

the rights of both depend alike on the overthrow of monopoly. The reform which has been explained, which is known as the Single Tax, would destroy land monopoly, which is the source of all other monopolies and of the burden under which labor is suffering.

BOOK NOTICES

*THE OLD FREEDOM

This work by Francis Neilson is an examination of the problems of Labor and Capital which have received additional importance by reason of the great war and the period of reconstruction through which we are passing, and to which the changed attitude of some of the financial and industrial leaders has given increased interest.

The title of the work is deliberately chosen, since Mr. Neilson argues that freedom was the condition of old, and that abuses of privilege grew up with the loss of these conditions or abridgement of laws and customs under which the economic equality of the subject had been formerly recognized. There is enough color in this theory to give it strong warrant. Mr. Neilson quotes in support of it Green's "History of the English People" and Freeman's "Growth of the English Constitution," and Thorold Rogers.

Undoubtedly, equal opportunity was the great principle of early English liberty. It has taken nearly a thousand years to reduce the English laborer to slavery.

Mr. Neilson's work is a strong plea for the Single Tax. "Natural rights," he says, "must be restored if we are not to share Europe's fate. It is the only positive reply to be made to all who favor compulsion—Socialists and Tories alike. By restoring natural rights we shall reset the old foundations and rebuild the best of our institutions, so that America may again open her gates to all who love liberty."

We commend this work, and desire to express our gratification that Mr. Neilson has returned to those literary labors for the great cause which have made his name favorably known on two continents.

A NOTABLE PAMPHLET BY JACKSON H. RALSTON

A scholarly "Study and Report for the American Federation of Labor on Judicial Control over Legislation as to Constitutional Questions," by Hon. Jackson H. Ralston, is a valuable pamphlet of 80 pages. The following from page 49 will interest Single Taxers:

"Finally it was the opinion of Judge Gibson that it remained—with the people, in whom full and absolute sovereign power resides, to correct abuses in legislation, by instructing their representatives to repeal the obnoxious act. What is wanting to plenary power in the government is reserved by the people for their own immediate use; and to redress an infringement of their rights in this respect would seem to be an accessory of the power thus reserved."

Later in life (in 1845), when Justice Gibson had become the chief justice of his court, the foregoing opinion having been quoted, it is fair to say that he remarked that he had 'changed that opinion for two reasons. The late convention, by their silence, sanctioned the pretensions of the court to deal freely with the acts of the legislature; and from experience of the necessity of the case.' (Norris v. Clymer, 2 Penna. Reports, p. 281.)

Age, with its attendant conservatism and advancement in power, seems to have caused the judge to deny the force of his own argument—a condition of mind which was later paralleled by Herbert Spencer who, in his youth, in writing 'Social Statics,' demonstrated to perfection the foundations upon which 'Progress and Poverty' was afterwards written by Henry George, and when his surroundings were changed and bent of mind affected by age so far repudiated the logic of his earlier writings that George was justified in his work 'The Perplexed Philosopher.'"

*The Old Freedom, by Francis Neilson. Clo. 170 pp. Price \$1.00. B. W. Huebsch, N. Y. City.

THE Minnesota Legislature of 1919, by C. J. Buell, a pamphlet of over 100 pages, is issued to inform the voters of the State as to the record of their Senators and Representatives. It serves a distinctly useful purpose, and shows care and more than usual ability in its preparation. Chapter IX on Taxation leaves little to be desired. It is written in short, crisp sentences, and should of itself make a very readable tract for wider distribution. Mr. Buell has done a work which should entitle him to the gratitude of his State, and his many friends will cordially recognize the value of a splendid and unselfish service.

CORRESPONDENCE

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

In answering Dr. C. J. Lavery as to why Single Tax would not increase the rent that a tenant would pay, I fear that, while your answer is perfectly clear to one who sees the truth, it may not be convincing to the student. I do not know that I can make it any clearer, but let us look at it a moment.

I think that question is an intelligent one and one that oftentimes envelopes the student in a maze until he really sees it. He knows that a tax upon goods increases their cost and therefore he is unable to see why a "tax on land" will not increase its cost.

In the first place he must be made to see that the Single Tax is in no conceivable sense a tax upon land. Once, when McKinley was sneering at Single Taxers, old Billy Radcliffe corrected his statement that we proposed to bring in the millenium by taxing land. Radcliffe said, "Not land, but land values, Major." McKinley asked, "Well, what's the difference between land and land values?" Billy answered at once, "The value, Major." There is the whole thing in a nutshell. The difference between land and land value is "the value."

It is true that a tax is represented in the price of everything upon which it is levied. Take 100 as a unit. Let that 100 represent wealth. Add a ten per cent. tax. The price is clearly 110. Let 100 represent land values. Add a ten per cent. tax. Instead of the "price" being 110 it is 90. Now why? Simply because in the one case the tax is upon wealth produced by human toil, as all wealth must be. In the other case the tax is levied upon privilege. In the first instance the tax increases the price. As the price is increased it operates as a deterrent upon the production of that thing. The market is more restricted and limited. There is less of the thing produced. In the other instance, the tax also operates as a deterrent—that is, upon land values. But, obviously, it cannot operate so upon land itself, since, regardless of the tax, there will still remain the same amount of land. In the one instance, it increases the price by checking production. In the other it decreases the price of land by burdening the privilege of holding it idle, and thereby in effect increases the supply. The natural law of supply and demand always controls.

Now, therefore, a tax upon improvements limits them; it restricts the supply, thereby increasing the price. (And let me remark that that part of rent paid for the use of a building is not truly rent, but legitimate interest upon capital invested. In most instances, however, the major portion of it is tribute to landed privilege.) On the other hand, by releasing improvements of taxes, enterprise is encouraged to produce more of them. As the burden of tax is increased upon land values, thereby depressing them, it operates to discourage investment in land, which in many instances must mean the release of it to those who will use it, which in effect is to increase the supply of land.

Obviously, to increase supply is to decrease price, and to limit supply is to increase price. Single Tax, by destroying the speculative value of land, would in effect increase the supply of land, reducing the rent of it. By releasing industry of the burden of taxation, it would increase the supply of wealth, thereby reducing the price of it to actual cost of production, including necessary margin for risk.

By the way, I am heartily with that portion of the Single Tax Party programme that confines our efforts to Single Tax alone. We have injured our cause, or at least prevented its growth, by compromises with socialistic superficialities. One who really sees the land question and understands the nature of taxation knows that there is absolutely no solution of economic injustice in government ownership, regulation,

income or inheritance taxes, or in any other of the thousand and one silly make-shifts proposed by kindergarten students in the economic field. For if all the good could come of these things which their sponsors predict, the only effect would be to increase the value of land, making it all the harder for both labor and capital to get at the source of supply for the production of wealth.

Omaha, Neb.

L. J. QUINBY.

WHEN DAVID GOES FORTH TO MEET GOLIATH

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The tenor of one of your articles in the latest and best number of our invaluable organ is your regret at the absence of the late Henry George. Of course, his untimely death was a great loss, but he would be the first to condemn the notion that his place as leader could not be filled. His successor will be found at the right moment.

Why not begin a general movement toward the unveiling of a statue at the next annual convention. A statue of Henry George and its unveiling with appropriate ceremonies would draw attention to the spread of his ideas once reviled.

It is indeed a pleasure to know that at last we have a national party, with the Single Tax as the sole object in view. At present it resembles David going forth to meet Goliath, but like the biblical hero it is assured of victory because our object is to give back the earth to all the children of men and destroy conditions which breed vice and poverty and greed.

Washington, D. C.

SYDNEY J. HAMILTON.

IN DEFENCE OF THE BAHAI MOVEMENT

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I am extremely sorry to see in your columns a violent attack on the Bahai movement because of its alleged failure to see deeply into the true line of approach toward the solution of the economic problem. As an unqualified Single Taxer who at the same time has accepted the teachings of the Bahai Revelation, I must enter an earnest protest.

A few weeks ago, I paid my annual visit to Green Acre, Maine, the Bahai summer centre, where lectures and discussions are held on all subjects, in the effort to reach a broader knowledge of truth. By special request, I gave a lecture on behalf of the Single Tax, as I have done in previous years. I had an excellent and sympathetic audience; and the many questions asked me at the close of my address were all of a friendly nature. Among my auditors was Ahmad Sohrab, who is at present in this country as the personal representative of Abdul Baha. If there were anything in the Single Tax in the faintest degree inconsistent with the Bahai teachings, he would have been quick to point it out. On the contrary, he expressed himself most sympathetically, and told me he had recently been reading "Progress and Poverty" with special interest, and had also read it to Abdul Baha.

Many of the Bahais in this country are Single Taxers, some of them most emphatically so; and I have yet to meet one of them who is strongly hostile to the principle. It is true that Baha'ollah, dealing mainly with the larger spiritual principles, and laying great stress on the necessity of economic justice, does not specify the precise method of the Single Tax. But he does dwell on the necessity of opening the bounty of the earth to all; and as we well know, the Single Tax is the concrete method of accomplishing this result.

The spirit of the Bahai movement is that of practical co-operation with all undertakings for the well being of humanity. It is a tremendous stimulus to labor in every great reform, and a dynamic force which strengthens the hands of all who receive and apply it. I am and have been a better and a more zealous Single Taxer because of my acceptance of the Bahai principles.

New York City.

JAMES F. MORTON, JR.

REPLY

We hope all our readers will turn to our editorial in July-August REVIEW, page 103. There we quoted from Tract 9, page 10, distributed at the Bahai Congress in New York, in which it is said:

"No religious books of the past prophets speak of the economic question, while this problem has been thoroughly solved in the teachings of Baha'ollah."

Our comment on this was as follows:

"Only ignorance of the teachings of the Jewish prophets or reliance upon the ignorance of the audience can account for such an amazing statement as the above quoted. The Old Testament, to mention no other religious books, is saturated through and through with the conception of a divine justice satisfied only when made manifest in every human relation—including those we call economic."

We then quoted what the Bahai prophets had to offer after their amazing boast that "the economic question had been thoroughly solved in the teachings of Baha'ollah," which turn out to be nothing but time-worn counsels of piety and charity.

Is this a joke? We don't know a thing about Bahaism. It may be perfectly lovely, and all that Mr. Morton claims it is. But how does that constitute a reply to what we have said about it? They have lied about the prophets, and then boasting that they have thoroughly solved the economic question they offer a lot of perfectly harmless, pale and anemic recommendations for social reform that would discredit the intellectual capacity of a high school girl.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

THE FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF NATURE

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Many years since Emerson said, "The laws of nature, which are the angels of the Most High and obey His mandates, are hastening on the time when a child shall die a hundred years old, when sickness shall fade from the world and with it the sins of the soul."

The first or fundamental law of nature is, that wherever men gather together in large numbers, wherever they congregate and settle, there land becomes valuable. There money is needed for all kinds of public purposes, and right there in the land, near at hand, nature supplies a never increasing fund for public purposes.

Each newcomer, from helpless infancy to snow-capped age, involuntarily adds wealth to this common fund. Every worker, every idler, yea, every loafer drops either his own or somebody else's pennies into this common reservoir of wealth. It is an involuntary value given to it by everyone that lives and moves and has a being on the land, under the land, or in the air above the land.

This fund keeps pace with the need for public improvements. The denser the population, the more crowded the streets, the greater the rush of individuals toward any given point, there these land values soar into millions and sometimes billions of dollars, as in all the big cities of the world. If the people leave, or emigrate to other localities, these values go with them.

Once we thought that only rich men were of value to a community; that poor working peoples' comings and goings were of small consequence. We are learning better. All are needed, the worker beyond any other; but this common fund, this involuntary value which owes its existence and perpetuity to the presence of the people, must be used for public purposes ere the House of Civilization can have any foundation save one of sand.

To insist that this foundation shall now—since the old world is passing from under our feet—be imbedded in the rock of justice, and made stable for all time is the duty of the hour. This can be done only by taking for public purposes these publicly created values, and untaxing industry the world over. By so doing we will have heeded the First or Fundamental Law of Nature.

Los Angeles, Calif.

JOSIE THORPE PRICE.

HANDICAPPED BY SELF-STYLED RADICALS

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The country is full of men who believe in the Single Tax, with all that it will mean to humanity, but I believe that to be taught and acknowledged and thereby applied to the solution of the great industrial problem, it must be divorced from other issues. Every real Single Taxer must believe in democracy and liberty in their pure meaning, but the