

what is needed to advance the cause rapidly. I approve the platform of the New York Convention printed in your July number. But being a "Single Taxer-limited" I do not believe that the full rental value should be taken at present. If we establish the principle that land values belong to the people the details of the question of collecting the rental, it seems to me, is secondary, and why "enough rental to pay the cost of government economically administered" is not a better formula than the "full rental," I fail to see. In many enterprises like my own specialty, mining, it would be impossible to distinguish between "rent" and "extra interest for unusual risk," so that the full rental could not be got in any case. Shearman also demonstrates this in "Natural Taxation," though I follow him only practically, not theoretically, for he believed in the principle of private ownership, which principle is directly at variance with Henry George and would negate the moral feature of the movement for the recovery of land for the people. Just as Bright Cobden beat the protectionists landlords by the money of the freetrade manufacturers, so the Single Tax party must rely on the money and influence of the successful non-monopolistic business men to beat the millionaires and their dupes. To advocate Single Tax because it will improve the condition of laborers or because it will lessen pauperism or clear out the slums may be well enough in its way, but these are really not the vital reasons—which are the restoration of economic justice, the abolition of parasitism and the moralization of wealth distribution. Let the trade unionists and the Socialists specialize in the sentimental arguments! We Single Taxers should rest on the need for economic justice.

The Spanish and the Argentine Single Tax Leagues seem to have made a good beginning along my suggestive line of work, for they have affiliated with them such societies as the Public Coachowners, the Associated Grocers, the Restaurant Keepers, the Retail Clothiers, the Dry Goods Merchants and other like bodies who suffer from exploitation by town-lot landlords.

Hgo, Mexico.

R. B. BRINSMADE.

"FARMER" ECONOMICS.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Who can tell what is the matter in the editorial department of the *Public*. Its editors seem to have drifted from sound economic moorings; in what appear to be editorial utterances, one finds misconceptions on fundamental propositions, and one wonders what Mr. Post thinks about his successors.

Essays that the *Public* gives space to indicate a peculiar state of mind in its editorial rooms. The F. C. Howe articles, to which you have drawn attention, claiming that wages are affected adversely by the export of capital, will be remembered. A recent issue contained two articles of a similar character, one "Wages and Wars," by Arland F. Weeks, an "educator" of North Dakota; the other by Chief Justice Walter Clark, of North Carolina.

Mr Weeks fathers the astonishing proposition that exports represent withheld "wages;" that high "wages" increase the "home market;" that if men are paid double wages—"they become "twice as much of a market," and to that extent cut down the quantity of goods to be exported. Mr. Weeks is dean of an agricultural college; certainly his ideas may be characterized by the irreverent as woeful examples of "farmers" economics.

Justice Clark contributed a few words on the "tax on the unearned increment," the first sentence of which is this gem: "When a tax is levied upon realty it is passed on to the renter in higher rent." How could a chief justice who supposedly reads the *Public* regularly be guilty of such a sentence? What is realty to him? Is it not land and buildings or fixed improvements combined?

The editors of the *Public* might well accompany such kindergarten essays with courteous comment calculated to bring about new inquiry or a new habit of thinking.

I notice that our old friend, Henry L. Bullen, has cancelled his subscription to the *Public* because of disagreement with its foreign or war policy, saying it is too bad Single Tax publications fritter away their influence by doubtful excursions into other fields. He might

have given an additional reason—that the *Public's* editors are not wisely using their opportunities for spreading sound economic doctrine.

NEW JERSEY SUBSCRIBER.

TIRED OF EXERCISING PATIENCE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

There is no evidence that Job, the propagandist of patience, was a Single Taxer, but I am sure if he had been, the kind of patience for which he became so justly famous, would have "buckled" under the strain, and Job would have become a raving, roaring and ranking apostle of Luke North's philosophy of "Do Something! Now!"

Nature has blessed me with a calm, slow-acting, almost angelic, temperament, and I hesitate, even under the most exasperating circumstances to heave any "vials of wrath" at our misguided brothers of the Single Tax, but I must unload the "burden of my grief" on some one's shoulders, so, why not yours? Ever since I strayed from the paths of conservative rectitude and staid respectability and became a Single Taxer, I have been consumed with enthusiastic longing to see it put in operation. To many Single Taxers, this will appear as evidence of a mind lacking stability and a defective vision, and in pitying love for my infirmities, would urge upon me what has been the stay and comfort of their minds—the patience of Job.

This, however, will not comfort my impatient soul, for I must confess I am losing patience with the Single Taxers who have no time to work or speak for Single Tax, but who can find time to work and speak for everything else within the range of possibility or impossibility.

I am losing patience with Single Taxers who, in fear of arousing the wrath and condemnation of their neighbors, would hide or obscure or apologize for the radicalism of taking 100 per cent. of land-rent for the benefit of the crowd who make it.

I am losing patience with Single Taxers who are always careful to present it as a scheme of taxation, much more easy, simple and, incidentally, more productive of revenue than anything we have at present, and then, stop, and refrain from presenting it as the *greatest moral issue* in history, or, emphasizing the absolute necessity of putting it in operation before right and justice can have a place in human government.

I am losing patience with Single Taxers who, in disdainful superiority, feel that they are giving an exhibition of correct political action when they carefully locate Single Tax upon the ballot and then vote some other ticket.

Let me state, while the light of enthusiasm and the joy of delightful duty still illumines my handsome features, a few words more on this latter class of Single Taxers. I presume they are not averse to the propaganda of the Single Tax, but only act the way they do because they are not sure about the best and most efficient form of propaganda. If this is their trouble there is a "Balm in Gilead," for lo, and behold, we have the answer.

Last November, through the strenuous efforts of a very few, "Single Tax" appeared upon the Pennsylvania ballot. Among the million or more voters in that State, there were found over 2,000 whose votes were counted for Single Tax. How many were uncounted I do not know.

No forward movement was made. No meetings were held. No literature was distributed, and, because of our poverty, no money was spent in trying to line up our forces for the very good reason we had none to spend, and yet, 2,000 voters were found, who in most cases had to brave the pity or contempt of their neighbors, yet thought enough of Single Tax to vote for it.

I want all of your readers who oppose separate party action, to study the facts here stated, and give an answer to the following question:

Suppose we had the support which such a movement deserves—enough men and money to run an active campaign, to hold lots of meetings in halls and on the street corners—getting in personal touch with the people—and handing out our literature to them while they are in the mood; suppose we could by organization of the entire 67 counties in the State, bring the thought of companionship to the now

isolated Single Tax voters, and which would, in a great measure, help to place on the tally list many heretofore uncounted votes; would we not have a more militant, self sacrificing and more efficient propaganda force, than could be had by any other programme?

Once let the party spirit and desire for efficient organization rule the hearts and heads of Single Taxers, victory will be near.

Philadelphia, Pa.

OLIVER MCKNIGHT.

CRAIG RALSTON FOR A NATIONAL SINGLE TAX PARTY EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I do not know what steps you and others in sympathy with you are taking with regard to separate party action by Single Taxers, but if anything is to be done in the next campaign a beginning should be made soon. It may be that under the primary laws in this, and other western States, it is not possible to launch a new party at all, for it appears to me, after an examination of these laws, that people with new ideas are virtually disfranchised. If anything is to be accomplished in such states as this, we must start early.

And in that connection, I wish to disagree with your position, as I understand it. I think you have advocated the nomination of state tickets only. I believe that to get the full benefit of separate party action, a national ticket is necessary.

If it is left to the states, it will be many years before all of them are running tickets. In some states, such as this, it may not be possible to run a state ticket. But a national organization can file its presidential electors, and possibly compel room to be made for them on the ballot.

The benefit we expect to derive from this movement, as I see it, will come from the publicity of the ballot. If our candidates are on the ballot they, and our principles, once every two or four years, will make a one minute speech to the voters. They will speak to the 16,000,000 voters of the country, through the inquiry that is prompted in the mind of each of them when he unfolds the ballot and looks it over to find his own ticket. It makes no difference whether we poll a big vote or a little vote. For advertising purposes, a very little vote is as good as a big vote, because a party that receives a very little vote, and yet insists on bobbing up year after year to be voted down again, will attract the notice of the voter by the very oddity of the circumstance. It will make him inquire why the people in that party keep on doing this. If any one doubts that this is the result let him study the psychological effect of the Prohibition column on the ballot. A political principle can be advertised in no better way than to be on the ballot, where it can be voted for or against; and I want to emphasize again my view, that the vote our party will poll will not matter—to repeat, that if we want to provoke the curiosity of the electorate, the small vote is just as serviceable as the large vote. It seems that a large number of Single Taxers have gotten the idea that if we put up a ticket and fail forthwith to sweep the country, the cause is ruined. I don't look at it that way. If a Single Tax ticket is put up, I expect to vote it henceforth, in the belief that every vote I put in for it now will ultimately count for ten, and that I am stuffing the ballot box of the future in a way that no law can prevent.

If lists of Single Taxers can be procured, I would advocate raising a fund for a post card referendum on this matter of separate party action. If we can make a fund large enough, we ought also to send with each card a printed statement of our reasons for advocating party action. We ought also to enclose a copy of your New York platform, to prove to them that a Single Tax platform can be made an interesting and instructive document. This is another thing I want to note—that we stand for a principle, as well as a measure, and our platforms should be an interpretation of our principle, as well as an advocacy of our measure. Up to this time, all the emphasis have been placed on the measure, and most people do not know that a great principle stands back of it. This is largely due to the fact that the designation "Single Tax" names the measure, and conveys no idea of the principle. It is as though the tariff men, instead of adopting the alluring title of "Protectionists," should designate

themselves as "High Taxers." Our old name "Single Tax" is well established, yet I have often thought we might consider the advisability of selecting a name more expressive of our principles.

In states where presidential primaries are held, the campaign will be on in less than a year. If we propose to be in it, we must begin now.

Madison, Wis.

CRAIG RALSTON.

We have received a number of letters in commendation of the policy of the REVIEW. A few of these we quote. H. Wheeler Chatfield, of New York City writes: "I do hope that before the year is up, the REVIEW will be a monthly; at any rate it is the only Single Tax publication with a purpose and a 'knowledge' that we cannot do without." John Cairns, of So. Manchester, Conn., writes: "Your editorial on the programme of the British Labor Party is alone worth the price of a year's subscription." Mr. John J. Lynch, of San Francisco, says: "I don't agree with you in everything, but your statement of the Single Tax is so good that I have clipped it for my scrapbook." A correspondent who asks that her name be not printed, thus writes: "It relieves me to let you know that there are Single Taxers who read several other Single Tax papers and still remain very much at sea, and who depend upon the Single Tax REVIEW to keep them anchored." H. C. Maguire, Brooklyn, N. Y., writes: "REVIEW just received. Reads fine after the bunk the daily papers are handing us." This is from a new subscriber, S. W. Wall, of Tacoma, Washington: "You have come so to my rescue in the matter of the tariff and trading with Germany that I really owe you 'financial support'. Your magazine and you should have all the help Single Taxers can give. The manner in which some of them have put forward the tariff question where it does the most harm, has been an exasperation to me all my life. You have put the doctrine forcefully and in the fewest possible words when you state the formula—Free Land, Free Trade, Free Men, but First Steps First. Let us have free land and all things else will be added unto us, a new heaven and a new earth." W. J. Flacy, of Kansas City, Mo, writes: "I believe the REVIEW to be the best Single Tax periodical in the English language." Judge A. B. Pittman, of Memphis, Tenn., writes: "You are doing a splendid work for the cause."

Letters of a different tenor have reached us. We quote the following from one of the "Old Guard," a man who has been one of the official lecturers for the Single Tax, and is now at the head of an apparently prosperous business concern:

"The average man not only does not think in terms of economic science—he knows no more about it than a Hottentot. Talking economics to the average American is like explaining calculus to a boy who hasn't learned the multiplication table."

This is true. We cannot reach the man in the street with talks on the law of rent, the margin of cultivation, etc., etc. Then why try it? But there is nothing surer than that the latent perception in the mind of every man that he has certain rights, the right to live, to pursue happiness, to receive due recompense for his labor. He can be made to understand the relation of these rights to the earth; he can grasp the fact that the earth owner stands between him and the realization and enjoyment of these rights. Wherever this appeal is made the response is instant. Henry George found it so; every advocate preaching in the spirit of Henry George and speaking his language has found it so.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

WM. A. BLACK, now member of the House of Representatives, is candidate for Commissioner of Taxation of San Antonio.

THE women members of the Single Tax Party of New York are advertising afternoon teas at the headquarters, 246 West 14th Street. Single Tax is served to visitors from 3 to 6. All are welcome.

W. E. WALTER, of Rutherford, N. J., who has been doing war work on the Federal Reserve Board, has resigned, and will resume his work as State Bank Examiner. He will be able to help the movement in New Jersey.