

provided in the contract of reservation. Not so upon any better terms than those of the reservation, however onerous. On the other hand, if the Mueller act were adopted before the granting of franchise extensions, the property of the companies could be condemned by regular condemnation proceedings, its value being determined not by secret contract with a councilmanic committee but by fair assessment by a jury. Does not Mayor Harrison realize that there is suspicious method in this mad hurry scurry to rush through franchise extensions before submitting the Mueller act to the people? A later interview indicates that he does. In this he is reported as saying:

The law provides that it may be voted on for adoption at any general or special election. That means that if there is a general or special election, on that day the law may also be voted on. There is no general or special election until next Spring. I think it likely the bill must be submitted at the Spring election before a franchise extension ordinance can be passed, judging from present indications.

Gov. Cummins, of Iowa, has given the Republican party a new "Iowa Idea." Driven by the national bosses of his party to abandon his attack upon the sacred tariff as a "shelter for monopoly," he now comes to the defense of the tariff with this extraordinary doctrine:

The chief purpose of government is to prevent natural consequences and to restrain the operation of natural law. Free commerce is no more sacred than freebooting or free killing.

One noticeable thing about this idea of government is its conformity with the idea of the anarchists. They also hold that "the chief purpose of government is to prevent natural consequences and to restrain the operation of natural law." They differ from Gov. Cummins only in the application of their common doctrine. Because they regard that as the chief purpose of government, they object to government; they believe in natural law. But Gov. Cummins, for the same reason, approves of govern-

ment; he does not believe in natural law. If Gov. Cummins isn't making fun of protection, any well-balanced man must prefer the anarchist idea of government to his. For if the chief purpose of government really is to restrain the operation of natural law, so much the worse for government and not so much the better for tariffs.

Mrs. Stuyvesant Fish, one of the aristocracy of our world-power republic, is a thoroughly likable woman, she is so delightfully candid. Most of her set pretend; she does not. She is an aristocrat and knows it; her country is developing classes, and she knows that; and believing it all to be a good thing, she frankly says so. Would that the rest of her class would declare themselves as candidly as did Mrs. Fish the other day when she said to a Chicago Tribune correspondent at St. Louis:

I do not believe in equality; it would never do. We are coming more and more to have an aristocracy and a common people. I do not believe in being too democratic. Europe is older than we, and she cannot get along without the different classes.

A REPUBLICAN CANDIDATE AND THE SINGLE TAX.

Mr. Myron T. Herrick, the Republican candidate for governor of Ohio, has raised the single tax question in his campaign in that State, doing so upon no better basis than the fact that his adversary is a well-known believer in single tax principles.

In fact, the single tax question is not at issue in Ohio. If Mr. Johnson instead of Mr. Herrick were elected governor, the single tax policy could not be adopted. The single tax policy cannot be adopted in Ohio without a single tax amendment to the State constitution, and that cannot be accomplished without a direct vote by the people.

But, issue or no issue, Mr. Herrick raises the question. He makes no argument in support of his assertions. To do that would fall beneath the dignity of a candidate whose object seems to be not to discuss public questions but to appeal to what he supposes to

be public prejudices. Since Mr. Herrick has gone thus far, however, it is proper to meet his assertions, leaving him to defend them or to hold his peace as may seem the more discreet to himself.

As Mr. Herrick read his speech from a manuscript, which has been published in full, we are able to reproduce his very words. He read this manuscript at the opening meeting of the Republican campaign on the 19th of September, at Chillicothe, and we take his words from the verbatim reproduction of that manuscript in the Cleveland Plain Dealer of September 20, as follows:

The only issue between the parties this year, having reference to taxation, is whether taxes raised for the maintenance of the State and its counties and municipalities, shall be raised in accord with methods long approved, not only in the State of Ohio, but in the other States of the Union, and whether we shall make such improvements by legislation, as experience has taught us can be safely made for the benefit of all citizens of the State, or whether we shall discard all recognized proper methods of taxation and adopt the methods based upon the speculative theories of Henry George and his followers. It is fair to discuss single tax, because the leader of the present Ohio Democracy has declared for it, and is supported on the stump by recognized exponents of that doctrine. I cannot resist calling public attention, in brief, to the fact that such a tax is objectionable to all classes, because it abolishes all plans of established revenue service; it prevents the assessment of desirable excise; it cannot be equitably assessed; it threatens free institutions; it cuts off the possibility of taxing trusts and corporations; it is unjust and not universal; it puts the whole burden of revenue on the few, and not equally; it makes the farmer and the home-owner overpay, and the dangerous forms of wealth escape; it would not remove a single hardship, it would not relieve the poor, would not reach the so-called monopolistic class, and, above all, has been a disastrous failure in the only instances of experience. Contemplating what we have, we can ill afford to sanction, even by the inference of indorsement, Ohio's commendation of such a peril.

Let us arrange Mr. Herrick's points of objection to the single tax in such manner as to make each stand out in full relief. He denounces this method of taxation as objectionable to all classes, because—

1. It abolishes all plans of established revenue service;

2. It prevents the assessment of desirable excise;
 3. It cannot be equitably assessed;
 4. It threatens free institutions;
 5. It cuts off the possibility of taxing trusts and corporations;
 6. It is unjust and not universal;
 7. It puts the whole burden of revenue on the few, and not equally;
 8. It makes the farmer and the home owner overpay;
 9. It would allow the dangerous forms of wealth to escape;
 10. It would not remove a single hardship;
 11. It would not relieve the poor;
 12. It would not reach the so-called monopolistic class;
 13. Above all, it has been a disastrous failure in the only instance of experience.
- It is impossible here to consider these thirteen objections except in brief. But we shall reply to each with somewhat more fullness than Mr. Herrick has devoted to their presentation.

The single tax "abolishes all plans of established revenue service." This is Mr. Herrick's first objection.

To understand him we must know, what he has neglected to state, precisely what the single tax plan proposes. It is a plan to abolish all taxes on industry, and to derive public revenues from taxes levied on land owners in proportion to the salable value of their land exclusive of the value of improvements.

To progress to this end single taxers urge the abolition of personal property taxes. But that would leave land and improvements still to be taxed according to the "plans of established revenue service."

But single taxers go farther. They would also abolish all taxes on landed improvements. Nevertheless, that would leave land to be taxed according to the "plans of established revenue service."

Further yet, single taxers would abolish all indirect taxes—those that people pay in higher prices for the goods they buy. But all this would still leave the land to be taxed according to the "plans of established revenue service."

If, therefore, the single tax would abolish all plans of established revenue service, as Mr. Herrick asserts, it remains for him to explain how it would do so.

Mr. Herrick's second objection is that the single tax "prevents the assessment of desirable excise."

By "desirable excise," Mr. Herrick probably intended to include liquor licenses, although he mentioned only the Ohio excise on railroad incomes. Whether the single tax would do away with excises of either kind would depend altogether upon whether the excise was levied for revenue or for regulation. With respect to liquor taxes, if the liquor traffic is a good thing the single tax would indeed free it from taxation; but the single tax would not free this traffic from prohibition or police regulation whether directly or by excise. A tax on dogs, for illustration, if intended to lessen the number of objectionable dogs in a community, would not necessarily be inconsistent with single tax principles; but a tax on houses for the purpose of obstructing desirable house building would be.

As to the Ohio excise on railroads, it really falls, in the long run, upon railroad patrons and not upon railroads themselves. For railroad charges are matters of legal regulation, and if railroads can pay an excise on their gross receipts it is because the law allows them to charge their patrons excessively.

However, no "desirable excise" would be prevented by the single tax.

For his third objection Mr. Herrick asserts that the single tax "cannot be equitably assessed."

If this means anything it means that land cannot be equitably appraised for taxation.

Why not?

It is equitably appraised in partition and in condemnation proceedings; why can it not be for taxation? It is equitably appraised for buying, selling and leasing; why can it not be for taxation?

Land is simpler of appraisal than any other kind of property; why can it not, then, be more equitably appraised? To appraise

any particular improvement—a house, for instance—experts in the particular line, perhaps in several lines, must be called in. To appraise the contents of a house equitably, numerous kinds of experts must be called in. But any intelligent man in any community can fairly appraise any land in that community, its improvements not being taken into account. In cities, where the single tax would be vastly greater, acre for acre, than anywhere else (outside of exceptionally rich mining regions), appraisements of land for the single tax could be made far more easily and more fairly than appraisements of improvements and personal property, the taxation of which Mr. Herrick advocates.

Why, then, does Mr. Herrick object that the single tax cannot be equitably assessed?

Mr. Herrick's fourth objection to the single tax is that "it threatens free institutions."

On this point a bill of particulars is needed, for the objection challenges all the possibilities of surmise. If Mr. Herrick knows what he means he should state it.

Trusts and corporations next excite Mr. Herrick's solicitude, lest they escape the sharp eye of tax inquisitors. He dreads the single tax because, for a fifth reason, "it cuts off the possibility of taxing trusts and corporations."

Why does he think the single tax would do that? If trusts and corporations own land—city lots, railroad terminals, railroad rights of way, mining rights, or other landed privileges—they would be taxed, by the single tax, in proportion to the salable value of such land. If it had but little value as land, they would not be taxed much; if it had no value as land, they would not be taxed at all; but if it had large value as land, it would have to pay a high tax.

Surely Mr. Herrick knows that the most valuable land holdings in the country belong to the trusts and corporations? Why, then, does he say that the single tax would cut off the possibility of taxing trusts and corporations?

The single tax "is unjust and not universal." That is Mr. Herrick's double-headed sixth point.

But why is the single tax unjust? Is it unjust to tax men in proportion to what the community earns for them instead of taxing them in proportion to what they earn for themselves? If not, then the single tax idea is not unjust.

Every cent of income that any man, any trust, any corporation derives from mere legal power to own land—flows from the public. It is not earned by the owner. The owner could go to bed, or go to Europe, or go to jail, and still draw this part of his income. He does not work for it. It comes to him without any work of his own. More than that, it would increase as the community improved. Here is proof positive that this part of his income flows from the community. No income which depends upon the work of its beneficiary can increase unless he works. But land values do increase, regardless of whether the beneficiary works or not, provided the community improves. Land values, therefore, are the just fund for public revenues. To take private earnings for public revenues, so long as there are land values to tax, is the unjust thing to do.

Then why does Mr. Herrick denounce the single tax as unjust?

Is it because it is not universal? What does he mean by "universal," anyhow? Are we to understand that the single tax is not universal because it does not tax everyone? But it does tax every one who derives financial benefits from the community; and it taxes each in proportion to his financial benefits thus derived. That is the only universality in taxation that is possible, consistently with justice.

If this view is erroneous, Mr. Herrick has yet to explain where the error lies. If it is not erroneous, why does he object to the single tax that it is neither just nor universal?

Seventh in the order of Mr. Herrick's objections is his assertion that the single tax "puts the whole burden of revenue on the few, and not equally."

But the few alluded to here are those who own the very valuable land of the country. And they own it in unequal values.

They did not make the land, nor buy it from any one who did make it. It is a gift of nature—not to a few, but to all. Neither have they given it any of its value—not as land; and such value as they may have added to it by improvements would be exempt under the single tax.

Is it true that people who own these great and valuable privileges—the earth which nature provides, and the value of choice parts of it which the community confers—is it true that these privileges are owned by the few? Mr. Herrick implies that they are, for he says that the burden of the single tax upon those privileges would be borne by the few.

Assuming that he is right—assuming, that is, that the bounties of nature and the values which the community gives to sites upon the earth—assuming, as Mr. Herrick implies, that this common wealth is owned by the few, why should not those few bear the whole burden of revenue? They are the few who have what in justice belongs to all. And why should they not bear it unequally? Their holdings of this common property are of unequal value, ranging from \$15,000,000-an-acre building land in Wall street, down to \$3-an-acre farming land in country places.

Mr. Herrick's eighth objection is that the single tax "makes the farmer and the home owner over-pay."

Is he quite sure? Has he not copied this objection out of a book, without scrutinizing it? Let Mr. Herrick reflect.

What farmer or home owner of the industrial as distinguished from the leisure class, but would be glad to pay the full annual ground value of the little share of earth he monopolizes, if he could thereby secure exemption from taxation on his improvements, on his personal property, and on his purchases at the store? It is a question in simple arithmetic. Any farmer or home-owner can figure out the answer for himself.

We mistrust Mr. Herrick, when he speaks here of farmers and home owners, of having in mind not the farmer who farms farms and the small home owner, but the "farmer who farms farmers" and the home owner who owns

other people's homes—the homes of those who build and build but enter not in.

As his ninth objection, Mr. Herrick urges that the single tax "allows the dangerous forms of wealth to escape" taxation.

No specification being made, we are in doubt as to what Mr. Herrick regards as "the dangerous forms of wealth." We are unable, however, to conceive of any form so dangerous as land monopoly; and this form is precisely what could not escape the single tax.

The single tax "would not remove a single hardship," is the compact argument with which Mr. Herrick elucidates his tenth point.

Let us see.

All manner of real estate improvement would be wholly exempt from taxation. Hence real estate would be improved more than now. The monopolized vacant lot would become the improved lot and the closed down mine an open mine. And as all other industrial operation would be likewise exempt from taxation, all industrial operation would be stimulated. That would act in one way to enhance demand for laborers, thereby increasing wages; in the other way, it would augment the supply and lessen the cost of goods, thereby lessening prices.

This tendency would be accelerated by decline in the price of land. Since all land would be heavily taxed, in proportion to its value, whether used or not, vacant land would seek purchasers on a falling market. Thus still more land would come into use, and the demand for workmen would be still further enhanced while the supply of goods would be still further augmented and their cost lessened, with an intensification of the effect of higher wages and lower prices.

These results alone would remove many a hardship. Why, then, does Mr. Herrick assert that not a single hardship would be removed by the single tax?

Akin to the last objection is the eleventh, namely, that the single tax "would not relieve the poor."

Possibly not. But it would remove the principal obstructions

to their relieving themselves, which, after all, is the thing to be desired.

Mr. Herrick's twelfth objection to the single tax is that it "would not reach the so-called monopolistic class."

That depends upon what Mr. Herrick means by "so-called." But we need not concern ourselves about any "so-called monopolistic class" if we can reach the real monopolistic class.

What class is that?

Can any class be more fundamentally monopolistic than the class that owns all the most valuable sites for industrial activity which the earth affords? We should suppose not. And that class would be reached by the single tax.

We now come to the thirteenth and final objection which Mr. Herrick interposes to the single tax, and the one he places "above all" the others. The single tax, he says, "has been a disastrous failure in the only instances of experience."

It would be interesting to know to what "instances of experience" Mr. Herrick alludes. But he was reticent in his speech and we must glance over the entire field.

Down in Alabama, on Mobile Bay, there is a settlement called Fairhope. Its promoters declare that it is as faithful an experiment in the single tax as the existing laws of Alabama and the United States permit. Whether they are right makes no difference so far as the present point is concerned. The important thing is that if Fairhope is not a single tax experiment it does not come within Mr. Herrick's "instances of experience," and if it is a single tax experiment it is one that has not been "a disastrous failure" but is a very notable success.

Over the seas, in Australasia, there are some fiscal experiments that may be called single tax experiments in a very limited way. We refer to the communities, especially in New Zealand, that have adopted the single tax method of raising their own local revenues. All these experiments are successful. The people of the respective communities refuse to abolish them, and neighboring

communities are adopting them.

Beyond this we know of no single tax experiments, nor of anything that can with any approach to fairness be called a single tax experiment, with the possible exception of the German land system in China which is regarded as successful thus far.

Mr. Herrick would perform a public service by descending from elusive general assertions to tangible particulars and specifying—

(1) What "instance of experience" in the application of the single tax anywhere in the world, at any time in history, has been "a disastrous failure."

(2) Why he regards it as a single tax instance.

(3) Why, in his opinion, it has failed.

These explanations ought to be easy to furnish if Mr. Herrick's very general assertion has any basis in his own mind.

Mr. Herrick has apparently thrown together a collection of college boy objections to the single tax. This appearance, however, may be deceptive. Possibly he really understands the single tax and in his speech was laying down thirteen propositions against it which he is prepared to maintain. If that is the truth of the matter, he owes it to his reputation for personal intelligence and fair dealing to defend his position. As his statement stands it is erroneous in many of its assertions of fact and fallacious in most of its conclusions.

HENRY DEMAREST LLOYD.

Among the names that have come to be familiar in the English speaking world in connection with the industrial questions of recent years, is that of Henry Demarest Lloyd, who died suddenly of pneumonia on the 28th at Chicago. His fame was most general, perhaps, as the author of "Wealth Against Commonwealth," an exposure of the development of the Standard Oil trust, which, published many years ago, is still the standard work on that subject.

But Mr. Lloyd was not a man of one book nor of one act of public service. Among his other contributions to industrial literature

are two books on labor conditions in Australasia (vol. iii, p. 629)—"Newest England" and "A Country Without Strikes." They are pioneer books about the pioneer experiments in economics of a pioneer country; and with due regard for Mr. Lloyd's economic point of view, no one can seriously criticize them. Even his adversaries in economic and industrial controversy must appreciate their value and acknowledge the ability and fidelity of their author.

Mr. Lloyd distinguished himself in another way last Winter as the professional associate of Clarence S. Darrow in the legal work for the anthracite coal miners before the arbitration commission. With sometimes more distinction and sometimes less, he has frequently responded as writer and lawyer and speaker to the calls of labor organizations. Although a man of large means, his sympathies and service were at the command of the disinherited workers. It was not as a dole-out of charity, not as a sympathizer with individual suffering merely, that he approached the working classes; it was as a man who realized that men like himself are victims of industrial conditions which neither he nor they could control but against which it was the duty of both to fight.

It was in this spirit that Mr. Lloyd entered upon the struggle for municipal ownership of the Chicago street car systems, as the adviser and the leader in that connection of the Chicago Federation of Labor. This was the impulse that spurred him on in the work that cost his life at the very moment when his leadership seemed most to be needed.

The trend of Mr. Lloyd's economic philosophy was socialistic. That was the direction in which his democratic impulses carried him, although he was not especially identified with organizations or movements distinctively allied with or representing socialism. But in whatever light socialism may be regarded, no one could know Mr. Lloyd with any degree of intimacy without realizing that the goal he sought, whether or not the direction he took seemed to others mistaken, was a democratic state of society. He was one of those rare men who