

Chimney Corner Sold

NO. 1 WALL STREET, corner of Wall Street and Broadway, called "Chimney Corner" because that is the general aspect of the 18-story building that occupies it, has been sold for a price not published. It bears distinction of being the most valuable piece of real estate in the world, considering its size. It extends 29.10 feet on Broadway, 39.10 feet on Wall Street, and its superficial area is 1,180 square feet.

It was sold in 1905 for \$700,000, the ancient 4-story shack that stood on it was demolished and the present 18-story "chimney" was erected. It is assessed for taxation at \$1,100,000, of which \$875,000 is assessed against the land.

The 1905 price for this parcel just shades under \$600 per square foot, a price that still stands—or did until this last sale, which presumably is for much more—as the world's record. The second best rate for New York city land was paid in the recent sale of Temple Emanu-El, Fifth Avenue and Forty-third Street, \$339 per square foot.

No. 1 Wall Street was sold about 110 years ago for \$4,500. Who said gold mines?

Commerce and Finance

"THE proposition to tax land values only would do more to increase the prosperity of humanity in general than anything else that the human mind can conceive."—ARTHUR DUNN, Business Counsellor and Banker, New York.

BOOK REVIEWS

CONCERNING WOMEN

This is a volume of three hundred odd pages written by Suzanne LaFollette and published by Albert and Charles Boni of this city at \$2.50.

It is with scant patience that the reflecting man or woman regards the general tendency to be interested in what Mr. So-and-So writes about women. It ought to be a matter of no importance at all what some individual male has to say of the opposite sex, yet this literature has grown until it now assumes bulky proportions. It is curious to reflect that we are almost totally without a literature that will tell us what Women Think of Men, studies of the male sex written in the same self-sufficient manner of these masculine—and a few feminine—lucubrations, until we wonder if there are two species rather than two sexes.

This tendency to place woman under the microscope and pronounce magisterially upon her habits as if she were a recently discovered natural phenomenon, and not a part of the human race influenced by the vices and virtues that naturally react upon men and women alike, arises from that concept of superiority which men assume toward women, and partly, too, from the subordinate economic position into which she even more than man is placed. It is for these reasons that we are without "Studies of Men" from female writers to be added to this already portentous and, for the most part, worthless literature.

When we saw the title "Concerning Women" we feared that we were opening another volume from one of the many schools of "Feminists," which is the name given to these philosophers who discuss the "Woman Question" as if it were a thing apart from the human question. We were happily undeceived. Miss LaFollette sees no

way of tearing apart the two groups of humanity and considering them as isolated phenomena. That kind of fatuous speculation is not for this clear-sighted young woman who writes intelligently, spiritedly, even profoundly, with a mastery of a prose style remarkable for its clean-hitting, vigorous and decisive strokes.

Here for example on page 117:

"The ultimate emancipation of women, then, will depend not upon the abolition of the restrictions which have subjected her to man—that is but a step, though a necessary one—but upon *the abolition of all those restrictions of natural human rights that subject the mass of humanity to a privileged class.*"

And on page 178 where she speaks of those laws relating to women workers, so many of which have inured to her disadvantage, though imposed for her protection:

"There is in all this bungling effort to ameliorate the ills of working women and to safeguard through them the future of the race, a tacit recognition of economic injustice and a strange incuriousness about its causes."

And on page 190:

"Under a monopolistic economic system the opportunity to earn a living by one's labor comes to be regarded as a privilege instead of a natural right. Women are simply held to be less entitled to this privilege than men."

And on page 195 where we shall accord ourselves the privilege of a more lengthy citation:

"Here, then, is the tacit assumption that marriage is the special concern of woman, and one whose claims must take precedence over her other interests, whatever they may be; that marriage and motherhood constitute her normal life, and her other interests something extra normal which must somehow be made to fit in if possible. I have heard of no institute intended to find a way to reconcile the normal life of marriage and fatherhood with a life of intellectual activity, professional or otherwise; although when one considers how many educated men of today are obliged to compromise with their consciences in order to secure themselves in positions which will enable them to provide for their families, one is persuaded that some such institute might at least be equally appropriate and equally helpful with that which Smith College has established."

And on page 207 where she summarizes in a paragraph the burden of the work:

"In the foregoing chapters I have intimated that every phase of the question of freedom for women is bound up with the larger question of human freedom. If it is freedom that women want, they cannot be content to be legally equal with men; but having gained this equality they must carry on their struggle against the oppressions which privilege exercises upon humanity at large by virtue of an usurped economic power. All human beings, presumably, would gain by freedom; but women particularly stand to gain by it, for as I have shown, they are the victims of special prepossessions which mere legal equality with men may hardly be expected to affect."

It will not be out of place in a review of this character to comment upon another review of the same book which appeared in *The New Republic* of January 12. We cannot expect this organ of the dilettante to be anything but flippant and supercilious. Without any fundamental principles to guide its policy, *The New Republic* is a perfectly harmless and superficially clever exponent of patchwork thinking on social and economic reforms. It knows nothing and cares less for the profounder currents that affect our industrial life; of those laws that determine the economic developments of peoples it does not dare to breathe even in whispers. Its editors and contributors are content to be clever but never candid. Mindful always of the sources of its financial support it picks its steps with careful premeditation, though with a show of brave words that cannot possibly offend. It is a perfectly ineffectual journal and if that seems a harsh criticism it will not appear so to the editors of the paper for that is all that it is intended to be.

Listen to the reviewer:

On almost every page its author displays a warning that she has something to convey that is not inevitably associated with feminist doctrine.

This in face of the author's contention and of the argument sustained throughout that until freedom of access to natural opportunities is secured there can be no freedom for the race. This may not be inevitably associated with the "feminist doctrine"—whatever that is—but it is inevitably associated with the economic position of woman in society, and that is what Miss LaFollette is considering.

And when *The New Republic* reviewer comes to the author's suggestion of what would result from the freeing of natural opportunities, she says:

"Utopia, in short. And unfortunately, a reader's mental muscles tend to become lax at the first mention of a Utopian programme. Miss LaFollette is admirable as long as she remains realistic; but beyond this point she is no more stimulating than any other fond deviser of an earthly Paradise."

Laxity of one's mental muscles fits in nicely with the whole policy of *The New Republic*, so why should the reviewer worry? If the self-sufficient critic were able to realize by a feat of the imagination of which she is apparently quite incapable, that the economic position of woman is due to restrictions, she might be able to understand what the removal of all artificial restrictions would accomplish. One is rightfully impatient of this stupid kind of dogmatism which characterizes every solution that goes to the root of the matter as "Utopian."

Here is a work on which more honest and earnest thought has gone than is expended in the making of many books. We say to *The New Republic* that no work on the subject has appeared in recent years more worthy of analysis page by page. Yet it is received with levity and unseemly flippancy by a journal whose pretentiousness is equalled only by its labored cleverness, its avoidance of fundamentals and its milk and water socialism.

—J. D. M.

HEALTH, FREEDOM AND SELF-KNOWLEDGE

This is the title of a medical book of 337 pages—or is it "medical," since the author proposes to dispense with nearly all medicines?—by J. Haskel Kritzer, M. D., and published by the Kritzer Educational Foundation at Los Angeles.

The work is calculated to cause a shock in various quarters, for many an established notion regarding the effect of drugs is vigorously attacked. The physicians come in for some fierce onslaughts, nor does the author look much more favorably on the newer schools of practice, osteopathy and chiropractic. He tilts a lance against many pet ideas among which is the use of salt and the bath tub. These he unsparingly condemns.

We are not competent to endorse or reject the author's conclusions, which are frequently supported by testimony from well known authorities. It is a thoughtful book, and presents the author as one conversant with the widest field of medical research and the latest discoveries in that pseudo science. There is much that is valuable in its hints as to diet and means for the preservation of health.

Chapter XXXVI, the last in the book, is entitled Social Economic Justice the Basis of Health and Freedom, confirms the author's acceptance of the philosophy of freedom and the restoration to all the people of the natural resources now monopolized by the few.

—J. D. M.

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROVES WHIDDEN GRAHAM'S ARTICLE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

"The American Farmer and the Single Tax," by Whidden Graham, in your Jan-Feb. issue expresses my ideas of the situation perfectly. More articles from the same pen will prevent many Single Taxers from barking up the wrong tree. Unionism is one of the smoke screens that hides the great truth.

Henry George Hotel, San Francisco.

A. J. MILLIGAN.

THE AMERICAN FARMER AND THE SINGLE TAX

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:—

Dear Sir:—I read with much interest in your last issue an article entitled The American Farmer and the Single Tax, in which the idea

is set forth that the farmer has been neglected by the Single Tax advocate in favor of "labor" and that little hopes of success can be entertained until the farmer has been included in the programme.

This sounds strange to me in view of the fact that my reading and experience had led me to think that the mistakes made with reference to Georgism were mostly of the opposite character. I have a dim recollection of reading in one of Henry George's subordinate books an answer to a criticism that had been passed on "Progress and Poverty" to the effect that it could only apply to agricultural land. Mr. George went into detail to show that it would apply to all land. This explanation interested me much at the time because I then saw something I had not been able to see before that it was broader than a rural proposition. About the same time a friend of mine sojourned in my home for a few days and spent his extra time reading "Progress and Poverty," but before he had finished it he threw it down in disgust and said it was simply a scheme to get everybody out on the farm and set them raising potatoes, and then what would we do for other things which were as necessary to our well being as farm products. In answer to that criticism I tried to convey to him some of my recently acquired information about it applying to all lands, but without avail. This mistake, as I now think, was due to Mr. George's frequent use of agriculture as an illustration. But I am at a loss to discover how the rural application would be missed entirely by the latter day leaders.

It seems to me the farmers are now at a stage where they would be open to the Single Tax Philosophy as a solution for their problems. In view of the fact that such problems are growing serious and no other solution seems to offer itself.

I talked with a farmer recently who was complaining about the heavy and unjust burden of taxation. He had probably never heard of the Single Tax but gave utterance to one of the most common Georgian arguments evidently thought out by himself. He said here are two farmers. Both hard workers and very economical. They had saved a little money. Their farms are considerably run down. So one of them takes his money and improves his house and barn making a great difference in the appearance but adding nothing to his income and increasing his taxes. The other buys tax-free bonds and leaves his premises as they were adding considerable to his income, but his taxes remain as they were. He thought it was all very unjust. Is not a mind like that open to the Georgian philosophy?

I have also been impressed lately with the fact that the farmer who lives a mile or more from town and off the improved road (and that is where the average farmer still is in spite of the vast expansion of the city and good roads) realizes that he possesses little or no site value, though he has no knowledge of that term. I know of four heirs to an estate consisting of a farm on a "dirt" road who were trying to dissolve their joint ownership. One of them proposed to buy out the others at \$700 per share and the others proposed to sell at \$900. I do not know the final price agreed upon but it was not in excess of \$3,600. Yet there was a good house and barn and other buildings of the vintage of the '90s which could not be built now for \$10,000.

I also saw a farmer building a commodious barn on his farm with all the modern equipment for dairying, and his neighbors were criticising him because they said he is spending money more than he could sell the farm land for, including the barn and the house.

I rode out sometime ago with a real estate agent who had a number of farms listed. As we rode up to one farm after another I said what are you asking for this farm, and he told me. I said that the buildings are worth more than that, and he agreed with me, adding "we are offering these farms at very reasonable prices." But none of them sold at those figures. All this within fifteen miles of a city of 125,000 people. It appears to me under such conditions it ought not to be difficult for a good persuader to make the farmer see that they possess no site value in such cases and therefore to put all the tax on site value would not bear heavily on them. I understand also that the programme of the school authorities call for the gradual closing of the