

We have received a pamphlet from *Land Values*, Glasgow, Scotland, containing "An Open Letter to Andrew Carnegie" by Arthur Withy, printed for the *Westminster Review* of March, 1907.

Direct Legislation, through the Initiative and Referendum, by Herbert S. Bigelow, is an admirably written pamphlet relating to that reform, consisting of illustrations rather than arguments.

How would a list of once active Single Taxers who, having obtained honors and emoluments by reason of their connection with the Single Tax movement, have now lapsed into quietude, look in print? Many definitions have been given of what constitutes a Single Taxer. Emphatically, however, a Single Taxer is not one whose interest in the movement ceases with his elevation to some trumpery office.

Mr. Harold Sudell, in a letter in a recent number of the Philadelphia *North American*, has a letter commenting upon Mr. Carnegie's recent talk on taxation. Mr. Sudell asks if Mr. Carnegie has not heard of a method by which the unearned increment can be taken. Yes, indeed, only Mr. Carnegie is not telling anybody. There used to be a volume of Triumphant Democracy in Mr. George's library—a presentation volume from the author—in which Mr. Carnegie had written "To Henry George, with regards of His Fellow Radical," Fellow radical, indeed!

BUILDING LOTS IN JAPAN.

During the progress of the Lexow investigation the city in the midst of its shame was moved to seismic laughter by the explanation given by Inspector Williams of his accumulation of realty and personalty on the narrow income of a police officer. His explanation, offered in all seriousness, was that he had been speculating in "building lots in Japan." That time has vindicated him from the cynical incredulity of his contemporaries the following extract from the Consular reports seems to demonstrate:

"Consul-General H. B. Miller, of Yokohama, quotes from the Osaka Asahi newspaper that Japanese real estate has become an object of speculation and prices have been rapidly advanced in many places.

"Land at Kumochi, Fukiai, Kasugano and Mirume has in some instances gone up to two and four times the former price, and at other points even to seven or eight times the previous values. In parts of Kobe land has increased in cost three and four times.

In Osaka the business center is gradually moving westward since the construction of the new harbor, and land in the western part of the city has gone up very high and is still rising. The general rise in real estate is moving eastward into Kyoto, and the rise is already noticeable in Fushimi."

May Japan have wisdom enough to meet the emergency.

THE NAME OF THE MOVEMENT.

We have discussed as fully as seems desirable the matter of name by which our movement should be designated. This was done in the last issue, and is prolonged in this by the addition of a few letters.

We do not feel that we should assume the responsibility of changing the name of this publication, which is the organ of the movement, or that we have any right to designate the economic change by any other name than the one it has come to be known by. We recognize the weakness of the name, and we would gladly use one that would be more inclusive of our purposes and the results that we believe would flow from the change we advocate. But such designation seems to be lacking, and the reasons for the retention of the present name seem to us to outweigh all recommendations for the adoption of any that have been suggested. The discussion has been useful in that it has shown the real strength of the name under which we march, compared with others which, while more embracing, fail to describe our method, or possess defects more grave than the inadequacy which all have come to perceive must inhere in the name in present use.

CONFUSION OF A SOCIALIST.

In *To-Morrow Magazine*, for February, is an article on "Individualism and Socialism, From a Socialist's Point of View." By Philip Rappaport. The writer misconceives, as so many socialists do, both the Single Taxer's position and his philosophy. We will let Mr. Rappaport speak for himself:

"The Single Taxers are in a peculiar position. They are neither individualists, nor socialists although they think they are a little of each. They recognize that unearned increment in land values is a social effect, but refuse to see it in the case of capital. They cannot or will not see that because land values are the effect of private ownership of land, the institution of private ownership makes land a species of capital. Because land is the product of nature they refuse to consider it capital, and their socialism does not go farther than common ownership of land. But even here they become confused and deny that their scheme is making land common property. They

assert that they will not disturb the right of possession, that the land itself is to remain technically the property of its holder, only its unearned increment is to be taken, or as Henry George puts it, we take the kernel and leave to the owner the shell: a sort of private property which is no private property and a sort of common property which is no common property.

"This condition is to be brought about by the Single Tax, which, the Single Taxer says, is no tax. Yet no one was ever more anxious to show that the Single Tax is nothing but a tax than Henry George. He tests it by all the canons of taxation, and is very eager to prove it to be not more than a tax for the purpose of showing its conservative character; merely a change in the form of taxation, that is all. It is so easy to reform the world."

The Single Taxer does indeed refuse to consider land as capital. It persistently declines to put in the same category capital and nature's storehouse from which all capital is drawn. And this is a gain to the purposes of clear reasoning. Why does not Mr. Rappaport show that if land values are taken in taxation the powers of landlord extortion no longer remain, though private possession continue? Certainly because he cannot.

It is true that Mr. George tried the Single Tax by the canons of taxation, because it is in form a tax, though not one in essence. It is true that ours is a reform which may be termed conservative, but it is not so in the sense in which Mr. Rappaport uses the word. It is—the etymological meaning of the word—radical in that it goes to the root. We do not find the conservatives of the country hailing it as the one desirable reform.

"It is so easy to reform the world." It is indeed, though it is not easy to make people see it. It is easy to return to natural laws, and to allow them to work out the salvation of the industrial world. This is more easy than the building of artificial systems and schemes for the distribution of wealth by means of state machinery. Maybe such machinery can be made to work, though the experience of history hardly promises as much. It is better to first get rid of the artificial hindrances to the free play of those forces which experience tells us do result in greater harmony and equality of distribution. And of these artificial hindrances land monopoly and all forms of taxation are the chief.

J. D. M.

THE LONDON ELECTIONS.

A concerted effort has been made to show that the recent elections in London, by which the so-called Progressives were defeated, was a defeat also for the principle of municipal ownership. Every newspaper organ of the corporations in this country,

from Maine to California, has sought to show that "municipal trading," by entailing upon the tax-payers of London unexampled burdens, has been finally repudiated by the voters of the great metropolitan center. Those who used to assert that British examples were valueless as illustrations of what might be done in this country, and ought not therefor to be cited as having any bearing upon American conditions, are now using this British example as conclusive. Demonstrations heretofore held to be worthless by reason of these different conditions, are now hailed as of immense value, and all that was said of the irrelevancy of illustration is forgotten.

The Progressives entering into power eighteen years ago, found London a mediæval city, and left it modernized. They began a policy to which there has been no interruption. Though London has "gone conservative" in general parliamentary elections several times since then, the Progressives have continued to hold their seats. The course of "municipal trading" has all this while progressed, and a number of tramway lines have passed into the city's hands. But with all of this London has not advanced in this direction nearly so far as many other British cities.

In view of this it would be strange indeed if this policy had been discredited. And it has not. The issue of "municipal trading" was not an issue, though every private corporation which hopes to profit by a change in administration, threw its strength against the party in power, seizing upon the circumstances that had arisen to discredit the party.

What these circumstances are will be clear upon examination. The increased tax rate was largely due to the making of new thoroughfares and the attempt to make the city more beautiful and healthful. The public improvements assumed by the city are not yet revenue producing, so the increased tax rate was resented. All this Charles Edward Russell, in an illuminating letter in the *New York American*, makes clear. To the facts given by Mr. Russell others may be added. The Conservative government some years ago threw upon the London County Council the cost of maintaining the church schools in London. Much, too, of the added values contributed by the enlightened London County Council to make London a better city to live in has been absorbed by the classes who absorb most of such gains—namely, the ground landlords. The members of the Council have not been blind to this, and they have never ceased to advocate the taxation of land values.

That the Progressives have made mistakes is perhaps to be granted. Few parties remain 18 years in power without committing errors and being led into some excesses, even though governed by the best