If he has ever heard of land in connection with production he does not tell us.

## Tax Jugglers

"And be these juggling fiends no more believed  
That palter with us in a double sense:

That keep the word of promise to our ear,

And break it to our hope." —MACBETH

THERE is a sacred right to property—sacred because ordained by the laws of nature, that is to say, by the law of God, and necessary to social order and civilization. That is the right of property in things produced by labor; it rests on the right of a man to himself.

—HENRY GEORGE.