

Land Values, a Glasgow paper of imperial circulation and influence. Referring to Porter's work, Mr. Paul writes:

The "plutocratic" criticism shows little knowledge of Glasgow's municipal doings; the mere twaddle of an ignorant penny-a-liner. The municipal improvements have come along in the nature of things; just as the city has grown and a better public spirit has been manifested. The citizens are quite conscious and quite satisfied that they get full value from the principal municipal services—water, gas, parks and galleries, tramways, especially the latter. The electric light is presently competing with the gas supply or supposed to be, but they are both very serviceable; the electric light of course is used more for business than for domestic purposes, while it is also used now for public lighting. The municipal telephones are on their trial, but seem to be giving satisfaction. The public market is an institution that has long existed in Glasgow. It suits the business transacted there, and in the old days was a center of trade in the town necessitating some municipal superintendence. The baths and wash houses have grown up out of a desire to meet the wants of the people who inhabit houses of one and two rooms; and sad to say 60 per cent. of the people of Glasgow live in such houses. The "Improvement Trust," which the "plutocratic" press calls municipal houses, really came about through necessary municipal improvement, i. e., knocking down unsanitary property and adding to the amenity of the district attacked in the common interest. The other things that Glasgow does according to the "plutocratic" press, look big in type, but there is really not much in them and the people of Glasgow do not bother about them—except that a few cranks ventilate their opposition by occasional "letters to the editor" on "the urgency of backing down," or "going steady." Compared with other towns Glasgow is a low taxed city; but nothing of the profits from any of the successful municipal services are taken to reduce the taxes, nor were any of these services initiated with that view. Far less with that of making the city tax free. Tax freedom has certainly been discussed time and again, at the council, in the press, and on the platform; but it has been so discussed as a thing to be done not through municipal services, but by the taxation of land values. Glasgow is engaged just now for example in a new sewage scheme, which must be got through. This will undoubtedly add to the taxes, as the scheme will probably cost anything in the neigh-

borhood of two millions before it is finished.

As Mr. Paul is a single taxer and represents through his paper that sentiment in Scotland, where it is very strong, even controlling the Glasgow city government, his views as such on the social utilities of these municipal improvements are of special interest. On that point he writes:

Single taxers, as such, do not attach much importance to municipal services. I have been interested at times in the visits of American single taxers here who profess admiration for Glasgow's controlling these monopolies; and as I look at your prints advocating a similar policy for the towns of the United States, I wonder, in view of our experience here, if the game is worth the candle. Whether they are controlled by private corporations or by the municipality, these services only add to rent. The conversion of the tramways from horse haulage to electricity and their extension for miles in every direction has sent up house rents one, two and three pounds a year; and, as you know, these advances in rent must be paid by all householders whether they use the cars to greater or less advantage, or not at all. Of course there is a sense in which the citizens get an advantage from some municipal improvements that the landlord cannot take from them. The children can have the enjoyment of open spaces and parks. But even these in the long run mean better health for the city and consequently more ability to produce wealth for somebody else to enjoy. But to come to the more political aspect of the question. The private corporations, it is asserted, owning and controlling your municipal monopolies, or services, control and dominate your local legislatures. They bribe councillors to vote their interest and further pollute public life by promoting the candidature of their own creatures. This is pretty bad and must make many who stand for progress at times despair. But look at the situation from our point of view. We have some 15,000 workers in the employment of the Glasgow council, and every further piece of municipal expansion adds to the number. Many of these workers are organized and are exercising more and more political influence in the return of their own creatures to the council. The candidate for their support is not the man who will look after the interests of the city, but he who will promise most to the employes of the council. The best interests of the city is a secondary consideration. In fact, these workers cannot see the city's interest except

through their own, while the more vigilant of them work for the return of candidates who will assist them or their friends into corporation jobs. A Labor candidate publicly boasted on the hustings that he had got so many men municipal employment during his term of office, which means that we have Tammany here. And we are likely to have more of it in the future. This is due solely to economic pressure caused by locking up the land in the hands of a class. It is accentuated by effecting municipal progress and expenditure. Therefore, as I say, we single taxers are not at all enthusiastic about these municipal improvements. We have got our eyes fixed on what is necessary to social redemption and hope to keep them there. The only thing that can purify our municipal government or yours—government by municipal socialism or by private corporations—will be the freeing of the natural opportunities to employment, thereby making it as easy to get jobs outside the corporation as inside. We must have the single tax to slack back the economic pressure that is not only responsible for the poverty of the people, but for the direct pollution of municipal government. The reform that will destroy land monopoly, open up the natural opportunities to employment, and raise wages as a proportion of the gross produce of labor, is the only cure.

A remarkable article on "the causes of industrial crises" appears in the December Commonwealth, a St. Louis magazine, from the pen of Isaac H. Lionberger. The distinctive thing about it is the essential identity of the theory adopted with that which Henry George advanced nearly a quarter of a century ago, though the writer doubtless supposes himself to be absolutely at variance with George on all sides.

It is true that Mr. Lionberger attributes the periodical panics since 1819 to different causes; but his allusion here is evidently not to final causes, but to those that are immediate—occasions rather than causes. Indeed, he says so; and his search is for the deeper and universal cause. Reviewing in this search "the events which always, under all circumstances, and in all countries precede a collapse of industry," he notes as his starting point the enforced economies of a period of depression. These reduce demand and consequently cur-

tail production. But with improvements in productive power, prices fall so that purchases may be more freely made. Demand consequently re-expands, and production is again stimulated. The next stage in this industrial revival is the disposition to venture upon investments. When these prove fortunate, as under such circumstances they usually do, confidence in investment is restored and the business of the country is once more in a "sound and healthy condition." Then comes the speculative stage. Men rush in to acquire great riches quickly, and "sure thing" operators spring up all over the country, who offer seductive investments, which promise great returns." Handsome profits being realized in many instances, pretty soon a boom is on. "The temptation to buy under such circumstances is almost irresistible, because prices and 'values' continue to rise day by day and profits seem absolutely certain." Ready money is of no importance. "Things bought are good collateral, and margins on a rising market are easily provided." Thus "values' are forced in all directions." But pretty soon the wiser men, who see signs of the coming storm, begin to take in sail. Prudent bankers are inclined to reduce accommodation and to call in loans. This sudden check upon speculation, however, tends only to hasten the very disaster it is designed to prevent. But disaster is inevitable. "Values cannot advance forever. There is a point at which even the fool stops, and at this point it becomes impossible to unload." Then "prices and 'values' fall, at first slowly, but with accelerating rapidity; more margins are called for; resources are exhausted; banks decline accommodation; there is a rush of selling orders, and the inevitable collapse follows; the great house has failed; the panic has arrived."

Mr. Lionberger has given an accurate diagnosis of periodical industrial depressions. In only one respect does it fall short of perfection. He

neglects to distinguish the kind of speculation that produces the general catastrophe, and so comes to the lame conclusion that panics are "inevitable and must occur at regular intervals under every form of government and every system of banking." Had he completed this sentence by making it read "every form of government that permits natural opportunities for industry to become subjects of speculation," he would have probed the problem to the core. It is only in that respect that Mr. Lionberger's diagnosis of periodical panics differs from Henry George's. George traced this social disease to speculation in land. But Lionberger, misled by his legal training into classifying mining stocks, railroad stocks, industrial stocks and the like, as personal property, fails to observe that speculation in such stocks is essentially speculation in land. It is not mining machinery nor output; it is not railroad cars nor locomotives; it is not steel-making machinery nor its product—it is none of these things, which enterprise and industry bring forth, that have their values forced and in which speculators invest for a rise. It is the source whence the materials for such things come, and the way rights and terminal rights for distributing them. These natural opportunities do rise with good times and fall with bad times, and they are represented, if not in greatest degree yet in the most impressive circumstances of our time, by corporation stocks; and it is this factor of title to natural monopolies in stocks, and this alone, that makes those stocks subject to the kind of speculation to which Mr. Lionberger traces periodical panics. In other words, land does not cease to be land when titles to interests in it are certified by corporate stock shares in place of individual title deeds.

Teacher—Bessie, name one bird that is now extinct.

Little Bessie—Dick!

Teacher—Dick? What sort of a bird is that?

Little Bessie—Our canary—the cat extincted him!—Puck.

THE SINGLE TAX IN GERMANY.

The book brought out last Summer by Adolf Damaschke, leader of the German single tax movement, is as good a summary of the methods of work and the success already attained by that movement, as has yet been published.

Damaschke has not attempted to give a complete history of the movement, although his book bears the title "Land Reform." He has gathered into book form a series of eight lectures given by him in Berlin and other towns, in which the theory is explained and an account of its progress offered in a way to interest hearers of the spoken word, particularly such as the speaker is anxious to win over to his views.

The opening chapter, "Neither Capitalism nor Communism," sets forth social problems and the pressing need for some solution of the great burning question of the day. The writer touches on difficulties in all countries, but naturally gives most of his space to conditions in Germany along the line of the average income of a great proportion of the people, and the manner of life this poverty entails. He then gives a rapid but excellently logical and lucid explanation of some of the remedies already proposed, and comes by easy and perfectly comprehensible steps to the question of ownership in land, the corner stone of the building.

One reason why the theory of not permitting private ownership in land is easy of comprehension in Germany is the fact pointed out by Damaschke, that the old Teutonic communities held all their land in trust for all. The idea of the land as private property is a comparatively later growth. In fact, there are many communes in Germany to-day, independent villages, country parishes, which actually still hold their land as communal property, and a large majority of them find the rental from this land quite sufficient for all communal needs, and raise absolutely no other taxes for this purpose.

Of course, most of these communities are obliged to send some tribute to their particular government, but some of them even make it possible to raise this sum from rental of pub-