Permit me to thank you for taking the trouble to return the article which I sent you about Mr. Louis F. Post explaining the difference between a single taxer and a Socialist. I'm glad that you recognize the fact that there's plenty of room in this town for "Several times the number of people that now live within the confines of the city." Of course I do not know how interesting it would be to some people to have "All the folks from Avenue A move up to Central Park West." But I'm positive it wouldn't be horrible. The fresh air might kill some of 'em off in short order. But the children would no doubt get used to it in time, especially after they'd lived in that neighborhood long enough to get blue blooded. As for reimbursing the landlords for any losses they might sustain by the adoption of the single tax I can only respectfully refer you to a much abler writer than myself, (Mr. Henry George in "Progress and Poverty"), who covers that point exhaustively. A letter to the *Times* must necessarily be brief and many things that should be covered must be left unsaid.

Thanking you once more for your courtesy in returning my letter, especially as I never enclose stamps. I remain,

Respectfully yours,
DAN CAVANAGH.

SINGLE TAXERS HONOR JEFFERSON.

The anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson was celebrated at a dinner given by the Manhattan Single Tax Club at the Hotel Vendome on the evening of April 13th. About 100 members of the club attended the dinner. Speeches were made by Congressman Robert Baker of Brooklyn, Judge Samuel Seabury, Dan Beard, Henry George, Jr., and C. E. S. Wood of Portland, Oregon. Miss Grace Isabel Colbron read a poem on Jefferson, written by Joseph Dana Miller, which appears in another page of the REVIEW.

(Expressly for the REVIEW.)

SERIAL ECONOMICS, NO. 4.

By James Love, Author of Jap. Notions of Pol. Econ.

The first step towards truth is in recognizing error.—SPINOZA.

I have prepared this additional paper, "By request;" though not without fear, for repetitions are so apt to tire that it is rarely prudent to respond to an encore. Besides the game is hardly worth the powder. For except economists, mainly unfledged, no one seems to write for these economic quarterlies, and except the same men and a few undergraduate parrots no one ever opens them. So that they might well be associated with the Constitution of the United States as the school boy defined it, "That part of the book at the end which nobody reads." In the Philadelphia free library I find them always in place. (Leaves cut to be sure but the librarians do that), while the other magazines are in constant use. Yet they make a brave show—heavy calendared paper, large type, wide margins; conducted under the supervision of economic committees of Yale or Columbia, or Chicago;—storage batteries of wisdom from which prudent people keep aloof. However students, (or rather memorizers) who seldom read anything they do not have to, soon find that often there is more to be gained in learning error than truth, and that by dipping into these cabalistic papers and affecting to comprehend them, they not only win golden opinions from teachers, but ever seeking not knowledge, but diplomas, they thus smooth the ways. Resembling in this respect the hygienic feeding of an elder brother of mine, who eating nothing except as the faculty commend it, takes bacon at breakfast not that it is nutritious or that he likes it, but because he has been assured that "It serves to lubricate the passages."

True political economy "Is the simplest of the sciences. It is but the intellectual recognition, as related to social life, of laws which in their moral aspect men instinctively recognize and which are embodied in the simple teachings of Him whom the common people heard gladly." Other sciences may be left to specialists. But political economy, dealing with the "Distribution" of wealth, is the one science of which every one easily could and should be a master. Yet as if society had turned over to them all of its "Trained intelligence and moral worth" (Ely's words), these professional assignees of a discredited "Economics" take possession of the whole field of controversy, leaving the rest of us in the plight of my old friend Deufel, who unable to collect from a bankrupt, explained to me in grief that "Assignee take all! Don't leave other folks *some*." These gentlemen do not study, they read, they memorize, they fill themselves full of other men's ideas and produce none of their own. "Much reading," says Schopenhauer, "Deprives the mind of all elasticity. * * The mind that is overloaded with alien thought is deprived of all clear insight, and so well nigh disorganized." And the Philosopher of Archy Road in the same vein, writes: "Readin' is th' nex' thing this side of goin' to bed f'r restin' th' mind. * * Believe me, Hinnessy, readin' is not thinkin'. It seems like it, an' whin it comes out in talk it sounds like it—to thim as doesn't think."

Now in the Journal of Political Economy for December, 1902, I find a review of the last book of Prof. Seligman of Columbia, a gentleman who has been admiringly called "The Economic Cormorant," and who has read himself into a state of intellectual disintegration. The same man who, a few years ago, insisted that when one loses a cow he not only loses the value of the cow but also all the milk and calves it might have yielded in an indefinite future, adding "What I complain of is the ignorance of your Single Tax men in the Science of Finance. * * If you desire to study it a little more in detail, permit me to refer you to a few works on the Science of Finance, such as Schaffle, Grundsätze der Stenerpolitik, pp. 176-190; or Rau, Finanzwissenschaft, Vol. ii., pp. 22-27; or Pantaleoni, Translazione del Tributi, pp. 168-183. Here as in countless other works, you will find the theory plainly set forth." The new book is The Economic Interpretation of History, reviewed by T. N. Carver of Harvard, who commences: "It is a favorable sign that economists are showing a tendency *in recent years to take the broad view or* to consider the bearing of economic *facts and* principles upon the broader questions of human progress *and social development.*" In this the italicized words might well be omitted as useless, the closing words "Social development" being a mere paraphrase of "Human progress." Besides, which are the broader—economic *laws* (natural laws) or political and social institutions resting upon them? He quotes Seligman thus, "To economic causes therefore must be traced in the first instance these transformations in the structure of society, which themselves condition the relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life." This reads smoothly and seems to have a meaning. But when *thought* about, has it? "Economic causes" is a common but ambiguous term. Webster defines economic as "Relating to the means of living or the resources and wealth of a country." Condition, Seligman uses for *govern* or *cause.* While "The relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life" is a mere wordy paraphrase of "structure of society." These give the passage a learned effect, but being corrected we find that Seligman really says: "To causes relating to the means of living or to the resources of the country must be traced these changes in the structure of society which themselves cause the structure of society." Says Carver: "If, however, one begins reading upon the subject, he would soon find (the economic way of saying, "One soon finds however") that the economic interpretation of History means the dogma," etc. "It is to the discussion of this dogma that Prof. Seligman has turned his brilliant pen." In this way these men pat each other on the back. Than Prof. S. no more tiresome and wordy writer exists. That his tongue ever runs before his wit is to be seen in "Japanese Notions," where a passage of 180 words from his "Finance" is easily reduced to 49, 131 redundant words in a passage of 180! What such men have in mind, says Schopenhauer, is trivial. But they spin it out in prolix incomprehensibility so that it may look learned and deep. Carver writes that "The necessities of economic life" and "The necessities of economic existence" forbid the socialistic system. May be, but what is gained by putting "economic" before life and existance? And while Seligman (condensing his verbosity) in referring to Das Kapital, says of Marx, that with the exception of Ricardo there has never been in economics a more powerful and original intellect. Carver affirms that Marx' Das Kapital must be classed among "crank literature." So it goes, nothing that outsiders may say of them can be more severe than what they say of each other. And this applies to all philosophy. Thus John Stuart Mill, writing to Bain of Hamilton: "I did not expect to find his works a mass of contradictions. * * It almost goes against me to write so complete a demolition of a brother philosopher." Yet, they all hold to philosophy as the quintescence of wisdom or at least of policy. "Philosophy is the chap for me," said schoolmaster Squeers. "If a parent asks a question in the classical, commercial, or mathematical line, says I, gravely, 'Why, sir, in the first place, are you a philosopher?' 'No, Mr. Squeers,' he says, 'I ain't.' 'Then, sir,' says I, 'I am sorry for you, for I shan't be able to explain it.' Naturally the parent goes away, and wishes he was a philosopher, and equally naturally, thinks I'm one."

In the Economic Journal for December, 1902, I find "Practical Utility of Economic Science," by Edward Cannan, who says: "This practical utility is not in private business but in politics." Thus travestying Hadley, now President of Yale, who says that *his* "Economics" "is an attempt to apply the methods of modern science to the problems of modern business." A discordance that makes economic "Science" look sick, and tends to illustrate Cannan's own remark that there is no text book that commands any really wide acceptance. Further illustrated by this, also from Cannan. "The question of distribution. Why some are rich and others poor? The teacher will explain that the share of each person depends on the amount and value of his contribution to production whether it be labor or *the use of property.*" To be contrasted with economist Mill's remark, "That the reward instead of being proportioned to the labor * * of the individual is almost in an inverse ratio to it; those who receive the least labor * * the

most." Says Cannan, "If the *general working of the economic organisation* had been understood" (the italicized words he makes a paraphrase for "economic laws"), the London County Council would have acted otherwise than it did. But he has already said that no text book is generally accepted, and we know that most of the recent writers deny that there are any economic or moral laws at all (Ely, Hadley, Seligman, etc.), and instance this passage from himself, "The economic theory has great utility in promoting peace among men." How? By declaring that our policies to be efficient must rest upon *justice* as the supreme law? Hardly. It promotes peace "By enabling working men to *get rid* of that stupid cry for 'Rights and Justice.'" "They demand a living wage * * and rend the air with complaints and get subscriptions from a compassionate but ill informed public," etc. However, he kindly admits that we cannot expect people who "suffer by them to regard even the most beneficial operations of the *economic organisation* with enthusiasm or even satisfaction." He seems to feel that "Economic *Organisation,*" a structure built up in violation of economic laws, and toppling in consequence, is co-terminous with economic *law.* And, to use Madam De Stael's language, "Treating virtue as a conjectural science and entirely submitted to circumstance in its application," he says, The rich do not hold their wealth "Because Moses brought it down from Sinai," (that is because of the moral law that the product belongs to the producer—the law that thou shalt not steal), but simply because it happens to be convenient for society not to rob them.

"A knowledge of economic theory would help the practical man." (Cannan's theory would surely help a practical thief.) "To any one who has grasped the main drift of economic theory," etc. But whose theory? What theory? Were earth's discordant economists in congress assembled, he *must* know that to the question "What theory is the true one," the reply would be, in a unanimous shout—MINE!

Aesop's ass in an Economic Lion's skin might have been a fairly good deception had he, while concealing his ears held his peace. But, when he essays to roar—Presto, the illusion is over.

But, not recognizing the disrupting and dis-social effect of our land system, confusion of thought and bewilderment of expression affect all social discussion whatever. Kidd's "Social Evolution" is in point. To which we may apply Montesquieu's words about a book of *his* day. "The more it is deficient in proofs the more it abounds in probabilities * * And as a prodigious fund of erudition is interposed, not in the system but around it, the mind is taken up with the appendages and neglects the principal. Besides such a vast multitude of researches hardly permits one to believe that nothing has been found." In this book on page 6 we read, "We have little in common with the past. It may be searched in vain for any clue to the solution of the problems which confront us in the future." Yet, on page 351, he quotes approvingly from Lecky that at no distant date we shall be able "To * * detect in the slow movements of the past the great permanent forces that are steadily bearing nations onward to improvement or decay." The term "great permanent forces" meaning *moral laws,* which history shows lead to improvement or to decay, as they are or are not conformed to. And if it is true that "To use many words to communicate few thoughts is everywhere an unmistakable sign of mediocrity," what is to be thought of his *style,* of which this passage of 88 words that can be easily reduced to 36, is a sample. "It may be observed also that the public opinion which earlier in the century regarded with suspicion (as tending to the infringement of the prevailing theories as to the restricted nature of the duty of the state), even the attempt to regulate the hours of women and children in factories and mines has already come to view as within the realm of reasonable discussion proposals to strengthen the position of the working classes by enforcing a legal eight hours day and even a minimum wage in certain occupations." As reduced, "Public opinion which once regarded with suspicion even the attempt to regulate the hours of women and children in factories and mines, now regards as reasonable proposals enforcing an eight hour day and even a minimum wage."

In the Quarterly Journal of Economics for February, 1903, is "A study of the science of welfare," by Fred. Kellogg Blue, 41 pp. Followed by two pages, of five diagrams, resembling geometrical ones. He commences, "There is now an urgent demand for a really scientific political economy." Putting it, however, in these words, "In the development of Economics according to modern scientific methods perhaps the most urgent demand is that which calls for a concept which will bring together all the various truths that have been presented and embody them in a consecutively developed and unified structure." He says, "Stated in terms of the psychological feelings of the individual the production of material things for the purpose of satisfying needs and desires or of gaining pleasure, involves an expenditure of effort which is accompanied by pain or disagreeable feelings. * * * Stated in terms of the metabolism of the organism, with which the production of wealth possesses certain analogies, the utility of the time spent in the production of anything is measured by the difference between the build-

ing up or preserving of organic tissue finally resulting from the act, and the tearing down the tissue involved in the effort of production." He then states the matter physiologically, and in other ways. While Diagram No. 1, "Let the distance from O to a point T in the line OT, represent the time spent," etc., etc., is to assure us that whatever it is he is maintaining, the argument is clinched. However, we who are not alumni must, like the participants at a seance when the materialization speaks in Greek, and "the *evidence* is of things not seen," have a receptive faith in the medium. The article ends with a partial synopsis of it, 3 pp., 15 numbered items. I give only the first and last.

No. 1. In any act of conduct of any organism the utility of the time spent in the act depends upon catabolism and environment.

No. 15. When the quantity of capital borrowed is controlled by the consumer, the distribution of the loanage between the consumer and the possessor is determined by the rate of interest which corresponds to that quantity of capital affording a maximum income, to the rate of interest, to the consumer of the capital.

Prof. Blue, and other quarterly economists, are regardless of Paul's warning, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air" because they know that to be reputed an oracle in the colleges one must *not* write to be understood.

Ask we for what fair end the Almighty Sire,
In mortal bosoms wakes this gay contempt,
These grateful stings of laughter, from disgust
Educing pleasure? Wherefore but to aid
The tardy steps of reason.

Benignant Heaven,
Conscious how dim the dawn of truth appears
To thousands; conscious what a scanty pause,
From labors and from care, the wider lot
Of humble life affords for studious thought,
To scan this maze of "Logic," therefore stamp'd
The glaring scenes with characters of scorn;
Obvious and broad e'en to the passing clown,
Had he but time to look.

—Adapted from AKENSIDE.

The enemies of Tom Johnson claim that he didn't keep his promises. They neglect to add that it took thirteen injunctions to prevent him from keeping them.

Johnstown *Democrat.*

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS OF C. B. FILLEBROWN AT BANQUET OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, HOTEL VENDOME, BOSTON, APRIL 13TH.

GROUND RENT.

I. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF GROUND RENT?

As defined by Mr. Thos. G. Shearman, GROUND RENT is, in its nature, "a tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." It is found operative in every civilized country, automatically collecting "from every citizen an amount almost exactly proportionate to the fair and full market value of the benefits which he derives from the government under which he lives and the society which surrounds him." It is a tribute, "a tax, just, equal, full, fair, paid for full value received." "It is not merely a tax which justice *allows;* it is one which justice *demands.* It is not merely one which *ought* to be collected; it is one which infallibly *will be* and *is* collected. It is not merely one which the State ought to see collected; it is one which, in the long run, the State *cannot prevent* from being collected." . . . "Seldom has there been a more beautiful illustration of the wise yet relentless working of natural law than in the proved impossibility of justly collecting any tax other than upon ground rent. It shows that Nature makes it impossible to execute justly a statute which is in its nature unjust." This definition of Mr. Shearman is offered as one difficult to be improved upon or further condensed.

Such, it may be added, is the nature of rent—gound rent that all the public and private improvements of a community today are reflected in the land values of that community. Not only this, but the value of all those ideal public improvements conceived of as being possible under Utopian conditions would be similarly absorbed, as it were, in the ground, would be reflected in its site value. For illustration: Suppose you stand before a big mirror, you see your image perfectly reflected before you. If you are a man scantily, shabbily clad, so is the image in the glass. The addition of rich and costly attire is imaged in the glass. Load yourself with jewels and fill your hands with gold, in the mirror, true to nature, is the image and likeness of them all. Not more perfectly, nor more literally, is your image reflected in the mirror, than are public improvements reflected in the value of the land.