

THE
**SINGLE TAX
REVIEW**

A Record of the Progress of Single
Tax and Tax Reform Through-
out the World



AUTUMN NUMBER

October 15th, 1904. Vol. 4, No. 2

Yearly Subscription, \$1. Single Copies, 25 cts.

PUBLISHED AT NO. 11 FRANKFORT STREET

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW,
JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor and Publisher.



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS	<i>Elmer E. Warner</i>	1
STORY OF THE HYATTSVILLE EXPERIMENT	<i>Jackson H. Ralston</i>	5
STORY OF THE DELAWARE CAMPAIGN	<i>Harold Sudell</i>	8
REVOLUTION vs. EVOLUTION	<i>L. P. Custer</i>	11
FIGHTING WITH ORMUZD	<i>James Love</i>	17
THE HENRY GEORGE BIRTHDAY ANNIVERSARY IN CINCINNATI		25
PUBLISHERS NOTES AND EDITORIALS		33-34
OLIVER T. TROWBRIDGE		34
TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE		35
NEWS—DOMESTIC		39
PROPOSED SINGLE TAX COLONY NEAR NEW YORK CITY		44
NEWS—FOREIGN		47
LAND VALUES OF NEW YORK	<i>A. C. Pleydell</i>	50
THOMPSON'S POINT	<i>J. F. Cowern</i>	51
ENFORCED PEACE	<i>Jane Dearborn Mills</i>	52
HOW I BECAME A SINGLE TAXER	<i>W. A. Douglass</i>	54
COMMUNICATIONS		56
PERSONALS		57
BOOK REVIEWS		58



THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

A Record of the Progress of Single Tax and Tax Reform
Throughout the World.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS.

(For the Review.)

By ELMER E. WARNER.

Question. Mr. A saves his earnings as a mechanic for 30 years, investing in land. Mr. B saves his for the same time and invests in saloons. A is worth \$6,000 and B worth \$50,000. Why should the community at a single stroke take away A's small income from his \$6,000 and add to B's large income from his \$50,000? Is the making of drunkards an industry we should encourage by freeing it from taxation? Is the owning of land such a crime that we should take without compensation a whole life's savings?

Answer. The question is not explicit in regard to the term "saloon" and dealing simply with surplus wealth does not at all indicate, if its presumptions are correct, the general effect of the Single Tax on the earnings and future prosperity of A and B.

In direct answer to the question as stated it is *not* just to confiscate A's earnings, nor is it necessarily involved in the adoption of the Single Tax. The real question at issue is, not the effect of the Single Tax on present accumulations of wealth, but its influence on future production and distribution; this demonstrated, and the introduction justified, the minimizing of local and temporary injustices involved in its adoption is next in order.

Question. Farmers are the worst paid workers as a class that we have in America. The great bulk of the life savings of farmers is in their land. Are stock gambling and brothel-keeping industries to be encouraged by freedom from taxation while farming is to be punished as the worst of crimes, deserving practically complete confiscation of their life savings?

Answer. A large part of the farms in this country are not worth the cost of improvements on them.

This follows as a logical sequence from the first statement made in the question. In the general depreciation improvements more or less transportable have not fallen as rapidly as bare land. Deduct a fair price (market price) for house, barns, implements, stock, fences etc., and what is left?—nothing in most cases. You have one hundred acres of average land in northern New Jersey but no improvements, not even fences. Find a tenant who will pay you any amount of rent for it—anything like the amount now paid in taxes direct and indirect on improved farms of the same size, and this question will deserve more consideration. The fact is that economic rent on unimproved farm land has almost disappeared and the abolition of all other taxes with adoption of S. T. is all in the farmer's favor.

Question. Some business men may try to found a new city or open a new

addition to an old one. Hundreds spend their earnings on lots. It is found that the cost of sewerage is too great to make it available or that the water supply is unwholesome and the whole experiment is a failure. In another region a similar experiment is tried and is successful. The hundreds whose earnings were invested here doubled their money in a few years. If it is right for the community to confiscate the property of the hundreds of investors of the successful experiment why should it not also be right for the community to restore the lost earnings of the investors of the experiment that failed? Where is the justice in confiscating all the successes and letting individuals take all the risks and losses?

Answer. The author of this question is evidently laboring under a delusion.

The State will not confiscate the property of the successful business men. No tax could be considered confiscatory except on evidence that it bore inequitably on individual tax payers or took more than was returned in substantial benefits. Those business men simply decide that a certain sum must be raised by taxation for public improvements, sewers, paving, flagging, etc., and that it may be most equitably assessed by appropriating the rental value of bare land.

This is not confiscation any more than an assessment based on lot frontage as at present, so far as the question indicates, but merely wise communal investment.

The assumption that under the Single Tax the State could abstract the ground rentals of a community without making any, or even a commensurate return is too grotesque to merit serious consideration.

It is even more absurd than if postulated of present systems of taxation, for the use of the unearned increment by the *community that creates it* is a fundamental tenet of Single Tax philosophy.

Therefore, since the Single Tax does not confiscate the earnings of the successful, there is no logic in its paying the losses of the foolish and unfortunate.

Question. Will not the capitalists who lease the land from the Government and build houses thereon compel the tenants to pay the taxes in rent just as they do now? Where then will the gain come in? If the Government refuses long leases, who will build houses?

Answer. Prof. Seligman in his monograph on "The Shifting and Incidence of taxation" shows very conclusively that the *occupier* of land would pay the Single Tax, in other words that economic rent could not be shifted. This paper of his is considered one of the ablest on this point and the writer in quite an extensive reading of economic literature has not seen the conclusion disputed.

The very statement of the question indicates a confusion of thought. It is not even assumed by Single Taxers that capitalists would be obliged to pay the taxes on land on which they built; for that reason, the question of shifting the tax is not a debatable one.

Capitalists building would get current returns for their investment of capital, and *wages* simply for collecting and handing over to the Government the ground rental assessed on the property as a whole.

They would not be salaried officials of the Government, but the law in its adjustments would award them something for collecting with their own rents the share due the Government. Capitalists generally will have precisely the same inducements to build that they now have in loaning from landholders, as is largely the case; to them it makes no difference whether they lease from Trinity corporation or the Government; nor is there any justifiable implication of a refusal of the Government to grant as long and favorable leases as at

present. Evidently there lurks in the mind of the questioner a vague notion that the Single Tax might in some way be shifted from rich to poor. And at the same time a very positive conviction that it would be confiscatory.

It is impossible for the writer to quite understand or to fully explain this paradox. For argumentative purposes it is merely necessary to indicate that these opinions are irreconcilable and cancel each other.

Question. Is it not speculation in land that spreads out a city? Is not the tendency always for human beings to huddle closely together? Would we not therefore have less healthy and more compact cities under Single Tax than at present?

Answer. The compactness of a city does not determine its healthfulness. The sanitary conditions secured by pure water, perfect sewage systems, inspection of buildings and foods all can be secured most cheaply and therefore sooner and more perfectly in a compact city; furthermore, there is not the slightest justification for the conclusion that a city under the Single Tax would be any more compact than its citizens thought best. Vacant land now held for private gain might be used for public benefit as parks. Suburban lands would be cheaper and probably more accessible than now, as speculation was prevented, and there would be the greatest encouragement to its occupancy.

Question. Who knows or has ever figured out the total value of land, exclusive of its improvements? Without such knowledge how can any one tell whether the Government could or could not be ran by the income from land values?

Answer. The revenues from ground rentals have been figured out repeatedly and approximate the present expenditures of Government. The matter is scarcely worth serious consideration at present, as Government expenditures are elastic, and the Single Tax can be remitted or supplemented by other taxes if found necessary.

Question. Is the title "Single Tax" any more than a dim and ignorant speculation about something that no one knows anything about, and that the probabilities seem to militate against?

Answer. The Single Tax is a dim and ignorant "speculation" with a great many advocates; but it is chiefly so among those who oppose it without reading its literature or having any comprehensive view on the general subject of taxation. It has been adopted progressively in New Zealand and in more modified forms in Australia; but although it is a live question in most civilized countries, it has not yet had a fair trial.

Question. Is there now, or has there ever been in the world such a thing as absolute ownership of land? Has not the Doctrine of Eminent Domain always to some extent prevailed?

Answer. No and yes.

Question. With qualified ownership of land—*i. e.*, land that the public can at any time seize for the public good by paying a fair value thereof, show us a single feature of injustice or wrong in such ownership?

Answer. The doctrine of eminent domain has always been held, but never fully enforced. Abstractly it demands that land in private hands should be put to its highest use. At present the State taxes heavily the man who puts up a building on his lot and benefits a community, while it partially exempts the man who allows his adjoining lot to lie unused and unimproved in the hope of profiting by the rise in value made by his neighbor. The Single Tax says to him, this lot is community capital, you must pay as much as it would let for, or relinquish it to those who will put it in productive use. It is merely a more complete application of the recognized right of eminent domain.

Question. In America all ownership of land has come from the community to the individual. Has the community no right to grant such qualified

ownership? If it has, the ownership is just and right, if it has not, then the Single Tax is as devoid of right. The community has no more right to assess a tax of the kind, than it has to give a title.

Answer. Yes! Ignoring moral considerations the community has a right to grant any title to land it thinks best, and to withdraw it at will. The right of the community to do what it deems best for itself at all times, is the only sound constitutional law and should be eternally supreme.

A man who builds factories under the Dingley tariff law, has absolutely no redress; if a Wilson bill ruins his business a few years later, he must take the risk. The man who buys land at present does likewise, and as a matter of judicial precedent has no more claim to special protection than the manufacturer.

Question. If rent causes poverty, why is it that where wages are high, rents are high, where wages are low, rents are low. And that in proportion to the rent paid by a community, its savings increase? Emigration is always away from regions of low rent to regions of high rent. Why is this so?

Answer. Wages are somewhat higher in proportion to purchasing power in centers of civilization because these places give the maximum efficiencies in an advancing civilization.

Emigration is generally toward high rent localities, because the immense relative growths of manufacturers and commerce over agriculture have created a labor demand in that direction. Furthermore, labor is always a little higher in new occupations than old; the quickest to adapt themselves gain a small advantage relative to the rest.

Savings are somewhat greater for the above reasons, and because the old standard of living still clings largely while earnings increase—witness German and Italian emigrants, etc. The demand for capital and conveniences for saving, banks, associations etc., might also be cited.

Some of the questions deal with injustices incident to the introduction of the Single Tax and do not touch the vital matter of its effects in full operation. They are made from the stand point of effect on present accumulations of wealth, and not from the central and all important one of effect on future production of wealth and the general well-being of mankind. The immediate effect of land holders in extreme cases is emphasized without regard to the equally direct effects on these same individuals as laborers and capitalists.

The chief difficulty in the mind of the questioner seems to lie in the lack of a comprehensive view of the effects of Single Tax, not on A & B relative to each other, but on the community as a whole. As a suggestion merely the following brief outline is annexed:

1st. All other forms of taxation being abolished, the present land tenant class will only pay taxes as ground rent on space occupied: This they now pay to private landlords in addition to a great variety of indirect taxes which aggregate about as much more:

1st. Effect then—tenant tax reduced about one half.

Considering next the present small land holders and occupiers; it is obvious that their tax would be increased or decreased just as the rental value of the land they occupied exceeded or fell below their present aggregate tax payments. Statistics showing the proportion between the rental value of land owned by occupiers and their present aggregate taxation are not available, but their position obviously is midway between the landlord who now collects ground rental and the tenants who pay them. The tenants tax will be lower, the small occupiers tax will be about the same as the present on the average. Higher where land values are rising, lower where they are falling. The large land holders will pay more than they do now.

This of course is only a hypothesis, you say; but it proceeds from a

demonstrable proposition, *viz.*: that the tenant classes which by last census number six and a half million families out of twelve and a half in U. S. will pay but about half their present amount of tax.

This deficit, assuming equal gross collections, must be made up between present small and large land owning classes with a fair presumption, nay conclusive proof, that the large landholder would pay the most of it. This is the ante-bellum statement of the case.

From the standpoint of the Single Tax the community as a whole pays the tax without a possibility of estimating the individual contribution exactly, as in fact we cannot now. Occupiers of land simply turn over to the state the unearned increment that collects under their feet, in other words, on the land used.

The Single Tax furnishes an ideal, unevadeable and unshiftable contribution to the needs of the state.

Under the present conditions the rich contribute voluntarily and through private organization to the support of the unemployed and indigent in addition to their Government contribution. Under the Single Tax it is believed that this would be unnecessary. Hampering taxes make paupers and necessitate charity in the first case. Relief from taxation and greater freedom and opportunity for employment make taxation unnecessary in the second. In the very extreme individualistic view, it is merely the difference between private and public, covert and acknowledged socialism, for the means of the strong must be used to aid the helpless in the Christian and common view. This is the condition, not the theory.

In conclusion the writer would like to put a few plain questions :

1st. Did you ever study systems of taxation?

2nd. Have you discovered any law or laws which indicate its evolutionary directions?

3rd. In what general direction should changes in taxation move, and what immediate modification would you suggest?

4th. The practice of taxing evils, in order to minimize them, especially the production and consumption of alcoholic beverages, is experientially established in every civilized country. Do you think this is all a mistake, or do you endorse the principle?

5th. Is not the holding of land of communal utility, coal fields, water frontages, Broadway lots, out of productive use, an evil?

6th. Do you not think a tax which would make it unprofitable to hold land out of use a wise tax from the standpoint of the public good and a natural extension of the principle of taxing evils, in order to minimize or destroy them, which is theoretically the basis of the liquor and excise tax?



THE STORY OF THE HYATTSVILLE, MD., SINGLE TAX EXPERIMENT.

(For the Review.)

By JACKSON H. RALSTON.

The most striking result in the United States of the recent development of the Single Tax idea in political matters, although operating in a very circumscribed area, was given at Hyattsville, Maryland, in the summer of 1892. This town is a suburb of Washington, located in the State of Maryland a short distance beyond the District of Columbia line. In the summer of 1892, a

majority of the Board of Commissioners of the town, consisting of Jackson S. Ralston, Charles H. Long and George H. Britt, being Single Taxers, determined to adopt for town purposes the principles of the Single Tax and accordingly struck from the assessment rolls all taxes on improvements. Prior to that time, taxation on personal property had been abandoned by common consent and the taxes had been levied on land and improvements, assessed separately. The then rate of taxation was very low, being fifteen cents per hundred dollars, but, with the omission of taxes on improvements, the rate was raised to twenty-five cents per hundred dollars in order to realize the same or a little larger revenue.

This measure was the legitimate result of a discussion running over several years, inaugurated in the first place by a proposition which came before the town for the issuance of bonds to make street improvements. Mr. Ralston and his associates then insisted that, if such bonds were to be issued, the taxes to pay the principal and interest thereon should be levied exclusively on land values, as the money expended could only maintain and increase them and could have no possible relation to the values of improvements.

The inauguration of the Single Tax system was not allowed to go unchallenged. Immediately the larger land holders of the town started a lively agitation. They represented to each other and to their fellow citizens that the measure adopted by the Board of Commissioners was anarchistic in the extreme and meant the confiscation of their property. The immediate result of these representations was the calling of an excited public meeting, at which only the opponents were heard, and which resulted in the passage of a resolution calling upon the majority of the Board of Commissioners to reverse the action taken or to resign. The majority had not acted without a thorough comprehension of the step taken and believed themselves actuated by a desire to benefit the larger number of their fellow citizens and in a true sense to benefit all, even the complaining land holders. As a consequence, the Commissioners themselves called a meeting and explained in the fullest detail the purpose and effect of their action and their explanation met with the apparent approval of the larger number present. But the complainants were not yet satisfied and about the same time and, in fact, before the meeting called by the Commissioners, they appealed to the Circuit Court of the County for the issuance of a writ of mandamus, directing the Commissioners to reform their levy and to include in their assessment personal property and improvements. Upon the cause being heard in the Circuit Court, the Judge decided contrary to the contentions of the petitioners, that the Commissioners were authorized by law to make exactly the levy they did make, and that their action was constitutional. This opinion was fortified by numerous citations from Maryland authorities and from it an appeal was taken. Without for the moment discussing the future course of the litigation, it may be said that, pending it, all those who were interested in opposing the enforcement of the Single Tax system, determined to pay no taxes under it, but the Commissioners proceeded in the orderly methods provided by law, and when the day arrived for the charging of interest upon the taxes they had levied, they notified all delinquents that such interest would be enforced and many who had been in arrears then paid their taxes. Later, when the moment therefor was reached, this was followed up by a further notification that the Commissioners would proceed to enforce the collection of taxes by levy and, upon this announcement, practically all taxes in arrears were paid.

Later the case was brought before the Court of Appeals of the State and that body decided that the action of the petitioners was wrongfully brought and that they should have proceeded by way of injunction instead of mandamus, and therefore dismissed their application. Not content with this, however,

which was all it would appear the Court was authorized to do, it proceeded to declare that the Commissioners were not authorized by the town charter to exempt personal property and improvements from taxation and, furthermore, that such action on their part was unconstitutional. Notwithstanding this decision, the Court of Appeals in another case involving a different question and coming before it three years later held that no provision of the Constitution, except some in certain particulars referring to the City of Baltimore, had any relation whatsoever to municipalities, which were, it declared, entirely subject to legislative disposition, thereby sustaining the principle contention of the Commissioners, and in effect, though not in words, reversing the decision in the Hyattsville single tax case.

The net result, however, of the local contest was in fact to reverse the action of the Board of Commissioners and to render impossible any further attempt to enforce the single tax system.

The interesting point of the whole experiment must be its operation and effect, rather than the details already given. When it was inaugurated, one of its leading opponents said, "We must get rid of this single tax. If we do not kill it now, we never will be free from it", as strong a tribute as possible could be made, for if it were right and just in its operation, they could never hope to escape from it, while, if it had been unjust, its speedy repeal was to be anticipated. Furthermore, the more farsighted ones feared that if it worked to the satisfaction of the majority in town affairs, it would most likely be applied to county and perhaps ultimately to the state taxation. The town rate of taxation was so small that any of them could have afforded well to submit to it, but its extension would have been burdensome to those who obtained unjust advantages from the present system of taxation.

Before the Single Tax was adopted, some of the large land owners maintained that if it were enforced, no poor man could ever hope to retain land, because taxes would be too large for them to be able to meet them. This contention was ridiculous, and it received no support after the adoption of the system, for immediately thereafter, the large owners said that they could not afford to hold their lands under it and would be compelled to dispose of them at any price, a result which would have materially increased the number of small owners whose only object would have been to put their land to its best use.

Many striking illustrations could be given of the manner in which the operations of the Single Tax changed the incidence of taxation. The largest individual speculative land holder paid in taxes the year preceding the adoption of the system about One Hundred Dollars. Under the Single Tax he contributed to the land revenues in round numbers One Hundred and Sixty Dollars. At the same time, practically every holder of improved lands found his taxes lessened, notwithstanding the increase in the rate of taxation and, as these smaller owners, together with others who hoped at some time to possess homes of their own, constituted the large majority of the voters of the town, it seemed fair to expect that the Single Tax, once adopted, would never be abandoned.

The whole contest was marked on the part of the advocates of the old system of taxation with a degree of bitterness hard to be realized by one who took no part in the struggle and which illustrated how thoroughly the opponents of the measure realized its far-reaching consequences.

It afforded new proof of the fact that those who hold unjust advantages will not willingly yield them.

Another fact was demonstrated, if demonstration were needed, and that is that land holders possess an interest far beyond that which pertains to numbers merely. They possess influence, and may never be expected to forego the advantages of wealth and incidental social, business and political power. Many of the landless, even, whose interests were not at all those of land

holders, found themselves indebted to land holders for employment or favor and in such a position that they were not free agents, even, to act for their own benefit. Incidentally we may observe that if a struggle is to come over the single tax, the sooner we reach it the better in the interests of order and success. With the steady drifting of lands into the hands of relatively a smaller number comes a degree of dependence for the right to live of a majority upon a minority, which more than counterbalances the growing difference in relative numbers.

If one lesson more than another is to be deduced from our experience in Hyattsville, it is that the line of natural growth of Single Tax thought and work is in municipalities, and from municipalities to the counties and, long afterwards, to the state and nation.



THE STORY OF THE DELAWARE CAMPAIGN.

(For the Review)

By HAROLD SUDELL.

The Winter of 1894-5, found Single Taxers in a discouraged frame of mind. A long fight for Free Trade had ended in the emasculated Wilson Bill, and the '94 election had gone so overwhelmingly Republican as to forbid hopes of any early revival of Free Trade agitation.

And so, when, in the Spring of '95, Jackson H. Ralston suggested an attempt to introduce the Single Tax by concentrating all work on one State, it met with ready acceptance. He named Delaware as the best place, his main reason being that the State was small; was very evenly balanced politically; was within easy reach of a number of large cities where there were strong Single Tax Clubs; its Constitution contained nothing inimical to Single Tax, and, in and around Wilmington, the State's largest city, there had already been some work done.

A discussion as to the best State ensued, but while this was still being argued, the Philadelphia Single Tax Society decided to inaugurate a Delaware campaign, and on Saturday, June 15th, it sent a number of speakers into Delaware, and that evening open-air meetings were held in Wilmington and a number of adjacent towns.

As soon as it became known that the campaign had begun, contributions commenced to come in, and a little later the National Committee appointed a committee of three, the late A. H. Stephenson, of Philadelphia, Jackson H. Ralston, of Hyattsville, Md., and Harold Sudell, of New Castle, Del., to supervise the campaign. The first named was elected Chairman and the last Treasurer of the Committee. They appointed Frank Stephens, of Philadelphia, to take charge of the meetings, &c., and under his direction a wonderfully active campaign was soon in progress. As far as money and men would allow, the whole State was covered every Saturday, the speakers distributing literature in the afternoon and holding meetings in the evening. In the northern end of the State, which was more easily reached, meetings were also held through the week. Later in the Summer, Dr. Longstreet, with a large tent, was brought on from Texas and toured the State.

At first the work was done almost exclusively by outsiders, but, as the campaign progressed, some very efficient speakers developed among the local men, and this greatly aided the work.

A vast amount of literature was put out—indeed the State was, as Frank Stephens phrased it, “ploughed with a book and sown with the seed of a great

thought." One of the most efficient agencies was *Justice*, a Single Tax weekly paper, published at first in Philadelphia and later in Wilmington, some thousands of copies being distributed every week.

When the weather grew too cold for out-door work, in-door meetings were begun and a series of Sunday evening meetings held in the Wilmington Opera House during the Winter were particularly successful. The opening meeting was addressed by Henry George, and a threat made by the City Solicitor to have him arrested for talking politics on Sunday, drew him an immense house and hundreds were turned away, being unable to obtain admittance. But, although police officers were present at the meeting, no such attempt was made. Following him, at succeeding meetings, came such men as McGlynn, Maguire, Garrison, Simpson, Shearman, Hearn, Post and Crosby.

With the Spring of '96, the out-door work was taken up with redoubled vigor. As travelling expenses to the lower Counties were high, paid workers were stationed in a number of the principal towns there, and on foot, on bicycles, or in carriages, they systematically worked the surrounding country, doing hand to hand work, distributing literature and holding meetings in the villages. At one time three tents were afield.

And the results appeared to be very gratifying. A large number of converts had been made and at the Democratic primaries, held during the Summer, in several instances, Single Tax candidates beat the regular Democratic nominees. From all points we got the same cheering news of numerous conversions to the Single Tax belief.

But troubles appeared. As members of the Legislature and of a constitutional convention to draw up a new State Constitution were to be elected at the November election, political action became necessary. The Campaign Committee were strongly persuaded that it was not wise to form an independent party and that our political action should be confined to indorsing those candidates of either party who would pledge themselves to support Single Tax measures. But a large number of local men, deluded by our rapidly increasing numbers into thinking they could beat both the Democratic and Republican parties, were insistent that a Single Tax party should be organized. About mid-summer a conference was called to decide on a plan of action and the attendance was gratifyingly large. A very decided difference of opinion, however, developed, and an unfortunate attempt to debar any but local men from taking part in the discussion disgusted a number of those present and they left the hall, refusing to take any further part in the campaign. It was finally decided to form a Single Tax party, putting on the Legislature and Constitutional Convention tickets those candidates of either party who would give the required pledges.

Our recruits had come mostly from the Democratic party and some of the Democratic politicians decided to try and stop our growth by having our speakers arrested on the charge of disorderly conduct. The first attempt was made in Middletown, but it was thwarted by the Justice of the Peace, before whom the prisoner was taken, declaring that he had done nothing wrong and discharging him from custody. But in Dover, the capital of the State, a more bigoted Justice was found and two speakers arrested there were sentenced by him, on their refusal to pay a fine, to thirty days' imprisonment. The Governor's attention being called to this, he denounced the arrests as an outrage and released the prisoners by granting them a pardon. But further arrests followed and the Governor, presumably yielding to political pressure, took no further action. This went on until about thirty prisoners were in jail and then the town authorities, dismayed by the cost the town was being put to, ceased the arrests and mob law was threatened. Preparations had been made for another meeting, but the local men, apprehensive that an outbreak

would occur in which our men must inevitably suffer, entreated that meetings be stopped, which was done. Meanwhile, legal proceedings looking to the release of the prisoners had been begun and these finally terminated, after some of the men had served out their term, in our favor (on technicalities however, for the question of our right to hold meetings could not be brought up) and the remainder of the prisoners were freed.

But the legal proceedings were costly and the concentration of energy in Dover had necessarily caused a slackening of effort elsewhere. And, while this was going on, the political tide was rising, and an unusually bitter fight was developing. The nomination of Mr. Bryan brought the money question strongly to the front, and, as time went on, it became increasingly difficult to interest people in questions other than those which were being nationally discussed.

A State Convention of the Single Tax party was held and a full ticket was nominated, the Democratic Presidential Electors being endorsed, and headed the ticket. This endorsement of Mr. Bryan lost us some of our followers, but it was undoubtedly the wish of a very large majority of the party.

But in spite of this, when the National campaign reached its height, our weaker-kneed converts began to fall away and to return to their old parties, on the plea that they could not afford, with National issues so important, to vote a third party ticket.

This had been foretold by one of the Republican politicians early in the Summer. He said to the writer: "I have been very much surprised to find what a large number of converts you have made, especially among the more intelligent of the working classes. If the election were held now, you would poll a vote that would amaze the politicians. But you will not be able to hold them until after election, for when the regular political parties begin their work, they will pull away from you, back into their old parties, at least three-fourths of your present followers."

And so it proved. When the election returns were in, the Single Tax ticket had polled a little short of 1,500 votes in a total of about 38,000.

This was a great disappointment, not only to the local men, but to the outsiders who had contributed so liberally to keep the campaign moving. About \$25,000 had been spent and the results did not seem commensurate with the expenditure and the work which had been done.

The effect of this was felt at once in an almost immediate and total cessation of contributions, and we were compelled to carry on the work on a very much smaller scale.

The Legislature, when it met, rejected all the Single Tax measures which were introduced, and to make matters worse the Constitutional Convention inserted in the new Constitution, in its article on Taxation, a clause, which was specifically meant to make it impossible to introduce the Single Tax into Delaware, without first changing the Constitution, a difficult thing to do. This clause directed that in all assessments of real estate, both land values and improvements, must be assessed. But this was loosely worded, for assessing and taxing are two separate and distinct functions, and it is the opinion of leading lawyers that it can be easily circumvented.

The local men, with some little outside assistance, kept the campaign going and the party retained its place on the ballot for several elections, but with a steadily decreasing vote, and this was finally abandoned. The work since then has been exclusively educational.

But, although political work seems to have waned, the result of past work is becoming apparent in the gradual change of public opinion. A separate Assessment Bill, separating absolutely improvements and land values (necessary under the Constitution as a preliminary to the Single Tax, and a measure

which would furnish most valuable arguments in its favor, particularly with the farmers,) has twice passed the lower House, and the second time it received a majority of the vote cast in the Senate, but lacked one vote of the needed majority of the whole body. Two more votes could have been secured for it had we had the money to put some one in Dover to lobby for the Bill, so it failed for the lack of a trifling sum. In the last Legislature, a "local option in Taxation" Bill passed the lower House, but was defeated in the Senate. The Democratic State platforms, year by year, have been broadening on the question of taxation, and this year's is notably good, being as follows:

"We favor abolishing all State taxes on merchants and manufacturers and similar licenses, and abolishing the local taxes on the live stock of farmers, and we declare our desire to be that our representatives in the Legislature shall enact suitable Statutes to this effect. We favor a permanent system of registration, and the abolishing of the registration fee of \$1.00 as a prerequisite to voting."

Bills designed to do these things have, in the past, been introduced in the Legislature by Single Taxers, and have been defeated. The fact that the Democrats are now taking them up is an evidence that the seed sown is germinating.

And the future seems hopeful. One of the recent converts is Francis I. duPont, a member of the well known family of Delaware powder makers. He has instilled into the work renewed vigor, and is now carrying on in Wilmington a very active campaign along the lines of the Initiative and Referendum. Under his guidance some fruits, in the shape of enactments which will make the Single Tax a possibility, on a small scale at least, should soon be reaped, for there is in the State a strong underlying Single Tax sentiment which we have not yet been able to avail ourselves of.

And it is the opinion of the writer, that Mr. Ralston made no mistake when he pointed to Delaware as being the shortest pathway to the Single Tax. But we underestimated the difficulties in the way and expected a too early victory. Only those who participated actively in the campaign can know the intense bitterness of the opposition we had to face. But this is gradually weakening, and when success does come (as come it will) we shall know that we were too easily discouraged by seeming failure, and that active work was stopped too soon.



REVOLUTION vs. EVOLUTION.

Karl Marx Socialism or Henry George's Single Tax—Which?

(For the Review.)

By L. P. CUSTER.

Few students of human progress but will agree that State Socialism in politics, with its declared revolutionary programme, is a menace to social order and renders insecure popular rights. We may differ from one another on the soundness or unsoundness of philosophical socialism, but when we look back over the pages of history and see how all violent revolutions have been brought on by political intrigue and strife, we know beyond cavil that, if the present day socialist party gains sufficient strength to alarm property interests and those in control of governmental affairs, those whose interests are thus affected will not hesitate to set in motion agencies for the thwarting of such a movement without regard to constitutional mandate or popular rights. Such a state

of affairs means violence, sanguinary and merciless, and the probable reorganization of our civil institutions under a more drastic system, with individual rights greatly abridged. The leaders of the Marx school of socialism must be aware of the danger of projecting such a revolutionary programme into the political field, and it behooves Single Taxers, who, of all others, are better equipped to meet the socialist party agitation, to be alert in laying bare the dangers these men would lead the people into, and to set forth the Single Tax programme as better calculated to accomplish lasting results, without disturbing the peaceful growth and expansion of popular institutions.

The Single Taxers are the conservators of evolutionary progress, accepting any measure of reform offered, no matter how slight, if it is founded on the principle of justice to all and privileges to none. We would take a step at a time, rather than attempt the overthrow of the present established order by hurried processes, peacefully or otherwise, even if it were possible. Some people, ignorant of scientific economics, call US socialists, but they mistake epithet for argument.

The followers of Henry George are not socialists, at least those who comprehend the meaning of the George philosophy are not. There are those among us who believe that the Single Tax will ultimately lead to a state of voluntary co-operative production and exchange, but we are not attempting to build on any such theoretical possibility, but are content to let the future take care of itself, trusting we may be able to make progress with the matters in hand, *i. e.*, the bringing about of a general knowledge of the iniquity embodied in the present system of land tenure and the bearing of taxation thereupon, with some measure of advance for the better, all along the line.

That socialism means revolution, the utterances of those who are its recognized exponents can be quoted to prove. For instance, E. T. Behrens, candidate for Governor of Missouri on the Socialist ticket, in his letter of acceptance, published in the *Appeal to Reason* of recent date, says: "What differentiates the Socialist party from all other existing political parties is its revolutionary class character. Its mission is the overthrow of capitalistic class rule, the enthronement of labor, and to make the workers the rulers of their own destiny."

A. M. Simons, Editor of the *International Socialist Review*, an exponent of the Marx cult, of recognized standing, says, ("Philosophy of Socialism," page 21,) "Let us now in one sentence recapitulate the philosophy we have been discussing: Our present society is to be transformed through a class-conscious revolt of the workers having as its object the capture of the machinery of social control that the productive forces of society may collectively organize in the interest of all producers.

"I would ask the reader to study the above sentence carefully. It is the fundamental position of the socialist philosophy."

Nowhere is it made manifest that socialism recognizes moral philosophy as one of the determining factors in shaping the destinies of men, much less THE determining factor. The Henry George school of thinkers build upon the moral law as the foundation of their economic philosophy.

Again we differ from the socialists in their theory of "class-consciousness" among the working people. Material conditions do not mark the line of differentiation. Mind action governs in shaping the course followed by the people, dividing them along the lines of thought rather than along lines of condition. In both these great divisions into which the masses are divided, we find all conditions of men, high and low, rich and poor, and of all degrees of mental make-up. A man may be personally upright, moral and agreeable, one who would not do an unjust act knowingly, yet who, in his political opinions is absolutely autocratic. I have in mind such an individual, a worker, with no property, except a few personal effects, yet who has unalterable convictions

that the rich and what he calls the intelligent, (intelligence being, in his mind, simply the complement of riches) should be in control of the government. This man is a splendid type of geniality, whose personality is noted for a remarkable sort of obsequiousness and amiability. On the other hand I know a capitalist—a number of them, who are the opposite of autocratic, men with large property interests who are ready to accept the truth wherever it may lead; men who have faith in the wisdom of all the people acting together as a civic whole, and who would be glad to see conditions so changed as to bring about a state of affairs wherein it might be said that no one was riding on other people's backs. But the privileged classes, backed by individuals like the propertyless fellow described above, will not agree to the transition, and the socialists propose to bring it about by capturing the government. What our sanguinary friends imagine the people in possession of the government are going to do when the changed conditions threaten, none of them tell out of school, but hosts of them have no hesitancy in saying they anticipate strife and bloodshed.

Reverting to the subject of classes, I know again some men who are immoral and degenerate in their habits, yet who are imbued with the very loftiest political principles. I have two such individuals in mind, and neither, in my judgment, would barter his vote in opposition to his ideas. The cases in point are but types. Yet those who constitute the leadership of the socialist movement harp on class-consciousness along industrial lines. There is no such line of demarkation, neither can one be forged by selfish appeals to the cupidity and material instinct of the workers of the world.

The longer I am in the movement for the overthrow of social privilege, the more certain I am that Henry George has outlined and made clear to those who are capable of thinking straight and who can reason analytically to some extent, the only true and natural method for bringing about the end desired. Socialism may be able to upset social order and disturb commercial and industrial progress, *and that is just what socialism as a distinctive political movement is calculated to do*, but it cannot eliminate privilege nor rectify the evils inherent in materialistic social life, for the reason that socialism, itself, is theoretically materialistic, and depends upon revolutionary procedure, peaceable or otherwise, for the installing of a better order of society.

Just government and the rights of individuals can be maintained only through the exercise of righteous principles based on Moral Philosophy, the root tenet of which shall be the Golden Rule.

The mental conditions of mankind are such as to render futile any attempt at the revolutionary overthrow of property rights, especially in the products of labor and exchange, and those who proclaim such a political purpose menace the best interests of our republican institutions.

Materialism is rampant to-day. It reaches down into the depths, where the "mudsill" of society wallows, and up into the palace of the plutocrat, and to talk of overthrowing it by pitting against it another form of materialism, is teaching of the most dangerous kind. The hearts of men must be changed before we can hope for such conditions as those pictured by either socialists or Single Taxers, but those of the latter persuasion only advocate evolutionary progress through reform measures acceptable from any source, without distinction as to party or political creed, the measure of such reform, whether far-reaching or but a step, being only an incident to the great purpose in view, namely, progress in bringing about justice in the conditions of social life, and full opportunity for every man to develop the best that is in him.

Man is a composite of physical and mental energies, controlled by two fundamental principles of human life, namely, Animal and Spiritual. The animal in man asserts itself instinctively, while the spiritual forces, latent in every human breast, must be summoned from without.

Materialism is selfishness in the concrete. It results from instinctive mind-action begetting the baser thoughts which lead to conduct likening the human to the less intelligent animals of the brute creation, the desire to live by the least expenditure of mental and physical exertion acting as the animating cause for the assumption of such marked characteristics as those peculiar to the hog, the wolf and the fox, characteristics as well defined in the human make-up as in those of the beasts named. Who ever saw a hog divide his provender with another hog, or refrain from taking possession of the whole supply if possible, even to the exclusion of the smaller and weaker? So it is with the human type allied to the porcine creature, the man who has never been "born again;" who has never had his latent spiritual qualities quickened and brought into play.

If one will but glance back over the few intervening years since the advent of our late lamented leader and his great work, how manifest it becomes that the latent spiritual forces of man are summoned from outward influences. George appealed to the spiritual in man, and the response has been marvellous. The work of breaking down the malevolent forces of brutishness in humanity is going on with accelerating momentum as the years roll by, and eventually social righteousness with all of its glorious possibilities must prevail.

Morals pertain to the individual. Morals cannot be pooled and a trust formed, nor can the quantity be multiplied by combination and co-operation. On the other hand those things which relate to the animal needs of man flourish best where men combine and co-operate. Production is multiplied and the earth gives up her bounty more liberally to two working together than to three working separately. From these facts we learn that there are two distinct spheres of action in which man finds his earthly being, neither of which must be ignored in working out the problems of civilization and the best forms for the preservation of the rights of the people.

Man is the keeper of his own conscience. He is born into the world with higher purposes than the mere catering to his physical wants. What those purposes are is an individual matter. Every soul has within its keeping the secret of higher ideals, and once the spiritual nature is awakened, the individual mind is in possession of all that is necessary to rise out of the brutal stage of human development and become possessed of a keener cognizance of his brothers' rights and a determination to conserve them. Socialism fails to recognize man's individual sphere of action. Everything is made subordinate to the one idea of collective control for the collective good. Collective control of the entire machinery of production and exchange means control of the individual worker and the loss of individuality. It would be swallowed up in one vast mechanism. This would circumscribe independence of thought and thwart initiative. Individuality can only flourish in an atmosphere of complete freedom, and individual freedom cannot be ensured under conditions wherein a central authority would have it in its power to forbid agitation for the righting of wrongs and curtailment of abuses. Socialism would render the power of the spiritual man over the animal propensities more difficult to exercise, for men would not be as free to appeal to the better natures and arouse them into activity. The outward influences over the dormant spiritual forces would be curtailed and materialistic savagery would become supreme.

In a few closing sentences, I desire to add a few reflections for those who may read this article, having had no previous knowledge of the philosophy of Single Tax. Henry George, early in life, saw the evils of land monopoly, particularly the monopoly of unused land, of which there are, even now, hundreds of millions of acres.

"Fenced 'round with paper against God and man," and are, to all intents and purposes, as Nature gave them, devoid of all improvements and wholly

vacant. The riddle which confronted George was how to preserve the rights of the people in unused lands against the gambling instincts of men who seize upon them for speculative purposes, holding them indefinitely and depriving the landless people of their right to its use save at a price fixed by a scarcity artificially created by a class who thus contrive to live without work. Mr. George solved the riddle when he wrote "Progress and Poverty." The solution was named the Single Tax, a handy expression which was adopted because nothing else could be hit upon that served the purpose so well. George's solution consisted of a simple proposition to shift taxation from all forms of property to site-values of land, taking cognizance of nothing in the form of improvements—in other words, the taxation of all land, improved and unimproved, according to its location value, making no distinction between two pieces of equal value, one of which should have a structure upon it, the other being vacant. This policy would be favorable to the people who invest money in building up a community by expenditure for labor and material for improvements, and hard on the speculator who stands idly and reaps where he has not sown, after others have built up and made the locality habitable. Taxes on land values must be paid by the holder of the title to the land, and a tax on such land, which would absorb a large percentage of all it was worth, would force the owner either to let go or put it to use by building. If he should choose to do this he might rent his property to another, who would pay the tax on the land value to the owner, but he would have to pay it into the public treasury. He could not increase the rent on this account, because there would be plenty of vacant land for tenants to flee to if oppression was attempted. Improvements being exempt, the owner could charge a fair rental for them, and keep it all, with no tax into the public treasury from this source. Everything would be cheaper because of the exemption from taxation of all forms of wealth, including personal property and money, and there would be lots of land that could be had free of charge. So it will be seen that the single tax cuts both ways for the benefit of those who are the bone and sinew of the country, but against the parasites, who without return gather so large a portion of the products of the labor of those who are its useful citizens. Mr. George never advanced this great idea as a panacea for industrial troubles alone. He advanced it for the purpose of showing the way the earth could be preserved against the encroachments of land sharks, and thus enable every soul to have its opportunity in the race of life. There are other things to be done—many things—but all else beside the single tax might be done, and the doing would avail but little; the owners of land would absorb most of the benefits, and little children would still fester and rot in noisome alleys and unclean hovels. The single tax is really not a tax. It is a reversion from the iniquitous system under which we now live and labor, to a method of meeting public expenses at once unique and far-reaching in its social consequences.

Land-values are social or collective values. Public expense is a social or collective expense. Where one individual lives in a wilderness with no one else near, there is no land value, nor are there any public expenses. But when others join him, and a little community is built up, the land thereabouts becomes more valuable, the social life concentrated at that point making the location more desirable. At the same time there will appear a necessity for some collective or community expenses; a public school house will have to be erected, a road cut through the forest, etc., and as the little community expands and assumes the pretensions of a village, then a town, and finally a city, both social values and social expenses will keep pace. All of these three—the community, the values and the expenses grow together, hence the only just and proper method would be the conversion of land values into public revenues paid into the public treasury to meet public and social wants. If our country had known

of and had adopted this method in its beginning there would now be ample unused soil for a home for every family in the United States, and vacant territory enough to house several hundred millions more. As the Government, at its inception, did not know enough to adopt such a policy, there is no other alternative than to seek a reversion from this great and overshadowing evil, and through a policy of moderation convince a large proportion of the intelligent and thoughtful people of the efficacy of our doctrine, and to gradually force it into the political policies of established organizations claiming to have the welfare of the people uppermost.

One final word: The Single Tax does not destroy land value. It simply destroys the power of a private person to set a price on land, and transfers the prerogative to the public taxing power. The privilege to speculate in land being thus eliminated from our commercial system, and production released from the burden of taxation now weighing upon it, would give enormous impetus to labor in every channel. It would increase the demand for everything produced by man, and wages would be increased to the equivalent of what the worker could produce for himself on land free to him, without the payment of taxes, or, in other words, on land having no taxable value. There are twenty square miles of vacant land inside the city limits of St. Louis to-day, or enough to supply a lot 50 feet front by 150 deep to 70,497 families and still leave 28,800,000 square feet, or more than a mile square, for streets, alleys, public institutions and play-grounds for the children.

Did our readers ever think of what a stupendous business scheme the power of land-ownership fosters? Why, as long ago as 1890, the United States Census gave the percentage of home-ownership in St. Louis as nineteen out of each one hundred families, and but fifteen free of debt. To-day, if the same proportion holds good, and it must be obvious that the percentage is less, more than 500,000 of the 650,000 people here are homeless and must pay rent, and in many cases to people who never see St. Louis, but who live in luxury and idleness on their rental incomes from the workers and business men who make St. Louis what it is.

ST. LOUIS, MO., Sept 30, 1904.



SENATOR HOAR'S ADVICE TO YOUNG MEN.

At the Vine Street Congregational Church, the pastor, Herbert S. Bigelow, made reference to the life of Senator Hoar as follows :

There would be some compensation in the death of the great man if the youth of the land would do him the reverence to reflect upon his advice : "Remember that there is something more to live for than money. Turn from the race after the world's goods, the mad fight for greed, to the love of higher things."

What shall a young man read? Senator Hoar said : "Read the lives of Thomas Jefferson, Washington, Lincoln, Wendell Phillips, John Bright, Henry George and other men that have stood for something and meant something."

In the larger sense of the term, Senator Hoar was a democrat. Senator Hanna was an ideal representation of the gross commercialism of the day. Senator Hoar was great enough to rise above party to plead for the oppressed. Senator Hanna, on one continent, like Cecil Rhodes on the other, was the idol of a generation that thinks only of new markets and more trade.

FIGHTING WITH ORMUZD.

(For the Review.)

By JAMES LOVE.

"Lo! here, now, in our civilized society, the old allegories still have a meaning, the old myths are still true * * * Ormuzd still fights against Ahriman—the Prince of Light against the Powers of Darkness. He who will hear, to him the clarions of the battle call."

Some years ago when living in Berkeley, the site of the University of California, a friendly instructor made it clear to me that I must entertain no hope of ever meeting the senior class in political economy, and that anyway I could not possibly affect their views for they had no views to affect. In that class of seventy members he was confident that not five were really interested in the study. Their main ambitions being to excel in athletics, pass examinations, and to secure their diplomas. Like Carlyle's "Auscultators, who were—Auscultators—who dressed and digested, and talked articulate words. But with small speculation in those eyes, that they did glare withal! Sense neither for the high nor the deep, nor for aught human or divine, save only the faintest sense of coming preferment"—my young economists were actuated less by a love for truth than by desire for position and income. For, in all professions, a *diploma* of general culture and a degree are usually a help, and in teaching almost a necessity. In looking over the list of professors attached to any university you will find that every mother's son of them has two or more letters affixed to his name. And thus it is—one set of teachers training its successors—that the studies mainly confined to the schools—metaphysics, ethics, political economy—make little or no progress, and tend to become formal, orthodox, incomprehensible.

Referring to the Scotch universities, Adam Smith, himself a university professor, though he says that they are the best seminaries of learning in Europe, also says "They are slow to adopt improvements and have sometimes become sanctuaries in which exploded systems and obsolete prejudices have found shelter and protection after they have been hunted out of every other corner of the world." And of "Degrees," which he thought always had been and always must be "mere pieces of quackery," he says "A degree can pretend to give security for nothing but the science of the graduate, and for that it can give but very slender security. While for his good sense and discretion—qualities not discoverable by an academic examination—it can give no security at all. * * * It is idle to suppose that the professors who have educated the candidates for degrees and who cannot reject them, except in a few cases, without prejudicing their ability as teachers quite as much in the public estimation as the capacity or industry of their pupils, should be very rigid in their examinations."

At that great seat of learning in Berkeley where one might suppose that intellectual superiority would be in highest esteem, the only monument on the grounds—a very prominent and a very costly one—is a bronze group erected to honor what has become transcendent in the schools—muscular superiority. But while directly exalting only the kickers of the ball, it indirectly makes conspicuous the professorial writers of the inscription—"The Prize of Superiority in Football Won by the University of California, 1898-1899." Surely the "Prize of Superiority" should be "Prize for Superiority." They have used the wrong preposition. Besides is not the inscription otherwise faulty in being too brief to be clear? To be grammatical and unequivocal, it seems to me that it should have been written—as almost any plain business man would write it

—“This Monument the Prize for Superiority in Foot-Ball Playing was Won by the University of California in the Contests of 1898 and 1899.”

The matter seems to be, and is small perhaps. Yet, in such a prominent and permanent lapidary work, we might reasonably expect professors to be as correct as the unlearned.

Again, the committee of one hundred—every one of whom sported a degree—appointed to select names for the Columbian Hall of Fame, after placing Washington first—to which there can be no dissent—placed Lincoln, Webster, Franklin, Grant and Marshall, ahead of Jefferson, who occupied only seventh place; and even then not by a unanimous vote.

Among the most useful members of every community are mechanics—stone masons, carpenters, printers, plumbers, machinists. Yet though it is only after several years of painstaking effort that they become skilled, degrees are never awarded to them. They are held in esteem not because they hold pieces of sheepskin scribbled over with Latin lines that they cannot read, but because they give *to a public competent to judge* daily evidence of skill.

At that Berkeley school physical athletics were all the go. Of foot ball, base ball and hammer hurling, there was enough. But for mental athletics—exercise to develop the thinking power to healthy action—there was a crying need. For the teaching of the physical sciences—zoology, geology, chemistry, mechanics, physics, astronomy, etc., as well as mathematics, languages and literature—the school was finely equipped, the professors enlightened and excellent work was done. But for the teaching of the immaterial, the spiritual, the mental—in the departments of sociology, psychology, political economy, metaphysics, ethics—studies confined mainly to universities—the professors, more fitted to misinterpret the writings of others than to *think* themselves, discoursed, it seemed to me, like men who “had eaten of the insane root that takes the reason prisoner,” permitting the place of thought to be usurped by books that they revered the more as they were the more incomprehensible. And that, after some months of vain struggle to comprehend them, leave young minds in state of conceited feebleness that to some degree is essential to teachers in these departments. So atrophied was thought in this Berkeley Alma Mater that political clubs sprung up there—Republicans, Democrats—dogmatic economists of the party stripe.

The department of “History and Political Science” (which included political economy) was headed by Prof. Bernard Moses, now in the Phillipines, Professor Bacon and Plehn being associates. Moses being credited with advanced ideas was disconcerted by them when he became a candidate for the Presidency, for nearly all the faculty fearing radical changes in the policy of the university and in its personel signed some sort of protest against his election, which defeated him. About the same time young Harold Bolce (now a writer of repute) having stated in the *Examiner* that Bacon as a Unitarian now repudiated the views he once was compelled to hold as a Congregational pastor, brought out from the professor a vigorous reply: “Allow me, my dear sir, without anger or any hostile feeling, to call your attention to the fact that this statement is a lie—not a simple every day sort of a lie, but one of a peculiarly outrageous and libelous character. That I was formerly a Congregational pastor is true; besides the rest of the statement the mildest tale of Sir John Mandeville would seem to shine with the glory of immortal truth,” etc. In the course of this letter he charged Mr. Bolce several times with lying, particularizing the kind of a liar he was. Not a calm composition nor Christian-like perhaps. But infinitely more decisive than his Economics.

It was only after a good deal of effort, and through the influence finally of Samuel E. Moffett of the *Examiner* staff, that Louis F. Post, then on the Coast, was invtted to address the economic classes. Judge Maguire came over, but

the faculty took no interest. And Professor Plehn, who said that he had paid little attention to the Single Tax theory and therefore was not prepared to express his opinion, was the only professor present. But up to '92 their library of fifty thousand volumes contained nothing by George, the only writer whose works were influencing thought. That which influenced the students not being thought, but authoritative text books—Hadley, Walker and the like, which wholly precluded thought. Adopting the same course by which his own mind had been clouded, Plehn was engaged in beclouding others. And now, twenty-five years after the appearance of "Progress and Poverty," California, like all other universities, goes on teaching Malthus as eternal truth—looking upon "Land" as a field only for agriculture, and accounting for social difficulties by pressure of population upon subsistence.

In teaching history as they do, only to bolster up the above current vulgar beliefs, they remind me of an amiable but illiterate friend who having possessed himself of Frost's three volume History of the World, Ancient, Medieval, Modern, and after much effort getting through the first, found, later on when he became a convert to Spiritualism, that he had at hand a convenient stock of names. So that when under influence (he fancied himself a medium) he could ask, "Is that you, Cambyses?" or, "If I mistake not I am talking to Sesostris?" And the ghostly Potentate invariably corroborated any allegation of the Seer.

But everywhere in what a muddle is "Economics." Professor Hadley having been chosen President of Yale, in his inaugural speech, October, 1899, said (to a great audience including sixty college presidents): "The *increase* of wealth in the *outside world* is a *perpetual* menace to old fashioned democratic equality." Really meaning, I suppose, not the *increase* of wealth but increasing inequality in the distribution of wealth. And by the expression, "Is a *perpetual* menace" really intending to say, "Is a *growing* menace." And the "outside world" is that an intimation of an inside world—a scholastic Flowery Kingdom—that excludes barbarians without degrees, and embraces in itself the wisdom of mankind? But what is to be expected of the Professor who in his "Economics" constantly uses such forms as "Every generation has a different ethical code of its own;" or, of one "Doing independent thinking on his own account;" or who in a paper on Herbert Spencer in the *New York Journal*, after commencing with "Nothing that I can say of Herbert Spencer will be new," unnecessarily and ungrammatically adds, "Or *any* different to what most *other* men would say." Inserting *any* before *different*, *other* before *men*, and using the preposition *to* instead of *from*. And who—less than a year after his old fashioned democratic inaugural—writes, under the head of "New Political Questions," "The days of legislative debate are numbered, if, indeed they are not already ended . . . the system of representative government has not proved successful. . . For the actual conduct of public business the legislature is at once an unwieldy and irresponsible body." He thinks that a colonial government by force and a great standing army are foregone conclusions, and that "The Economist who is at a disadvantage in advising a legislature, would be invaluable in advising an executive *on whom the nation relies for progress.*" Now—"However much he may desire the advice of economists, and even avail himself of their services, he is frequently bereft—because of legislatures—of the power to utilize them. But just how this change in governmental methods will come about none will venture to predict," &c. This announcement of a coming autocracy counseled by "Economists" has met with no dissent, I think, in scholastic circles. And one wonders how such men could have placed Jefferson even as high as seventh on an American roll of fame.

But, after all, talkative college presidents and economists are more impres-

sive to boys than to men. And as to President Hadley, I have an old book in my library the mere title of which, to him, might be instructive. It reads: "The Government of the Tongue," by the author of "The Whole Duty of Man."

Here breaks in my archaic but emphatic brother, "Oh, my heavens! Jimmy. Who the devil cares for your opinions? Here you are day after day—writing, writing, writing what men shall never read, and if they should, what none could comprehend. Admitting that George is, all in one, the Newton, Kepler, Copernicus of political economy, and that the Stygian Ptolemaics of Marshall, Bohm-Bawerk, Nicholson, Hadley and the rest are merely rubbish. What then? Surely you are a fool not to see that the world loves rubbish—will have rubbish—struggles, fights, dies for rubbish. What are all these priceless things so dear to men—these diamonds, rubies; emeralds; this gold and silver, ebony, ivory, dirty laces, old paintings, broken marbles, rusty bronzes, antique books; these huge life-embittering palaces, yachts, fast horses, titles, degrees, decorations—*et id omne genus*. Rubbish to the last item—all rubbish! The world cares for the useful—the comprehensible? Bah! The painters it worships are the perplexing and undefineable—the philosophers the unfathomable—the poets the mystical—and in political economy it shall ever grovel before equivocating oracles. The idea that a professor may not wish his discernment to be superior to the mob's! But shall eulogize a work, be it a painting or a political economy, that can be understood by all! From the very nature of things it must ever be that the highest praise shall be given to what no one—not even he who does the praising—can understand."

The feelings manifested and the adjectives used by a retired sea captain who happened along when my uncle Jimmy was propping up the rickety rottenness of a decrepit house: "No, sir! I want nothing to do with a damned old house nor a damned old ship," might not be amiss, I think, when applied to school economics.

The university had a great big chair of philosophy on which George H. Howison, M. A., LL.D., "Mills Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity" sat enthroned; supported, I think, by two associates and three instructors. To the young men Howison was awfully impressive, having as they thought—or rather believed—a firm grasp of what no one else, even from highest rung of tallest ladder, could even touch. He presided too over the Philosophic Union, where wondering youths and puzzled men and women listened to "Alumni"—divines, lawyers, professors—who assuming the confidence of intellectual athletes tossed about with greatest ease words and phrases of such specific gravity, so expressive of the very darkest depths of wisdom, that no lexicography, not even the Encyclopædic nor the ten-volume Century, had succeeded in lifting them to the surface and to light.

Professor Josiah Royce, then of Harvard, but whose great mind was a result of Berkeley training, and of whom Berkeley was very proud, had written a book upon "The Religious Aspect of Philosophy," which had caused what it would be mild to term a sensation, and upon this book the Philosophic Union based a whole course of monthly discussion from October, '94 to August, '95. The first two of these discussions, as announced in their circulars, were:

(1.) The asserted dependence of religion upon Idealism, and its satisfaction thereby; whether Professor Royce succeeds in establishing, first, the tenability of Idealism as a mere hypothesis postulated not on moral but on purely theoretical grounds, and secondly, its sufficiency both for science and religion. (Chapter X.) Friday, February 22nd, '95. Paper by H. M. Wright, '94. Discussion opened by Mr. G. H. Blake, '94, and Miss Mary L. Benton, Minn., '87.

(2.) Professor Royce's offered proof of Absolute Idealism by exhibiting

the sole ground of the Possibility of Error; whether it is really not another case of "Postulate;" whether it is otherwise invulnerable; whether its resulting Idealistic Monism is the only form of Idealism it can establish; and whether such Monism deserves the name of Absolute Idealism. (Chapter XI.) Friday, March 29th, '95. Paper by Mr. E. N. Henderson, '90. Discussion opened by Mr. J. E. Beard, '88, and Mr. E. B. McGilvary.

The ordinary subjects discussed in this Union were always announced in the local papers, as, for example, this:—"The Philosophic Union of the University will meet Friday evening, when Professor Howison will make the address of the evening, taking for his topic 'The Personality of the Eternal Cause. Its Meaning. Its Reality and the blessing upon it of the Theory of Evolution.'" And, a week later, this:—"Whether the Doctrine of Symbolic Conception, as legitimately interpretable in the light of Natural Selection, can really satisfy the Craving for a Final Cause when the latter is so stated as to exhibit its deepest sources in the human heart."

In the summer of '95, I think it was, I was presented with a ticket of admission to a lecture to be delivered in the Gymnasium by Professor Royce, then on a visit. The place was packed—many could not get in. I did, unfortunately. But I forced my way out, as I had to stand in a crowd, could not distinguish a word, and was apprehensive that the floors would give way. But from *The Examiner* of next morning I present these two bits:—

(1.) His idea of the Divine will: "The Divine will is that aspect of the Absolute expressed in the differentiated facts of the individualities of the world." And (2.) His idea of God: "An absolute experience transparently fulfilling a combined series of ideas." These "Ideas" read smoothly, and considering the great reputation of their author, most of us will say that they must have a *meaning*. But, without denying that they have, I declare that I can't discern it. And by re-arranging the words in either Idea, sentences can be formed that are fully as lucid, and if uttered by Joyce would be equally impressive. Thus, No. 2:

"A combined series of ideas transparently fulfilling an absolute experience."

"A transparent series of ideas absolutely fulfilling a combined experience."

"An absolute series of ideas fulfilling experience transparently combined."

"A transparently combined series of ideas absolutely fulfilling experience."

"A transparent experience combining an absolute series of fulfilled ideas."

I was not so well versed in metaphysics as I believed that I was in a kindred study, "Economics;" where finally having been made to see that the perplexities of early writers had of late days, in the hands of hair-splitting school-men, become a mere mystical jargon—a science without principles, based upon what they term "The selfish nature of man"—a social science that in place of the Divine sets up "The Unknowable" and rejects moral *law*—a pseudo science in which every vulgar economic belief and political fallacy may be found, defended in writings of "Economists," college branded Ph. D., D. D., or LL. D., my suspicions were aroused that all this "Discussion" was not really such, but merely words tossed back and forth as boys do balls. Words, only words—that infinite deal of nothing, of which Shakespeare speaks.

Yet not wholly useless, let us hope. For, upon the Homeopathic principle—*similia similibus curantur*—such discussions might, possibly, have therapeutic value when, in small doses, read to the insane.

The foregoing is provoked by the fact that these collegians, as if by concerted action, almost wholly ignore George. Not only are the teachers of economics silent, but also the teachers of ethics, logic, philosophy, history, psychology, even of *belles lettres* and rhetoric. "Truly," wrote Carlyle, "A thinking man is the worst enemy the Prince of Darkness can have; every time such a one announces himself, I doubt not, there runs a shudder through the nether empire; and new Emissaries are trained, with new tactics, to, if possible, entrap him, and hoodwink and handcuff him." Yet, before he was a menace, while he was only locally known, his splendid powers were recognized. In "A California Anthology," 1880, I find nine pieces from Henry George, evidently selected because of literary merit. But the compiler, Oscar T. Schuck, is without a degree, and includes in his collection nothing from himself. But since George's fame has become world-wide and perturbing to school-men, there has appeared Ingham's article, "Political Economy," in the Encyclopedia Britannica, and Palgrave's three-volume imperial octavo "Encyclopedia of Political Economy," both of which omit all mention of the man who, in a series of books unexampled for originality of thought, logical exactness and literary powers, refounded political economy. And on the ruins of "The Dismal Science," erected a true science radiant with hope. In looking over the multitude of books entitled Economics, Finance, Ethics, &c., you will find that the schools follow suit, the writers not mentioning George, or, if they do, showing at once that they have not read him, or that they have misapprehended him or falsify him. Seligman, of Columbia, is among the few who notice him, and in his "Finance" devotes some pages to the Single Tax, closing with: "We have studied the Single Tax and have seen that it is defective fiscally, politically, morally and economically." A lamentable *study*, which one would think might now cause the author himself upon reading it to become sick at the stomach. But his associate, Professor Clark, in his recently published "Distribution of Wealth," makes slight mention of George, while in the Cooper Union debate with Post he showed how well equipped he was by naively remarking in the midst of his argument: "I do not see what enormous difference it makes if I pay rent at all whether the man who comes to collect it is a government official or the agent of the owner. I will have to pay in any case." As if this was not the entire matter in dispute.

From a literary standpoint alone, surely nothing in any language is finer than the essay "Moses," or the opening chapter of "Progress and Poverty," or the appended chapter, "The Problem of Individual Life." And how exquisitely pictured is that development of a city, in Chapter II of Book IV; and the difference between the man and the animal, in Chapter II of Book II, and what a masterpiece is Captain Kidd's great-great-grandson in the "Land Question." Indeed there is not a chapter—hardly a page of anything Mr. George wrote that is not worthy of place in any collection of "Literature." Yet in the numerous great collections published since George became famous (outside the schools) there is either no notice or but a cursory notice of this *most* original and brilliant of men. Thus:

"The Library of American Literature." Eleven volumes. N. Y., 1889. George is in volume 10, about two pages, selected because the passage they thought embodied his land views. And is contrasted with four pages immediately following, from "Land and its Rent," by F. A. Walker, a writer painfully unliterary.

"The University of Literature." Twenty volumes. N. Y., 1896. Gives half a page to George, one-half being biography, the other a short extract from "Property in Land in the United States." While Horace Greeley has six pages, Gen. Grant twenty, and so on.

"International Library of Famous Literature." Twenty volumes. N. Y.,

1898. With selections from F. Marion Crawford, J. T. Trowbridge, Richard Harding Davis, Mary Mapes Dodge, etc., makes no mention of George.

"Library of the World's Best Literature." Thirty volumes. N. Y., 1898. George is not mentioned in the body of the book and there are no selections from him. But in volume 30, under head of Synopsis of Famous Books, one-half page is given to "Progress and Poverty."

"Chambers Encyclopedia of English Literature." Three volumes. Edinburgh, 1904. Omits all mention of Henry George, even in a Supplementary Notice of American Authors that includes Capt. Mahan, Eugene Field, Edward Bellamy, James Whitcomb Riley, Hamlin Garland, Kate Douglass Wiggin, F. P. Dunne, etc.

* * * * *

It may now, I think, be opportune to present some pertinent thoughts from Schopenhaur:

"Between professors and independent men of learning there has always been from of old a certain antagonism. The only thing in which the former agree is in trying to keep down a really eminent man if he should chance to show himself, as one who would be a common peril."

"That men are slow to recognize merit when it appears in their own age, proves that they do not understand or enjoy or really value the long acknowledged works of genius, which they honor only on the score of authority."

"It is obvious that if the ordinary, average man can easily recognize, and the rivals willingly acknowledge, the value of any performance, it will not stand very much above the capacity of either of them to achieve it for themselves."

"As a rule people discover a man to be worth listening to only after he is gone; their 'Hear! Hear!' resounds when the orator has left the platform."

"He who wishes to experience gratitude from his contemporaries, must adjust his pace to theirs. But great things are never produced in that way. And he who wants to do great things must direct his gaze to posterity, and in firm confidence elaborate his work for coming generations."



A NON-RECEPTIVE PUPIL.

After eight weeks of induction into the elements of political economy, she had, to the question, "What is the first principle of the science?" returned the absurd answer, "To do unto others as I would that they should do unto me."

"Tell me more of your mistakes?"

"I am almost ashamed," said Sissy. "But to-day Mr. McChoakumchild was explaining to us about Natural Prosperity."

"National, I think it must have been," observed Louisa.

"Yes, it was. But isn't it the same?" she timidly asked.

"You had better say National, as he said so."

"National Prosperity. And he said, Now, this school-room is a nation. And in this nation there are fifty millions of money. Isn't this a prosperous nation? Girl number twenty, isn't this a prosperous nation? and ain't you in a thriving State?"

"What did you say?" asked Louisa.

"Miss Louisa, I said I didn't know. I thought I could not know whether it

was a prosperous nation or not, and whether I was in a thriving State or not, unless I knew who had got the money, and whether any of it was mine. But that had nothing to do with it. It was not in the figures at all," said Sissy, wiping her eyes.

* * * * *

"Then Mr. McChoakumchild said here are the stutterings—"

"Statistics," said Louisa.

"Yes, Miss Louisa—they always remind me of stutterings, and this is another of my mistakes."

From "Hard Times"—CHARLES DICKENS.



ANNIVERSARY OF THE BIRTHDAY OF HENRY GEORGE IN CINCINNATI, AT THE VINE ST. CONGREGA- TIONAL CHURCH.

The sixty-fifth anniversary of the birthday of Henry George was commemorated in Cincinnati at the Vine Street Congregational Church, whose pastor is the well-known disciple of Henry George, Herbert S. Bigelow.

The spacious lecture-room of the church was filled with guests. Mr. Oscar C. Rasch was master of ceremonies. After the supper, addresses were made by Mr. Ameringer and Mr. Frank H. Howe, of Columbus, and Mr. J. M. Eilers and Herbert S. Bigelow. A very enjoyable feature of the occasion was the reading of letters from representative men and women of the movement, Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Tom L. Johnson, Robert Baker, Hamlin Garland, Ralph Hoyt, Warren Worth Bailey, John S. Crosby, J. J. Leggett, Lizzie Nye Northrop and Mrs. Sallie McLean, who was a close friend of Henry George. Some of these letters follow. A most gratifying communication was read, the author of which, Mr. Elliott H. Pendleton, is the proprietor and editor of a Cincinnati weekly, devoted to municipal reform. He is a Harvard man and is a prominent figure in the most influential society of the Queen City. In his letter to the chairman of the meeting he regretted his inability to be present and unreservedly endorsed the work of the Henry George men. He insisted that the ideas for which they stand are looked upon with favor by a great many men in the social and commercial world, and that those who are active in the work would be amazed to know the real progress their cause has made. This letter was a great source of encouragement to those present who realized its significance.

Mr. Bigelow's address—the main one of the evening—had for its title "The Bottom Question." He introduced many convincing facts and figures evidencing the growth of the movement in this and other countries.

It is the comment of those who hear Mr. Bigelow regularly that he never repeats and whether he is discussing biblical or economic subjects, every talk he gives is somehow given a new dress so that interest never lags and his hearers are becoming familiarized with the philosophy of Henry George without, perhaps, realizing it.

The general tone of the meeting was one of confidence and satisfaction that the ideas of "Progress and Poverty" should have gained so much in a quarter of a century. These birthday celebrations have been omitted in Cincinnati for several years but this one was such a conspicuous success that the sentiment is strong against missing any in the future.

Following is the address of F. H. Howe, of Columbus, Ohio:

SOCIAL PROGRESS.

When our good friend Kiefer got me to promise to come here and talk to you I was at a loss for a subject, and asked my friend MacLean to suggest one. He said "Progress," and it occurred to me that the subject was eminently proper on such an occasion as this in loving memory of our leader, and furthermore at a time when it seems to many of us as though our cause was making little or no progress. A few days later a copy of the *Public* for that week came in and I read in its columns an address on "Social Progress" delivered by Louis F. Post last June. This address treated the subject in Mr. Post's clear and convincing style, and at first I felt like selecting some other subject, but, on second thought concluded that nothing could be better than to center your attention upon Mr. Post's speech.

It is difficult to determine that which does the most to hasten or retard social progress. That which seems to be an advance may be a step backward, when all its effects are understood.

I well remember a lesson taught me when a boy; my father took me into a printing office where the men were setting type. My attention was attracted by one compositor who seemed to work with wonderful speed, every muscle in his body was in action. I remarked to my father that that man must set more type than any other in the shop. "Oh! no!" was the reply, "there is the fastest compositor." He pointed to a man who seemed to me the slowest one in the office, and then and there gave me a lesson on the conservation of energy that I never forgot, excepting for a short period when I had the "Howling Dervish" stage of the Single Tax fever.

So while we watch events as they transpire from day to day, and conclude that this or that marks rapid or slow development of social progress, the sensational and spectacular are apt to draw our attention, and we lose sight of more potent forces working steadily but quietly toward the same ends.

Then, again, many fail to consider the reactionary effects of those acts which abrogate rights that we have won in the past and thought secure. Mr. Post's address treats particularly on this feature of the Colorado miners trouble. He says: "Men who are in the whirlpool of social disturbance at any time in the world's history cannot know whether the world is at that time progressing or not. Living generations never know whether their social disturbances are carrying them forward or turning them backward. All they are positively aware of is the disturbance. They cannot be sure of its tendency; they can only infer.

"And their inferences are not always rational. When social motion lifts one's own interests to the top, he naturally fancies that the disturbance implies social progress. But if the social motion jostles him 'out of the swim,' he as naturally fancies that it implies social decadence. It is the same with one's pet reforms. If our own theories happen to be tossed up into popularity, we think the world is progressing because our cause seems to be winning. But if our theories happen to be submerged, our cause seems to be losing, and we think there is no God in Israel.

"Let us not be deceived by appearances. A sailing yacht is none the less truly moving forward though it turns from its course to beat against the wind. Driftwood floating down the Mississippi is just as surely on its way to the great southern gulf when it follows the river's current around a bend and toward the north as when it turns another bend and floats toward the south. The piston rod of a locomotive drives the iron horse forward as truly by its backward as by its forward stroke. And so with social phenomena. We must never be swift to infer from any backward social motion that the social movement is backward. Rational inferences depend upon further circumstances, upon wider observation, upon clearer thought.

“Considered simply in themselves, most of the social phenomena of our day discourage inferences of social progress.”

With the foregoing words as an introduction to his subject, Mr. Post goes into the history of the Colorado troubles.

“But make no pessimistic mistake. All this does not necessarily imply social decadence. The social motion is indeed backward, but the social movement of which it is part may nevertheless be forward. To me, at any rate, there is more to hope for in such great backward manifestations, discouraging and alarming though they be in themselves, than in all the little manifestations of progress which side-parties in politics and segregated reform associations are able to show. Notwithstanding that in themselves the great social phenomena of our time give little encouragement to infer social progress, those phenomena take on a different aspect when we consider them in the light of wider experience and closer observation.

“In the very excesses of social reaction I see some of the strongest assurances of social progress.”

Now in the light of Mr. Post's philosophy let us consider some past history in the Single Tax movement. When Henry George, believing Grover Cleveland to be sincere in his Free Trade professions, led Single Taxers to his support, only to their betrayal and disappointment, was it a step in advance or was it backward? Who can say? Seemingly the cause of Single Tax was checked for the time, and bitter was the disappointment.

When the Single Taxers throughout the whole country were led to contribute of their scant means, and many went down into benighted Delaware in the expectation of carrying that State for the Single Tax, many of us thought the adoption of our principles near at hand.

For one, I thought, we should carry the State, and with the Single Tax in operation in Delaware we should soon have it in Ohio. The defeat was very discouraging at the time; I am satisfied now that we gained more in defeat than victory would have brought us.

When Henry George was nominated for mayor of New York and made that memorable campaign which closed with that Christ like utterance, “I am for men,” many said that the Single Tax cause had died with Henry George. Single Taxers, of course, knew better, yet many of us felt that its progress had met with a serious check, but I doubt if the cause has ever taken so great a stride forward as it did in the days following the death of our great leader.

The Single Taxers turned again to the movement in the State of Washington. Then to Colorado, and lastly to the Tom Johnson campaign of a year ago in Ohio. Defeat everywhere. Was it failure? I say most emphatically, NO! And I believe that had we accomplished what we set out to do, in any one of the campaigns mentioned, that is, had we succeeded in our primary objects, the cause of Single Tax would not be as far advanced as it is to-day.

Don't reason from what I have said, that I would not favor any one of the campaigns mentioned, and that in the light of the present knowledge would not go into them again. I thought they were wise when projected and I think so now, and under the same circumstances would repeat them, but, what I do mean is that they were the best methods we could adopt at that time to further the cause and that we have advanced farther in defeat than we could have done in victory. Our mistakes were not mistakes as to methods, but in the motives and sentiments that actuated our fellow-men.

I am not discouraged as to the future, but, feel as Mr. Post says, that the “backward social motion” is like the piston rod of the engine, and that the social movement is forward.

It was my good fortune to hear the late John P. Altgeld deliver what is said to have been his greatest speech. It was at Columbus only a few weeks

before his death. In it he made use of the following words, with which I may fittingly conclude:

"I am not discouraged; things will right themselves. A pendulum swings one way and then another, but the steady pull of gravitation is toward the center of the earth. Any structure must be plumb if it is to endure. So it is with nations. Wrong may seem to triumph; right may seem to be defeated; but the gravitation is upward to the throne of God. Any political institution, if it is to endure, must be plumb with the line of justice."

Following are a few of the communications received and read. They are from those who have become eminent in the movement and are all of them sufficiently characteristic of the abilities and personal traits of the writers to hold the interest of our readers.

From William Lloyd Garrison.

To my regret, I cannot be with you September 2nd, to celebrate the 65th birthday of Henry George. As this year also marks the 25th anniversary of the publication of "Progress and Poverty," the occasion is most suggestive. It was an event whose magnitude the world is slowly recognizing.

I wish it were possible to express my personal indebtedness to the great reformer and his regenerating gospel. To me a new life was opened, faith in ultimate triumph of the moral law was strengthened, my intelligence was informed, my spirit exalted by contact with the author and his inspiring works.

Although born into the historic struggle for the abolition of American slavery, witnessing its trials and rejoicing in its accomplishment, I shall ever be grateful for the instrumentality that summoned me from the contemplation of past deeds and heroes to the recognition of a still wider conflict for human rights. Negro emancipation was but a step in the world-wide advance of individual freedom.

The Single Tax movement was the natural sequence of the overthrow of chattel slavery, an evolution necessarily delayed until the grosser form of bondage was destroyed.

I recall Henry George's expressed recognition of the fact and his gratitude to the abolitionists who had cleared the way and made his own propaganda a possibility. While the buying and selling of human beings was a legalized custom of the nation it was impossible to attract attention to that subtler form of slavery resulting from land monopoly.

I recall also an evidence of Henry George's breadth of vision in his modest disclaimer of belief that the Single Tax was the final work for humanity. I had quoted Wendell Phillips' remark deprecating ridicule of so-called spiritual manifestations. "They may be," said Mr. Phillips, "the refraction of some great truth yet below the horizon." Impressed by the spirit of the utterance, Mr. George, after a moments' reflection reverently said:—"I wonder what next great truth will appear above the horizon when the Single Tax has reached success!" The thought was parallel with his oft-quoted declaration; "I do not claim that the Single Tax is a panacea for social evils, but freedom is, and the Single Tax is in the line of freedom."

It is an inexpressible satisfaction to me that Tolstoy, who more than any living man speaks to the conscience of the world, has linked in his regard the memory of my father and of Henry George. They are the pre-eminent names spoken with veneration by the great Russian. The likeness of the two in moral vision was recognized by Tolstoy in his recent remark to Michael Davitt: "Henry George was right. Compensation to landlords is morally wrong. It is rewarding a class for the successful robbery of the public," precisely Garrison's view regarding the compensation of slaveholders.

The recent death of Mrs. George makes this double anniversary still more notable. No worker in the cause to which her husband gave his life, should fail to recognize her invaluable though obscure service. But for her devotion to his interests, her wifely and motherly care, her intelligent appreciation and encouragement, her unflinching moral support in days of trial, how different might have been the issue of the career we commemorate.

From Henry George, Jr.

Permit me to rejoice with you in your celebration of the twenty-fifth birthday of "Progress and Poverty." To all of our faith it must be a mile stone in the progress of real civilization, and the number that we can say are of our faith is quietly but steadily increasing, not alone in this country, but in every country where men realize that there is a social problem to solve. It has been well said that one man with an idea can make a revolution. As truly it may be said that one man with social justice in his heart can remake the world.

The event you celebrate awakens memories relative to the writing and publishing of "Progress and Poverty."

None but a very few among my father's friends, less than could be counted on the fingers of one hand, realized the importance of the book that he was at work on while he was in the act of writing. But his very intimate friend, Edward R. Taylor, the lawyer and poet, knew it, and his partner on the *Evening Post* up to a short time before, William M. Hinton, knew it. Professor William Swinton, holding the history chair in the University of California, also knew it. My father read what he wrote to these friends, and he tested his own conclusions and manner of presentation by their criticism. Later as the writing advanced he read parts of his manuscript to other friends in respect to special points, and thus before the book went into the printer's hands it had become strong as a fortress in all that its pages contained. So thoroughly had the subject been thought out, so fully had every contention been tested and buttressed that up to the day of his death my father would have been willing to lay down a copy of the book itself as his answer to the world of controversial literature "Progress and Poverty" had called forth.

Hinton knew that the book was to be of great importance to the world and he offered to set the type and make the plates for it, and to take his pay when some time in the indefinite future my father should have it to give.

Taylor very early realized the deep significance of the work, and indeed he was of the few men who early in the seventies, when my father published his pamphlet on "Our Land and Land Policy," urged the author to rewrite it into a larger, fuller and more ambitious work. Taylor had constant words of praise and encouragement for the author, and was ever ready with his purse to lend his friend money, but for which the work at critical moments must have stopped. Taylor had the warmest and deepest admiration for his friend's character, sympathies and genius, and later when the book was born my father testified to his appreciation of Taylor's companionship by presenting to him an autograph copy inscribed, in the blue ink used in writing "Progress and Poverty," with words of affectionate gratitude that to Taylor's posterity in times to come should be richer in worth than treasuries of gold and precious stones.

I have a vivid recollection of standing with my father out on the front door step of our residence at twilight just after the "Author's Edition" of "Progress and Poverty" had been printed and was being read with exclamations of astonishment and admiration by his larger circle of personal friends. As was his wont, my father gazed at the brightening stars and talked of their wonder

and glory. My thoughts were rather on the book, and I asked: "When do you expect to see your views accepted and the principles in the book realized?"

He was silent for a few moments, and was still gazing at the stars when he said, as if half musingly: "Perhaps it will not come in my day. But it will come, as surely as those stars are there. It would be a deep pleasure to be here when men generally realize the great truth, but it is a deep pleasure to have seen it myself and to have pointed to it. That is enough."

But he did live to see the world give heed to his words far more widely than had ever been pictured in his wildest dreams, and while he died feeling that the forces of darkness had grown to appalling proportions and would make the establishment of right principles and the cause of social justice very difficult in this country, yet he was sanguine of its victory in some part of the world before long, so widely had the ideas been scattered. He was certain that with its triumph in one important place it would soon sweep the world.

From Mrs. Sallie R. McLean.

Nothing short of or smaller than the World's Fair could by any possibility have kept me from being with the believers in Single Tax in Cincinnati, who will to-morrow assemble in honor of the anniversary of the birth of Henry George. A tinge of sadness comes at this year's return of the day, since so lately the one who was in every sense the helpmate of the greatest reformer, Henry George, his loved and loving wife, has been called to join him. In many instances as regards what great men owe to their wives, to their understanding and sympathy, we cannot know; we may have our opinions drawn from our knowledge of human nature, and the logical results of certain causes. But in the estimate of the influence of the home life of Henry George on the great work he so bravely and thoroughly accomplished, we can have no doubt whatever how important was the place filled by Mrs. George.

The crisis in the life of Henry George, the turning point which was to decide whether he would become "the prophet of San Francisco," or the esteemed, respectable, conservative editor of a daily newspaper, came when Senator John P. Jones, of Nevada, broke his promise to Henry George, and asked him to advocate in the *San Francisco Post* measures which his conscience did not approve. In the admirable life of his father, by Henry George, Jr., the writer dwells but a short time on that incident in his father's life. That such was the case is another proof of the nobility of his mother's character and of his own. At the time of the publication of his father's biography, Senator Jones was still in public life, and both the widow and the son hesitated or refrained from too plainly giving facts which reflected little credit upon him. There is now no such excuse for saving his reputation at the expense of leaving untold the story of the devotion of Henry George's wife to his best ambitions, and to his life work.

At the time Senator Jones made the demand for a sacrifice of principle on the part of Henry George to help on his own political ambitions, not to comply meant to Henry George the giving up of all his interest in the *Post*, and the loss of all the money he had invested in it, which represented the savings of years of literary and other work. It also meant equal financial loss to his partner, Mr. Hinton. From Henry George himself I had these facts, and when I asked him what he intended doing he answered: "Oh, I will give up every dollar I own, but I will not write anything I do not believe." And Mr. Hinton? I queried. "Oh, *he* says all right." And your wife, what does she say to your giving up everything and beginning again? He threw back his head with that peculiar, dignified gesture which afterwards became familiar to his hearers, and said: "My wife! God bless her! she says all right, too." Within a few months

thereafter the man who might have compromised with truth and honesty to secure present success, and who would thus have become "our prominent fellow-citizen and able editor" was appointed gas inspector in San Francisco, and in the hours of leisure, at the close of each day, began to write "Progress and Poverty." At that time their children were young, and Mrs. George, with her husband, bravely turned away from an assured competence to harrowing uncertainty just at the time when a competence was so much needed for their children's welfare; yet had Mrs. George not said—God bless her memory—"all right," how difficult, how almost impossible would it have been for Henry George to make the sacrifice which was fraught with the welfare of the world!

From Governor L. F. C. Garvin, of Rhode Island.

Henry George and his work will never be forgotten. His soul is marching on. It is only a question of time—probably of a very few years—when the people of some state will apply his scientific system of taxation. An object lesson is all that is needed.

Let one city, or large town, exempt personalty and improvements from taxation, and the end will be in sight. *To the bringing about of a local experiment, therefore, should our best energies be directed.*

We have much occasion for encouragement.

From Hamlin Garland.

It is now twenty-three years since I first read "Progress and Poverty," and some nineteen since I first met Henry George, and as I look back at those early days, my eyes dim a little. Our leader at that time showed no sign of breaking, and his power was tremendous. I have never heard more satisfying oratory than his when moved and fired by an antagonist of large mind. Now he is gone, and his loyal wife is gone, and many of our best fighters are growing old, and some of them are discouraged. But I do not feel so. The movement George began is larger than any paper can chronicle, and wider than the leadership of any man. The principles he taught are subtly interfused with the policies of reformers who acknowledge no allegiance to the Single Tax. I do not deplore this, I think we should be mightily enheartened by it. We lost something when the *Standard* ceased publication, but we gained more when the papers of Chicago began to advocate municipal control of the street railways. What I mean to say is this—we want results, not fame for any man, least of all do we fear for the fame of Henry George. Tolstoy is but a forecaster of the final judgment on "The Prophet of San Francisco," who lived for others, and died for others, simply, and without the slightest wish to be celebrated in bronze.

In its magnificent unselfishness his life and that of his noble wife may well be studied by the youth of the land. I gladly pay tribute to what Henry George did for me in days of doubt.

From Ralph Hoyt.

All honor to the memory of one of the grandest characters that this world ever saw.

Henry George loved his fellow men and all human kind as none but Jesus ever loved them. He turned his back upon all allurements pointing toward fame or wealth for himself, and walked in the straight path toward the emancipation of his fellow beings from a condition of bondage caused by the monopolization of God's bountiful storehouse. He pointed out the true and only way

by which all men can have equality of opportunity. He braved all obstacles, cared for no jeers or foolish criticisms, and clung to the right as he saw it.

While engaged in a noble effort to become possessed of even more power for doing good than he could possibly accomplish in private life, he was called home. No purer spirit since Christ was crucified ever entered the portals of the New Jerusalem.

From Louis F. Post.

I am glad to join in spirit with our friends of your city in celebrating the 65th birthday of Henry George.

These celebrations, as we all feel, are not personal tributes merely. Much as we who knew the man were drawn to him by the full roundedness of his personality, his extraordinary balance in love of the right and corresponding apprehensions of the expedient, it is rather for the cause with which his name is linked that we annually honor his memory.

His was a great cause, a cause worthy of all the devotion any man or woman can give to it. Prosperity from righteousness, progress by justice, this is the natural law; and this is the cause that Henry George came among us to lead.

I am often asked if this cause is growing rapidly. When I look back over the quarter of a century during which I have known something of it, I think it has. But what gratifies me more is the fact that it has grown sturdily. Among causes, it is the oak with heart of iron, and not the elder bush with core of pith. Other causes may come and go and this one may come to be known by new names in the future as in the past; but it is a cause which once born cannot die while man's natural inheritance is unrestored and his equal rights to the benefits of social growth are thereby denied.

From Congressman Robert Baker.

I trust the day is not distant when real Democrats, those who are enlisted in the fight for real Democratic principles under the leadership of that great Ohio Democrat, Tom L. Johnson, will be in control of the party machinery in your city. The party will then no longer be a mere adjunct of one of the most corrupt Republican organizations in the country, but will be a virile, fighting force challenging and boldly attacking, not apologizing for, the fraudulent, robbing system which its dupes term protection. When that time comes I hope to be permitted to participate in the canvas in aid of congressional candidates who will hold aloft the banner of free and unrestricted commerce with all nations. That such a campaign would soon bring to the support of the party thousands of workers who are now deluded with the idea that this robbing system in some occult way assures them higher wages than they otherwise could secure, I am entirely confident, although it would probably not succeed at the first attempt no more than success was yours in the magnificent fight which the Henry George men made in Cincinnati last year, in spite of the secret support which was being rendered to the Republican machine by McLean and Bernard and their henchmen. No one who participated in or observed the splendid series of meetings held in the public squares and adjacent streets last fall and who noted how hundreds stood for an hour or more listening to the enunciation of true Democratic principles, and saw how those meetings sometimes continued through the entire afternoon and evening, can doubt that good seed was sown and that the harvest will yet be reaped therefrom. It will always be one of the pleasant memories of my life that I was able to be of some service in that fight.

To those who understand and advocate the philosophy of Jefferson, broadened and applied to the problems of the times by Henry George, I send greeting, with the expression of my hope for their early adoption.

From John Sherwin Crosby.

On the sixty-fifth anniversary of his birth, and the twenty-fifth of his more than Herculean labor, the writing of "Progress and Poverty," we may well say in the words of one who loved him, "There was a man sent of God whose name was Henry George." For in the midst of the otherwise hopeless industrial chaos of the time what warrant would there be for belief in a God of wisdom and goodness but for the word spoken by the no longer reviled Prophet of San Francisco?

The truth he taught is fast finding its way into the hearts and minds of the people, as fast perhaps as conditions permit of its practical application. And yet our faith should not be apathetic, but more and more the incentive to enthusiastic work. Who shall say what results another quarter of a century's united effort may bring forth. May it bring the year of jubilee.

From Hon. Tom L. Johnson.

Permit me to join with you, of Cincinnati, in doing honor to the memory of our friend and philosopher, Henry George. He, more than any other American, has laid the foundation of the work of securing liberty and equality to the down-trodden.

The spreading of the truths of his philosophy gives us hope in the future. While I cannot be with you in person, I want to join in paying respect to our beloved leader.

From Frank Stephens.

We of Philadelphia send salutation on this anniversary of the birth of the Prophet of the new Gospel, wishing you all success in the great matters which are in hand with you. We know your works. We know that in a community whose name, like that of our own beloved and unhappy city, is as a by-word and reproach for political wickedness you have set up an altar to civic righteousness that may be seen of all men; that above the wrangling and haggling of those who make the high places of your city a place of infamous traffic and a den of thieves there goes forth from you and by your help a voice which is as one crying in the wilderness, heard and waited for wherever men have ears to hear throughout our country. Our faith is sure that you will be constant in this work still, as in the past, as men who know how great is the cause for which we labor and how short the time left us in which to do. In your ears, as in ours, rings day and night the cry of the oppressed and of him who hath no helper—what need is there that we urge you more. Never was the need of the world greater than now; never was the responsibility of knowing what should be done clearer than to us. Never was there more joy in the working; never was the day of our deliverance so near at hand.

We that are about to live salute you.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An Illustrated Quarterly Magazine of
Single Tax Progress

Edited and Published by

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 11 Frankfort St.
New York.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE: — In the United
States, Canada and Mexico, \$1.00 per
year. Payable in advance.

Entered at the Postoffice, New York, as Second
Class Matter.

AUTUMN NUMBER, 1904.

PUBLISHERS NOTES.

Will our delinquent subscribers bear in mind that the REVIEW is in need of their subscriptions?

We call our readers' attention to the advertisement of the Anniversary Edition of the Works of Henry George on our back pages. The Holidays are approaching and no more desirable Christmas gift can be made than this very handsome set of books. Order of the REVIEW and receive a year's subscription with the order. Will our readers also remember that we can supply any book they may need? Instead of ordering of the publishers or of their bookseller they can aid the REVIEW by sending in their orders to us and having such orders supplied promptly. Note terms on which the Anniversary Edition can be secured and write us for further particulars.

On another page will be found an article advocating the formation of a Single Tax colony somewhere near New York. No doubt if support could be gained for such a venture it might be made to serve as a valuable object lesson. Indeed the Single Tax will demonstrate itself much more effectively where land values are high than where land values are low. Mr. Gaynor makes a forcible plea for his project, and while the obstacles seem almost insurmountable, chiefly because of the difficulty of securing desirable land at a reasonable price, the plan is worth considering.

It is suggested by one of our correspondents that a Single Tax colony be organized somewhere in Cuba. The advantages urged are that land is cheap in Cuba now, is wonderfully fertile, and that a

colony in that country formed on the Fairhope plan might prove a great center of agitation for the taxation of Cuban land values now untaxed.

We have received a handsomely printed and illustrated pamphlet on Fairhope, which is a history of that most interesting experiment, with statement of the plan, portraits of the founders, etc. It is admirably designed to attract settlers and to convert the doubting Thomas. For if partial application of the Single Tax principles under great difficulties and not very favorable conditions work such results, what may not be hoped for its full application to the broader field of human society?

THE PRESIDENTIAL CAMPAIGN.

We are in the mild excitement of a Presidential campaign. Never before did the result seem to interest the voters so little. The desperate efforts of the Democratic party to manufacture new issues while ignoring real and existing ones, are pathetic in the extreme. But the game is the chess play of the politicians at which the people seem merely passive spectators.

It must be remembered that the REVIEW has no partisan leanings. It does not come within our province to declare for Roosevelt, Parker, or Watson. Single Taxers are divided in the support of these three nominees, and all are able to give plausible reasons for their preference. Whether these varied activities on the part of the believers in the true economic gospel are to be deplored as tending to place the movement in an equivocal position to the outside world, or whether the activity of each group tends to widen the circle of those who are brought under the influence of our teachings, is not for us to say. The Single Taxer wherever he is is a force for righteousness and a keener intelligence in the apprehension of economic and social laws. "I do not care how you vote, but I do care how you think," Mr. George was accustomed to say to his hearers, confident that if they began to think at all they would come very soon to think right. Thus it is that while unable to co-operate with any of these groups in their separate activities, and doubtful of the wisdom of the policy of all alike, we recognize that where so little that is really vital is involved, such differences do not greatly matter. We could no more expect to find Single Taxers a unit on political issues where the Single Tax is not directly involved than upon some particular canon of art or aesthetics.

A PRIMARY CAUSE OF WAR.

We are not disposed to refuse to President Roosevelt the measure of credit that is due him for the courteous assurance to the

delegates of the Peace gathering that he would himself call a convention of the Nations to deal with pending international questions in the spirit of the Hague Conference. He is to be commended, too, for his admirably chosen words on that occasion, which breathed the spirit of amity, and evidenced a latent apprehension of the value of peace.

It is to be hoped that when the second Peace Conference convenes that the delegates will deal more largely with the fundamentals of their problem than with such questions as the prohibition of dum-dum bullets and fire balloons. Such prohibitions are important as far as they go, but they do not touch the essential matters that are a perpetual menace to the peace of Europe. Russia and Japan are engaged to-day in an exhausting struggle that might have been avoided had the question in dispute been impartially considered by a Congress of Nations, and the claims of both governments reviewed in detail. For it is impossible not to sympathize with Russia in her need of an ice-free port, and this could have been accorded to her by a pact of the nations which should at the same time have assured to Japan the immunity of Korea and all the rights that are properly hers in Manchuria. It is not at all unlikely that if the spirit which gave birth to the Hague Conference had been permitted to grow, that both Japan and Russia would have accepted without resort to arms such guarantees as the governments of the nations might have extended. These guarantees would have been respected by both governments when backed by that strong public sentiment which really exists in favor of peace, and which would have allayed that irritation occasioned among the people of each country by contemplating the other in the attitude of the aggressor.

It is not, of course, to be hoped that the members of the Conference will be in the mood to consider the secret springs of war, for the diplomatic correspondence that precedes these conflicts contains no intimation of them. But nearly all wars, and most certainly all wars of conquest, have their origin in land gambling. Governments are urged to war by private interests, more or less intimately directing the secret springs of action, and playing upon the mingled motives of the impulsive and unthinking masses. These privileged interests are always there, but always in the background, rarely emerging from their concealment. These private interests are invariably those that seek concessions in the shape of landed privileges. Thus the Russian war party, whose influence with the Czar and his counsellors was the strongest and most intimate, included those who sought and received the Imperial charter under which the Yalu Timber Company was organized. It was this baleful power, and not Russia's legitimate aspirations in Manchuria, that hastened the conflict with Japan.

And again in the recent British incursion into Thibet the same secret springs of action are disclosed in an innocent looking paragraph in the ninth article of the Convention in which it is stipulated that "no foreign power shall be permitted to construct roads or railways, or erect telegraphs or open mines anywhere in Thibet." The accomplishment of this practical annexation of the mineral resources and land values in the form of railroads and telegraphs of the country, was the real purpose which sent Col. Younghusband into Thibet, and, not, as was said, because of the interests of trade and civilization. Civilization is not advanced by punitive expeditions of this kind, and trade is best encouraged by amity.

Britain's war with the South African Republics had its origin in the same sinister beginnings. "We were unfortunate in building our country over a gold mine," Kruger is reported to have said with bitterness but in truth. How true it was the British subject of the Transvaal who toils in the mines is now finding out when brought face to face with the labor of imported Chinese coolies. Again it was a chartered company organized to gamble in the natural resources of the country (and not the disabilities of the Uitlanders) that borrowing the ear of the facile colonial secretary set in motion the engines of war.

And the conclusion of the whole argument (and it would be well if the friends of peace would realize it) is that the end of war is in sight when the natural resources of every country become the inheritance of all the people and cease to be the pawns of the gambler's chess-board.

OLIVER T. TROWBRIDGE, AUTHOR
OF "BI-SOCIALISM."

Oliver T. Trowbridge, (see frontispiece) was born at North Salem, Indiana, in 1860. It happened that Warren Worth Bailey, owner and editor of the *Johnstown, Pa., Democrat*, was born about four miles from the same place. Apparently there is, or was, something about the place that kindled a love for freedom, for more staunch supporters or more stubborn defenders of liberty than these do not live. The parents of the two boys were well acquainted before and during the War of the Rebellion.

In the year 1869 the Trowbridge family moved to a farm in Champagne County, Illinois, where the boy enjoyed, or suffered, the lot common in that day to the prairie life of Central Illinois. It was in the following year, 1870, that he first noticed the sweep of emigration to the West. One covered wagon (or "prairie schooner") followed another, in a seemingly endless procession, carrying family after family to the then frontier of Kansas and other states. As these ships of the prairie crawled their slow way past his home and past thousands of acres of the most fertile soil in the United

States, covered with wild grass, at that time untouched by the hand of civilized man—some of it within a mile of his home—the boy wondered to what might be due the mighty movement. What could be the attraction? What did these people seek?

He learned that the caravans he saw were but a fraction of a host, for by nearly every road across the State like droves were moving. He was impressed, but found no answer to the half-formed thought. Like most students who have passed the age of ten, he failed to observe that the emigrant is not seeking for, but fleeing from, a power—one that is felt rather than perceived.

Under this impulse the boy began to think as best he could within the circle of his limited experience, and some three years later he discovered that books had been written on a subject called political economy—a term that hitherto he had not known. The drier of these he eagerly devoured, and soon learned that the so-called conflict between capital and labor was the expression of an abused concept. He has not found it necessary to depart from the statement he formulated at that time, namely, "Naturally there is, and logically, there can be no conflict between capital and labor."

Trowbridge remained on the farm until twenty-two years of age, but varied this honorable industry by teaching school during the winters after he arrived at the age of eighteen. Subsequently he attended the Illinois State Normal University, graduating from that institution in 1885. During the latter year he was married to Alice C. McCormick, daughter of Professor Henry McCormick, vice-president of the State Normal University. Afterwards he was superintendent of City School, at Lacon, Illinois, for three years, during which time he studied law. Mr. Trowbridge practiced law in Chicago for eight years, and removed to Bloomington, Illinois, in 1896, where he has continued a large and remunerative practice of the law up to the present time. After this year it is his hope and expectation to devote a large part of his time to studying and writing on economic and philosophical questions. His taste and his natural and acquired equipments in these directions give strong promise of valuable results.

It was in the year 1883 that Trowbridge first read "Progress and Poverty," which he says is "an original work of great power and clearness, in which was first elaborated the doctrine of taxing ground for public revenue."

This work, the criticism it received, his previous reading on economic matters, and his native taste, all conspired to induce him to undertake the labor of producing a work on economics. Ten years elapsed before this undertaking was completed, but the book appeared in 1893 under the title of "Bisocialism: the Reign of the Man at the Margin." This work has challenged the

attention of the serious and capable. It will not have much effect on others. After reading it one gentleman said, "His ideas are so hard and set." This gentleman evidently preferred what is soft and loose. Bark defaulters would prefer that sort of bookkeeping—they need it in their business. Another critic wrote: "I cannot see that it adds anything to the learning of economic literature," and yet it is probably impossible to find elsewhere in print the theory of interest set forth in "Bisocialism."

Many other points might be cited, but a review of his work is not here intended. To those who read it, however, there will be revealed a strong, patient, moderate, yet stern nature.

While Mr. Trowbridge has been, and is, a successful lawyer, while no failure has marred his career, still the growth of the inward life has always proved more attractive to him than the glory of outward achievement.

TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

John Z. White began his eastern trip with a dinner at Cleveland, Ohio, at which there gathered a number of our friends who are making arrangements for a series of meetings some time during the coming winter. Single Tax men here as elsewhere are anxious to discover the best method of carrying the good news to their friends and neighbors. How can we popularize the doctrines of Henry George? The only reply to this question is to point to the work of George himself—agitate, proclaim the truth. Is your life worth more than his? Thomas Jefferson said something to the effect that all history proves that mankind will continue to suffer under the burdens that oppress him so long as those burdens are endurable, rather than indulge the effort necessary to be rid of them. There comes a time, however, when they will bear no longer. When that time arrives they will make changes, and those changes will be wise, or otherwise, according to the degree of knowledge the people possess. The time for agitation and education, therefore, is the period preceding the time of change—with us that time is "now." "Now, now is the accepted time; now is the day of salvation." For it does not require a prophet to foretell a change of some sort in the not distant future.

The Chautauqua at Findley Lake, New York, was visited and an address on the Single Tax was the cause of quite a discussion. One good farmer said, "Well, you have given us something to think about, anyway." We have some good friends at this point, but most of the crowds at these gatherings prefer amusement. The fact that fundamental economics are admitted as subjects of discussion, and that the discussion can be carried on without animosity is cause for congratulation. That this was

accomplished is shown by the fact that it was proposed to "repeat the offence" at the same place next year. The explanation was continued to quite a group on the grounds after adjournment of the regular meeting.

At Pittsburgh, Pa., two meetings were held. The first on Sunday morning in a church in that good city. It proved a very delightful gathering whose members needed no diagram to explain either jest or argument. If we are to judge by our meagre experience, smoke does not injure the intellectual capacity—perhaps, though, they are acclimated. Pittsburgh ought to be one of the favorite cities of the United States. It is decidedly picturesque in its natural features, but look at the condition in which some of the people live. We know of soldiers living in barracks or military reservations, like stalled horses or cattle, but here are families of men, women and children living inside the old stockade of which we heard so much at the time of the Homestead labor troubles. They are living in much poorer surroundings than one sees at military reservations. Perhaps they are as well situated as the soldiers in the matter of hygiene, but there is an utter absence of anything in the way of stimulus to an existence that shall include the slightest aspiration above animal requirements. We do not know just how, but understand that in some way a revenue is drawn from the toil of these families which in part is used to provide other communities with books—and, incidentally, one individual with cheap notoriety. Pittsburgh is probably no worse than other places, but somehow it seems more bald in its misery. The enormous productive power expressed in the great Westinghouse establishment and other similar concerns, in such close association with evident and extreme poverty, served to emphasize the tragedy of our time. Poverty is seemingly deepest where the power to produce is greatest.

The Chautauqua at Cumberland, Md., was next visited. At this point it was hoped Rabbi J. L. Sterne would be seen, but the good Rabbi had removed to New York, where he will no doubt continue the energetic work so persistently carried forward in Cumberland and vicinity. There are some Single Tax men in and about the city, though it is likely more have, like the Rabbi, left for a point of more extended survey. Several of our friends, however, appeared at the meeting devoted to the doctrines of Henry George and were ready with praise and good wishes. The audience was "distant" at first, but gradually yielded, and a good many were desirous of fuller knowledge of the subject. They were of course referred to E. B. Swinney, 720 Carroll Street, Brooklyn, for literature. Chautauqua circles show the life of our people—as, in truth, does each variety of

association. Bring the people together, and whatever is common to all of them will appear on the surface. At the Chautauqua the one thing desired, and for which the people are willing to pay, is amusement. They will, however, give some time to serious matters, provided—always provided—no adverse criticism of existing social and religious conditions is indulged. There seems to be a feeling that in these matters any jar is likely to prove fatal. There is a feeling that something is wrong, and most people are afraid to pull the wrong into the light. Many questions were asked at this meeting, and there was some talk of arranging for local meetings for the purpose of further study.

The capital of "our beloved country" was visited and three gatherings were addressed, all of which were productive of discussions both enjoyable and profitable. If any Single Tax man or woman finds occasion to visit Washington, we urge a careful examination of the Congressional Library building as another illustration of our social paradox. The building is a veritable poem; the estimated cost was reduced by Congress; the less amount thus offered was not wholly used, and the balance was returned to the coffers of Uncle Samuel. All of these results, achieved by the same people who permit the growth and development of the combinations that are just at present enjoying a view of themselves at the hands of Thos. Lawson, in *Everybody's Magazine*, reveal the possibilities for good and evil that exist side by side throughout our civilization. These antagonistic forces prevent a complete development in either direction, and any arrested development is in some degree abnormal; and certain it is, the abnormal cannot last. When we realize that the Congressional Library building is but the result of rational adaptation of means to ends, with beauty and justice for objects, and that the Lawson combinations are the results of the adaptation of means to ends, with that which is ugly and unjust as necessary objects, we perceive how very small are the obstacles that lie in the pathway leading to the good, the true, and the beautiful. The forces by which wrong are done are identical with those by whose aid righteousness is achieved. The difference is wholly in the plan of adjustment—and control of the plan is entirely within our volition.

A pleasant dinner was given at Baltimore and a very enjoyable afternoon spent in looking over the burned district and in interviewing the city officials who have charge of the rebuilding of that portion of the city. It is admitted by these officials that the land burned over was worth more the day after the fire than it was the day before. As a result none of them were at all anxious to maintain the popular notion that the value of land is caused by the

improvements made upon it. Here was land not only without improvements, but covered with a mass of rubbish that would cost a very great sum to clear away, yet this land was, and is, worth more with all this obstruction to use than when fitted for general business with all of the previously existing improvements. It certainly presents an excellent condition for Single Tax "explanation," and our good friends, W. J. Ogden and Dr. Hill are not slow to take advantage of the opportunity—neither are the landlords.

At Wilmington, Delaware, a banquet was held at the Clayton Hotel, with an attendance of probably one hundred and fifty. The subject for discussion was the referendum. The need of a popular check on some notorious characters in public life is more and more keenly felt, and the gathering, which included many of the leading citizens of Wilmington, were evidently well pleased with the moderate tone of all the ideas advanced. The papers gave a very full and favorable account of the banquet and programme. Mr. Francis I. du Pont is quietly calling on all citizens to take a somewhat more definite and emphatic interest in public questions with the intention of bringing to public business a portion of the common sense that is customarily exercised in the conduct of private affairs.

A dinner party was attended at Philadelphia, and the Single Tax men of that good city are worth while. They are intense, and they mean to make this world a better place to live in than it ever was before—they know what they want and they know how to get it, if there is not too much opposition.

At Meriden, Conn., a debate was arranged with a prominent Socialist, and Mr. Cary, on the relative merits of the Single Tax and Socialism. The audience was not friendly to the Single Tax position at first—was apparently merely curious as to both Single Tax and Socialism, but before the close of the discussion the vigorous defense of the institution of private property brought most of the body to our support. Mr. Cary is a strong advocate of his "ism," and is evidently sincerely of the opinion that Socialism offers the only plan whereby labor can be equitably compensated. He, like most of those who believe with him, thinks competition has broken down in practice, when, in fact, it has never been fairly tried. They are like those who insist that representative government has proved a failure, when the truth is that the world has never given us more than a very partial trial. We do not desire a change of any of our American institutions, but do desire a change of some details of the governmental machinery whereby American ideals may be realized.

A dinner by the New York and Brooklyn

Central Labor Unions, which was designed as a first step toward amalgamation by those bodies, was given on Aug. 21, and was a very enjoyable occasion. Among the better features of the evening was an address by the celebrated "Mother Jones" who had but just returned from the mining regions of Colorado, and, being a lover of truth and justice, felt herself and all honest citizens to be outraged by the condition of affairs her investigations revealed in that State. The address on "The Duty of Labor in the Present Crisis" was received with great approval and much applause. The affair was thought to be a great success, and did not adjourn until an hour past midnight. A. J. Boulton, of Brooklyn, was toastmaster—and a good one.

Meetings were also held at Bridgeport and Hartford, Conn., and an open air meeting was attended at 125th St., New York. The boys are doing good work at this point.

A number of meetings were held in Rhode Island. Governor Garvin and his secretary, Robert Grieve, together with a goodly number of their associates are carrying on a continual agitation for improved social conditions. Meetings were held in three churches, also an address made before the Young Men's Christian Association, and before a session of the University Club, on which occasion Col. Robert P. Brown was host. Three or four other gatherings were attended, and at all of them a hearty invitation to call again was extended. Through the good offices of the Governor, Mr. White was given excellent opportunities to present our views, and the chief executive was highly pleased with results.

At New Bedford, Mass., six meetings were held, including the North End Merchant's Club, Men's Union, Board of Trade, South End Merchant's Club, and the Central Labor Union. S. S. Tabor is possibly the most energetic of local Single Tax men, and anyone who shall surpass him in persistent endeavors will truly deserve a crown of glory. These meetings were beneficial, in that all sorts of people attended. At the Board of Trade the president of the New Bedford Gas and Electric Co., Geo. R. Stettson, asked a number of questions, to the very great pleasure of some of our friends who also were present. The president of the Board of Trade, Rufus A. Soule, who is ex-president of the Massachusetts State Senate, volunteered the opinion that municipalities should assume control of public utilities as far as experience shall demonstrate to be necessary in order to eliminate private monopoly of the common right—that is, the right of way, or the opportunity to do business. If experience shall show that this end can be attained only by complete public operation—well, when public operation it is. New Bedford is

all right. Local papers gave considerable notice—critically and otherwise.

One meeting was held in Fall River, where the great strike is in progress among the cotton mill operatives. The meeting was well attended—mostly by the men usually referred to as "laboring men." This term always suggests the notion that some men are not labor men. If the suggestion is based on truth, one might well inquire as to how those who are not labor men get a living. Is it possible to live without working? What has become of the Bible saying, "He that does not work, neither shall he eat?" The newspapers of Fall River gave us considerable space, but, while the audience appeared to understand, the reporters were apparently unable to "get the hang" of a democratic idea. May be they have so long reported plutocratic sentiments that the sense of equity has become dull. In describing the nature of landlordism the statement was that "we have to yield a part of what we produce in return for permission to work; and it is by virtue of a grant of legal power that these men get this amount." The reporter wrote: "We have to yield what we produce to grant the legal power for these men to get that amount." The distinction between land and rent is quite beyond these gentlemen. Instead of concentrating our efforts on a single State, would it not be a good plan to concentrate on the reporters. One paper managed the matter somewhat better, however, and reported as follows:

"In the Skinner's Hall last night John Z. White, of Chicago, delivered a highly entertaining lecture on 'How to Prevent Strikes.' Mr. White is a very clever and witty speaker, and his stories were of merit and well told. He spoke in part as follows:

"The chairman has recommended that we should not believe anything that comes to us from editorials in certain newspapers, Democratic or Republican. I would suggest that after all, possibly there are so many editorials of a political kind that all cannot be wrong, even though they tried to make them wrong. When a man talks all the time, as editorial writers do, he is bound to tell the truth once in a while, if only by mistake. However, I shall have to concur with the chairman upon the idea that you should arrive at judgment of your own, and I shall caution you in advance not to believe anything I shall say. I do not appeal to your belief. I hope you will understand what I say, and understanding it, will be able to pass your individual judgment upon its merits. I shall refer to political matters, but do not ask you to join or sever your connections with any political party. I appeal to you as American citizens, simply as men. I appeal to your understanding alone, not to your belief.

"I have read some interviews with pastors in your city relative to the strike here. Only one of them seemed to have

any degree of wisdom; the rest were all kind and sympathetic, but did not know anything about the matter. This man said if we consider any method of settlement of this disturbance we must consider the whole industry, not a part of it. When a business man makes up his balance sheets to see whether he is making or losing money he wants the whole account. This is the correct idea. Let us consider the whole industry. Spinning and weaving cotton cloth is not the whole matter, for you would spin a long time before your toil would supply you with a loaf of bread. Other toilers are raising grain, rearing cattle, etc., for your need, while you are making cotton cloth for them, and thus a consideration of the "whole industry" (and it is the only reasonable method of investigation) leads through many exchanges.

"Why do we work? Is it not because we become hungry and cold if we refuse? Is not the reward of the toiler wages? Is it not true, therefore, that an inquiry concerning strikes is an inquiry concerning wages?

"I must have clothing and shelter in order to live. Every man, woman and child on this earth must have food, clothing and shelter or die. I can get food, clothing and shelter only by work. No man ever got food to eat or clothing to wear or shelter for protection except by work. Of course it might be someone else's work, but until labor begins there is no food or no shelter. There is not an article of food or clothing in the world that was not produced by human toil. Labor is cash payment of nature, and here we meet the test question—to whom, when these things are made, do they rightfully belong? The answer to that question is the answer to every question in the whole industrial world. The answer to that question will determine the question of wages. It will determine the cause of strikes. It will determine the power of society. It will determine the equities as between men upon the material field.

"When any article is produced who rightfully owns it? The thing primarily belongs to the man or group of men that participate in its production. Labor primarily owns all wealth, in justice, not a part of it. That is the basis of the institution of private property. The fact that one individual or other individuals associated with him produce wealth is what makes property sacred. It would not have been in existence except for the exertions of these individuals. Therefore does this group own it, each in proportion to the amount of labor he has contributed to its production. The property right is originally with the laborer. You can't sell labor. You can't buy labor. We talk about buying and selling labor, but we talk about the sun rising when it doesn't rise, but appears to rise. We sell the property right in our product. We call it getting wages. You get the pro-

duct of my labor, not my labor. You get the product of my skill, not skill itself.

"If each man who toils gets what he produces there will be nothing left for anybody else. That is a very important part of the labor question. Do you get what you produce? You make a stove and you get wages enough to buy a cover. You make a wagon and you get wages enough to buy a wheel. Andrew Carnegie, the great Scotchman, said that the most surprised he ever was in all his life was when he learned that the man who did the work was not the man who got rich. Andrew Carnegie discovered that some way or other there was a trick in the combination whereby the men who did the work were not the men who get rich.

"It is true, as stated, that all wealth is produced by labor, but labor of itself can make nothing. Labor must be placed in possession of the natural material of which articles of wealth are made. This material is called "land." At every step in production there is the conjunction of land and labor. Land is owned by a relatively few. It therefore follows that wealth is divided between those who own the earth and those who work upon it. These funds may be called the wage fund and the rent fund, and payments of whatsoever nature must be made from one or the other—including public taxes.

"To-day nearly all taxes are laid upon wages. As a result labor supports the owners of land by paying rent to them, supports government by paying taxes, and, as a consequence of failing to tax rent, it becomes profitable to hold land vacant in anticipation of future rent. This forces labor to produce at an enormous disadvantage, because being forced, by the high price of vacant land in our cities, to inferior lands, their toil is less productive. Further, being thus scattered, the expense of government becomes abnormally large; with the result that we not only support landlords, but rent is artificially high; we not only support government, but taxes are artificially high; we not only must produce in order to live, but production is made artificially low. Added to all this is the fact that the difficulty of making a living stimulates dishonesty, and we come to enjoy the blessings of boodle.

"Remove taxes from industry and place them upon the value of land and all the above enumerated effects will be reversed.

"We the people have enacted and are enforcing regulations whereby some men are given legal power through the force of which they levy tribute upon every man who toils. We yield that which we produce and then wonder why we are poor."

At Boston meetings were held in various parts of the city. The first was a dinner, which was very favorably reported.

The Newton Single Tax Club held a meeting on Sept. 26th. This meeting was reported in the *Newton Journal*.

Addresses were also made in Boston before the Franklin Square House, the Building Trades Council, the Polishers' Buffers' & Plasterers' Union, when the chairman, Geo. W. Lever, said on shaking hands at the close, "That's the best labor speech I ever heard." The work was also noted editorially in the *Boston Herald*.

A good meeting was held in Worcester, Mass., which was attended by professional and business men, and a full representation of officials of trade unions. Prof. A. T. Chamberlain, of Clark University, presided. Our friends insist that only the largest hall in the city will answer for the next visit to Worcester. The Single Tax men of that city are earnest workers.

News—Domestic.

GEORGIA, ATLANTA. — (Special Correspondence.—Wm. Riley Boyd.)—The people of the South are confronted by the problem, How shall the rural home be made secure and good order preserved? Some recent acts of lawlessness by negroes, followed by cruel law-breaking and outrage by the whites, suggest a need for radical changes. If it be possible to induce on the part of the idle negro in the cities a migration back to the land, if access to the land were made possible, if the law-abiding negro be protected under the law, not outside of it, and the law-breaker of *both* races be sternly dealt with by our "best citizens," we might look for substantial gain in material prosperity. Only a small percentage of negroes commit nameless outrages, only a small number of whites engage in lynchings of criminals; the majority desire the reign of law, and in time will have it. The Single Tax applied would rid us of nearly every hindrance to advancement. The occupant of the land becomes conservative and law-abiding. Continue to advocate our cause and the South will feel the impetus of a better civilization.

ILLINOIS, CHICAGO.—(Special Correspondence.—G. J. Foyer.)—The members of the club here have given much discussion to the coming Presidential campaign which seems to interest little those active in the various reform movements. The conservative Single Taxer can see little or no hope in capturing the Democratic Party, and looking in this direction the goal seems further off than ever. The Single Taxer who has been in favor of political action credits himself with being "disgusted" once more, while the most of the Single Taxers have vowed to vote for Roosevelt or Tom Watson, and go so far as saying they would register their protest by voting for Debs. First Bryan and 16 to 1 is getting close to us, next Tom L. Johnson is going to capture Ohio. Then everything goes

wrong and we all get mad and are going to vote for Plutocracy in a spirit of revenge or for Socialism. The truth of the matter is that the Single Taxer is bobbing like a cork behind the Ship of State in a small rowboat until the time is ripe for the big ship to fall to pieces and then the little row boat will come to the rescue with many shouts of "Bravo." Nothing has discouraged the members of the club more than the fact that the Socialists are becoming a power through political action in most every community, while we are following the rotten hull of Democracy. The political managers have now come to realize that they must figure upon the Socialist vote all over the country as to who will be elected, and most every paper in the country records notes and comments upon them. In the editorials of the Chicago papers hardly a day goes by but some reference has been made, slightly or otherwise, to the Socialist party or Mr. Debs. It seems as though the outlook is extremely dark, but there are some who can see light, and here in Illinois it is being spread by those who hold the torches. The petition for Home Rule in Taxation has already been filed with the Secretary of State, and at the coming election this fall the people will have the opportunity to vote for it, while the balance of the country will be choosing between bad and evil. There is no doubt but that the questions on referendum petition will receive a favorable vote, if not carried overwhelmingly. After the Legislature has enacted Home Rule in Taxation into the law of the State the Single Tax party will again attempt to force the issue in Cook County.

MASSACHUSETTS, BOSTON.—(Special Correspondence.—W. L. Crossman.)—John Z. White has delivered seven lectures in Boston, besides a number in New Bedford, Fall River, Worcester and Newton. His work was highly appreciated wherever he spoke, and those who heard him were not disappointed, for they found him a strong and ready speaker and a logical and entertaining orator. Unfortunately Mr. White came at a time when the lecture courses of all kinds of organizations had not begun, and in consequence not as many audiences were reached as would have been later in the season.

Open-air meetings have been held every Sunday afternoon on Boston Common during the summer. That indefatigable worker, Edward Doherty, attends to this work, and often speaks for the two hours assigned the Boston Single Tax Society, for frequently no other speaker puts in an appearance. Open-air evening meetings have been held once a week at Roxbury Crossing, East Cambridge, Charlestown, South Boston, Haymarket Square. Often Mr. Doherty is the only speaker at these meetings. When conditions will permit he is assisted by W. L. Crossman.

Walter J. Isidor has received the Democratic nomination for representative to the State Legislature from Ward 10. The ward is strongly Republican, but as the candidate is a worker and clever Single Taxer, he may astonish the politicians. However, there will be a lot of open-air meetings in Ward 10, at which the Henry George doctrine will be preached.

Edward Doherty was a Democrat and labor union candidate for State Senator in the Second Suffolk District at the primary election on September 27th. It was a three-cornered contest and one of the regulars won out. Quite a number of open-air meetings were held in the district.

The Boston Central Labor Union and the Building Trades Council have adopted resolutions favoring local option in taxation. It is hoped that other central bodies in the State will now do the same, and an attempt will be made to have this home rule principle advocated at the coming session of the State Legislature.

MISSOURI, ST. LOUIS.—(Special Correspondence.—L. P. Custer.)—Direct legislation is the principal subject of discussion and agitation in Single Tax circles of St. Louis and Missouri generally at this time, a constitutional amendment, to be voted upon at the approaching election, being before the people of the State. Dr. Wm. Preston Hill, of whom mention has heretofore been made in these columns, is the principle individual worker for the success of the movement to incorporate in our organic laws the Initiative and Referendum, and his efforts, coupled with those of the many others, principally Single Taxers, are likely to prove effective. Dr. Hill has expended a great deal of money, physical and mental energy in this work and his labors are looked upon with appreciative deference by all who are cognizant of the facts. Dr. Hill's efforts are not relaxed in the slightest, but, if anything, are more pronounced than when he was working for the submission of the amendment. He has had 12,000 or more addresses on direct legislation, printed in the *Congressional Record* through the intervention of Congressman Baker, mailed to country village, town and cross-roads' business men throughout the State, and has had 100,000 leaflets printed for hand-to-hand circulation. He has taken an interest in *Wetmore's Weekly*, the successor to *Eltweed Pomeroy's Direct Legislation Record*, and Robert Tyson's paper in support of the same movement. *Wetmore's Weekly* is an up-to-date weekly magazine of general interest, and is circulated extensively in the State.

Mr. T. K. Hedrik, within recent times on the staff of the *Globe Democrat* as cartoonist and contributor in a literary way, and a Single Taxer of the true-blue order, is associated with Mr. Claude Wetmore, who is also a newspaper man of experience and standing, in the launching of the new publication, and it promises to develop into a

substantial and widely circulated periodical.

On Thursday evening, the 6th inst., a party of Single Taxers, including a number of ladies, called by appointment on Governor Garvin, of Rhode Island, at the Hotel Washington, and a pleasant hour was spent in short talks back and forth between the Governor and three of his party, all Single Taxers, and the spokesmen of those who constituted the visiting party. Altogether the affair, informal and simple in every aspect, was a happy culmination of the visit of Rhode Island's chief executive to our city and the great World's Fair, the party leaving the hotel for the train on the return trip immediately after the reception came to a close. The Governor and those who appeared with him gave evidences of great strength of character and force, and no one marvels at the political prestige enjoyed by them in the little but important New England commonwealth.

S. L. Moser, now located at Rohwer, Ark., formerly associated with the late lamented John J. McCann in the great agitation for taxation of franchise values in this State, was one of the party who called on Governor Garvin, having come to the city on business. Mr. Moser promises to become the legal possessor of a large area of land in Arkansas, but his Single Tax faith is as pronounced as ever.

The Single Taxers of St. Louis favor the proposed conference at Fairhope early next year, the League having voted to that effect.

PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA.—(Special Correspondence.—William Ryan.)—Propaganda work has been prosecuted in the usual way this Summer. Two open-air meetings on the City Hall Plaza on Wednesday and Sunday evenings of each week; about eight meetings at 40th Street and Lancaster Avenue, one at 23rd Street and Columbus Avenue, and one in Camden, N. J.

Besides local speakers, Messrs. L. S. Dickey, of Chicago; Charles Rodd, of New York; Robert Richardson, of Clifton Heights, Pa., and Wm. Preston, of Lancaster, Pa., spoke during the summer.

As a means of more effectively pushing the agitation for the Single Tax, some consideration is being given to a plan to compose a number of glaring illustrations of the injustice of the present system of taxation and also what might be expected under the operation of the Single Tax on land values, into the form of the ordinary stereopticon lecture, but with this new feature: instead of a lecturer, to so arrange explanations and quotations from Henry George and others between or on the views that they will be self-explanatory and need no lecturer. Such a plan would open a large field for advertising Single Tax meetings, literature, etc., and arousing interest in the movement. It could be operated by almost anyone, and with a slide stating

that it is purposed to show the views wherever anyone desires if he will make all of the necessary arrangements, there would be little expense and no effort required to find places for the exhibitions. Illustrations could be constantly added or substituted as time determined. Suggestions could be requested from those who wished to make them.

A number of views have already been taken, but as yet no definite plan has been formulated for prosecuting the work. If the readers of the REVIEW have anything to suggest, kindly address Wm. Ryan, Secretary, Central Single Tax Club, 1317 Filbert Street, Philadelphia.

On August 19th a dinner was given in honor of John Z. White at the Colonnade Hotel. Besides Mr. White, Messrs. Frank Stephens, Wm. M. Callingham and Herman Hetzel spoke. Mr. Richard Chambers recited the chapter on liberty entitled "The Central Truth" from "Progress and Poverty."

The Single Taxers, during the last three years have celebrated Henry George's birthday by a picnic at "Arden," Delaware. The picnic this year was on Sunday, September 4th, the Sunday nearest September 2nd usually being the day.

Arden, owned by Mr. Frank Stephens, is on the Baltimore & Ohio Railroad, six miles from Wilmington and nineteen miles from Philadelphia. He purchased it a number of years ago with the intention of making it a Single Tax colony, but because of a mortgage did not do so. Arrangements have now been made that have lifted the mortgage from sixty acres, and Mr. Stephens has turned this over to three trustees to be held for the benefit of all living on the land. The land is to be leased for whatever term of years the lessee may elect at a rental to be fixed each year by the whole people living on the land. The rental is to be expended, first, for paying all State and county taxes and the balance for public improvements. This is carrying out Mr. Stephens' original intentions, and here is another opportunity to try the colony plan upon which Fairhope has been so successful.

The Henry George Club will hold its annual meeting in October to elect officers for the ensuing year. The regular public meetings will begin in November.

The Central Single Tax Club will hold its annual meeting on the first Sunday in November to elect officers.

That there may be no misunderstanding it should be stated that the Henry George Club and the Central Single Tax Club are, and have always been, harmonious. Each has its distinct function to perform in the movement and each is composed practically of the same members. The sole purpose of the Henry George Club is to hold meetings on Sunday during the Winter in a public hall, at which the leading men in the movement may be heard. The Central Single

Tax Club is the permanent headquarters of the movement in Philadelphia. Here the general propoganda work is planned and prosecuted. Its headquarters are always open to welcome local or visiting Single Taxers.

TENNESSEE, MOUNT PLEASANT.—(Special Correspondence.—A. Freeland.)—There is nothing special to report in the way of Single Tax news from this State, with the exception that the people's party, in State convention assembled at Nashville, Sept. 8th, took an advanced step in the direction of our reform by incorporating in its platform the following: "That the holding of large bodies of land under a single control should be prohibited by a system of taxation. We demand that all water in the stock of corporations on which the people are compelled to pay dividends shall be assessed for taxation as real property."

The national platform of the people's party, adopted at Springfield, Ill., July 4th, among other things said:

"Land, including all the natural sources of wealth, is a heritage of all the people, and should not be monopolized for speculative purposes; and alien ownership of land should be prohibited. To prevent unjust discrimination and monopoly, the government should own and control the railroads and those public utilities which in their nature are monopolies. As to those trusts and monopolies which are not public utilities or natural monopolies, we demand that those special privileges which they now enjoy, and which alone enable them to exist, should be immediately withdrawn. We demand the taxation of monopoly privileges, while they remain in private hands, to the extent of the value of the privileges granted."

Several amendments to the State constitution are to be voted upon, most of them for the lengthening of official terms or for the abridgement of local self-government, most of them being in the interest of plutocracy.

TEXAS, EL PASO.—(Special Correspondence.—Henry Ware Allen.)—Although the El Paso Single Tax Association has no active existence, there is in this community a very general understanding of and a readiness to support, when the time comes, the proposition to tax land values only and to exempt improvements. Post's *Public* has quite a circulation here, and that is evidence enough that there are a number of democratic democrats in El Paso. For after all, we must have something approaching democracy before we can have the Single Tax. So far as national politics is concerned there is an ominous silence in this part of the country just now. Nobody seems to care particularly who is elected President. Four years ago we were having lively meetings, and sending our dollars to Willis J. Abbott. Now nobody cares. We see before us a choice of evils, and Judge Parker seems to have succeeded in assuring

us that the evil he represents, while a weak imitation of the other, could do no harm anyway, as the other evil would dominate, through the Senate, for four years to come. So we shall have to wait four years for a real call to arms.

Thirteen years ago I passed through El Paso on my way to the City of Mexico, and had the pleasure at that time, as I reported in a letter to *The Standard*, of meeting a veteran Single Taxer, Chas. E. Hubbard, now dead. Since that time the place has grown from a village to a city, and is, in many respects, very different from other American cities. I have looked at the place, its people, and its institutions through Single Tax spectacles for nine years and will give you some of my impressions. Except for a fertile valley below here which is kept productive by irrigation, El Paso is in the middle of a vast desert with no other cities within hundreds of miles. The climate attracts health-seekers, and besides being an important railroad centre this is an important gateway to Mexico. Here we have the daily privilege of witnessing a continuous vaudeville of tariff taxation absurdities that would be wholly amusing were it not so unjust. Early in the morning a Mexican brings a basquet of crude bouquets over the bridge, for the other side is more fertile and flowers grow more easily over there. He is halted by a United States Customs inspector and a goodly ad valorem tax is collected from the ragged fellow. Then some lady tourist, suspected of smuggling, is taken from the street car, searched by a lady inspector, with a result that a mistake has been made, that either seizure of goods follows, or that the person is imprisoned for smuggling, as the case may be. And while the petty tragedies, or comedies, are being made to bring the law into disrespect at the city bridges, the gigantic system of stifling the nation's commerce is being conducted by the rival custom houses of the two republics. The enormous freight charges of this region are doubled by this unnatural barrier to trade. Commerce, the prolific agent of prosperity, peace and goodwill, is placed on the rack here at the border, thousands of miles from producer and consumer, and tortured nigh unto death. I have no figures of export and import to give, Single Taxers have little use for statistics anyway; suffice it to say that while an enormous quantity of goods is exported and imported here, this is but a fraction of what would come with free trade. The vagaries of the Mexican law was illustrated the other day when a car of iron rods were pronounced "raw material" calling for a high duty, and were therefore returned to this side of the river to a foundry, where a useless hole was punched through the end of each rod. After that the law was satisfied, and the car load of "manufactured articles" were admitted at a low duty. Examples of similar absurdities, both Mexican and American, would quickly fill this

issue of the REVIEW. A faint idea of the commerce that might be is indicated by an inspection of the shops across the river where European laces, silks, gloves, Mexican drawn work and cigars are sold for half or less of the El Paso price. There is a so-called "free zone"—a strip twenty miles wide all along the border on the Mexican side—for the purpose of preventing the whole Mexican population on the border from moving over into the United States, consequently our neighbors directly across the river have only a small tax to pay. But the thirteen millions south of the border would no doubt consume immense quantities of our goods, the demand for which can not even be started under present conditions.

The evil of our present taxation system is certainly more glaringly bad in western towns like El Paso than in eastern cities. A view of this city from Mount Franklin, a high hill nearby, reveals the paradox of a city with narrow streets, scarcely an open public place, and dwellings huddled up together in so crowded a manner as to exclude playground for children and necessary light and sunshine, and this in spite of thousands upon thousands of idle acres stretching off to the horizon. This unnatural way of building a city is explained when we learn that desirable building lots cost from \$1,000 to \$2,000, and the incentive for the speculation in land is learned from the recital of the thousands and hundreds of thousands of dollars which our prominent citizens, and their clients back east, have made by buying and selling city lots. The result is, of course, that the cost of living is unnaturally high.

None are so blind as those who will not see, and sometimes it seems as though the common people were as blind as the horse that rushes back to the burning barn to be consumed. However, we Single Taxers have faith that a better time is coming before long. Walking along the streets of Kansas City years ago with James A. Herne, I told him that I had been baffled in fighting against odds myself and in looking about me and seeing so little hope for the masses of men so far as the material comforts were concerned, until I came to see the true and natural system which Henry George had revealed, when I at once had a new faith in God. "Allen," said Mr. Herne, "yours has been the experience of Single Taxers everywhere, and Hamlin Garland expressed to me his experience in almost the very words which you have used." "The Single Taxers are the salt of the earth," the old man said. Now the older I grow the more certain I am that the great distinction of the Single Tax as elucidated by Henry George, in contrast to Socialism, is that it simply means the conforming to law, natural law, divine law, while Socialism is the vague up-building of an artificial system which, not being natural, appeals not one whit to the religious instinct that

is within us all. I believe that the good work which Single Taxers have been doing for the past twenty years will, with the support of Jeffersonian Democrats, result in a political revolution in the near future. I had hoped that Tom Johnson would have led us to a real victory this year, possibly waiting four years will make the victory more overwhelming and conclusive.

WISCONSIN.—(Special Correspondence.—John Harrington.)—The broad philosophy of the Single Tax works out in ways not dreamt of or understood by those who do not know that philosophy. An instance in point, and one I consider an extremely valuable example, has recently occurred in this city.

The Fond du Lac & Oshkosh Electric Railroad Co. two years ago built an inter-urban railway between the two cities. The company secured no franchise in Oshkosh, but instead, made a private arrangement with the local street railway company to enter this city over the tracks of the latter. This private arrangement proving unsatisfactory, the F. & O. E. Co. asked for a franchise and independent right-of-way into and across the city, a distance of about $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles. After lengthy negotiations of the usual cat-hauling kind, the city council granted a franchise for thirty years, subject to the payment by the company of a rental or license fee of one thousand dollars per year, to be paid into the city treasury. The officers of the company stormed and declared the demands of the city exorbitant, and threatened to terminate all further negotiations. Many citizens also thought the requirements of the city unreasonable, as the franchise required certain pavement and other street construction, iron poles, and the usual provisions contained in such grants. However, the city officers remained firm, and before the expiration of the ninety days allowed to the company, its officers came in and meekly accepted the franchise and paid in the first annual rental of \$1,000.

One thousand dollars is a small annual payment for a franchise. But this is a small city of 30,000 population, and the franchise covers only two or three streets and a bridge. There is a local street railway occupying all the desirable streets, operating about 15 miles of street railway and paying nothing. The especial service of this new deal is that it recognizes the city's ownership of a valuable right; it is an unusual reminder of what the people should be receiving, and are not, from the local street railway company, and from other public service corporations. It is a constant educator of the people. It is an example to surrounding cities. And finally, it is an example of the single-tax doctrine pure and simple, as far as it goes; namely, that the values created by the community belong to the community, and should be taken by the community for public purposes.

Only those who are well-informed single-taxers have any appreciation of the extent

this philosophy is permeating public affairs. It is actively modifying and changing public views in every department of government. There are thousands of true single-taxers in every State, in every important city, who would rigorously deny that they ever sympathized with the movement. They will readily acknowledge that the assessment of a house should not be increased whenever its owner beautifies it with a new coat of paint; that a man should not be compelled to pay more taxes because he saves up his earnings and buys his daughters a piano. They acknowledge that the great and increasing value of sites in cities should go in some form to the public whose growth and enterprise create those values. They see clearly that the city should collect the rapidly growing value of public service franchises and rights-of-way. They will even admit that the old theory of "equal assessment of all property" is neither equitable or expedient; that it is a proved and admitted failure. They believe in the different items of single-tax belief; but they strenuously deny the philosophy as a whole. They will admit that the great values created by the public should be taken by the public; they will admit that the fresh coat of paint, or the new porch or piano, or even the new house should not be taxed; but they will not put the two thoughts together and see that if the former is taxed so as to absorb the annual value created by the community, the latter need not be taxed at all. But after all there is no other movement gaining such momentum, making such progress, and so modifying public opinion, as the philosophy of Henry George.

PROPOSED SINGLE TAX COLONY NEAR NEW YORK CITY.

The successful establishment of the Single Tax colony of Fairhope, Alabama, as related from time to time, in the *SINGLE TAX REVIEW*, and in the *New York World*, and by Ella Wheeler Wilcox in *The American*, recently, marks the opening of a new period in Single Tax development and ought to inspire the founding of other settlements of like character throughout the world.

The Fairhope colonists are the Pilgrim Fathers of the twentieth century as the practical representatives of the cause of economic liberty.

Let all who believe in the principles of freedom as set forth by Henry George, tender homage and gratitude to the Fairhope pioneers who, by their courage and energy, have blazed the way for all other believers in the grand cause of human emancipation.

While the Single Tax theory is invulnerable, it is complex, and therefore not easily understood by the people, so that though the doctrine has been ably preached by its exponents now for many years, the subject is yet in its academic stage, and conse-

quently too abstract for the masses to comprehend or put in practice. However great in itself a new idea may be, the efforts expended in a single practical demonstration will do more towards illustrating its merits to the average person than a hundred times as much labor of a theoretical educational nature alone can accomplish.

The Fairhope founders planned well. They first selected a mild and healthful climate. Then a location near a large commercial center and upon the shores of a great waterway, thus insuring forever the cheapest of all transportation facilities—navigation. Next a large tract of fertile ground at a very low price in a prosperous centrally located agricultural and manufacturing state—Alabama. These indispensable requisites secured, together with other and incidental advantages that are unnecessary to refer to—show that these brave pioneers planned upon the broadest lines for posterity and the cause of humanity in trying to establish a practical illustration of the workings of the Single Tax theory—as well as it could be done by humble beginnings and under existing political conditions.

With this successful example before us, it is now proposed that another Single Tax colony be organized and established within the closest practicable proximity of New York City, with all that that implies, and to start the project as quickly as possible. All persons who may be interested in the development of the enterprise are hereby respectfully requested to signify their willingness to cooperate in any way, by communicating with the undersigned to that effect.

After a sufficient number of persons have been heard from, a notice will then be sent to each one of the time and place where a meeting can be held, at which the whole subject can be discussed and a temporary organization started to carry the work along towards its further development by the proper organized effort in a permanent way.

Some persons to whom this suggestion has been made, have already given it their hearty approval and promised their fullest co-operation, but it is desirable that as many friends of the cause as possible be participants from the start and that the undertaking may have the greatest obtainable strength and vitality when launched.

No plan or locality is in mind other than that the settlement be somewhere near New York City, and that suggestion is not offered as an indispensable factor, but is proposed for the following reasons:

The Single Tax theory, it is believed, is known to more people in Greater New York than can be found in any community of equal area anywhere else in the world. Here in the person of Henry George, the cause received, we may say, one-third of the votes cast for mayor. Here he fought for the cause with an energy and persist-

once that cost him his life, finally, and made him its martyr.

It is reasonable, therefore, to suppose that his teachings have convinced a sufficient number of persons to combine them together to carry out this undertaking. And in this connection, let us hope that when such a settlement is named, that it be known as "George City," as a tribute to his memory.

Next, the grinding pressure of land rent is felt here with greater intensity and suffering, perhaps, than anywhere else on the globe. It is stated that the annual ground rent paid by the people here, is over \$200,000,000. Just think of it? Allowing \$500 as the average gross annual income of every man here, this means that 400,000 men are contributing their entire gross earnings every year to the land-owning class, for the privilege of being able to live and do business in this community. Bear in mind, this is for the bare land rent alone. Not for the use of the capital invested in buildings or other improvements, only the right to live on this particular spot of earth. This tribute must be paid and is paid out annually by the producers, to the non-producers of this congested community. Then comes the life-and-death competition for employment which keeps the rate of wages as near as possible to the starvation level. And, finally, the vast and constantly increasing army of incomers and emigrants that must also find their living here. These tremendous forces are all focussed here and make the question of minimized personal expenditures of paramount consideration. Surely in such a community, the matter of lightening the burden will be of the greatest interest and the remedy will be gladly accepted, if properly presented, by at least enough of the people to make a large and flourishing city in due time. Moreover, the agitation of the Single Tax theory constantly going on here in the different associations and meeting places, shows that the people are already in a receptive mood.

Then again, New York City being a great manufacturing community, the largest in the world, in fact, the shifting of a few thousand of its skilled citizens to a new settlement close to the city, ought to be an easy matter, compared with the inertia overcome by the Fairhope colonists who travelled thousands of miles to locate.

Now being located and settled, say, within fifty miles of New York, what would be the advantages to the colonists, independent of those of the application of the Single Tax principle? We will suppose our new city is somewhere up along Long Island Sound, either on Long Island or in Connecticut, or up the Hudson or down on the New Jersey shore, for instance. We then would have a line of steamboats making daily trips to and from New York, and we will, if possible, have the transportation for passengers and freight free to the colonists. They could then manufacture the same

articles or goods they now are making in New York and deliver them anywhere within the city limits as cheaply as can be done by the city manufacturers. Instead of paying enormous land rents the workmen and employers would have only nominal rents, and the saving in this respect would amount to fully twenty five per cent. of the gross earnings of the workers, and prove a corresponding economy to the employers.

A very large part of the manufacturing done in New York City is of a character that requires but very little fixed capital, such as large buildings and grounds and costly machinery. The sweatshops for instance, that were suppressed, and their present equivalents employ large numbers of operatives and need only sewing machines and the like to do the work, which is done in lofts, and improvised quarters like tenements and stores. This class of work could be done just as well in the colony under the favorable transportation arrangement suggested, and the saving in rent would enable the colonists to successfully compete with the city manufacturers.

By reason of the close proximity of New York, the great American market and distribution point, a great diversity of industries could be carried on, such as clothing, men and women's ware, small articles, &c., flour milling, hardware, &c., &c.

This would, of course, mean a manufacturing colony, but its advantages would be those of a large community on a small area of land. One manufacturing plant that employs say 200 heads of families, is equivalent to a settlement of 1000 persons, and that would require only a few acres of ground for factory and residence purposes. If the community were of an agricultural composition, it would mean a mile or two square of ground for their cultivation and maintenance.

But agricultural industry could also be carried on in products such as would suit the large market requirements of the city, like poultry, eggs, milk, garden truck, &c., that always pay with a near-by market and cheap transportation.

The free transportation feature may appear impracticable. But why? Why not free boats as well as free streets and roads? A boat is simply a road that moves. Nature furnishes the roadway—water—which nothing else equals as a level, easy riding surface. The boat is only a bridge, as it were, at each end of the trip. The colony could well afford to go to the limit in boats and wharf facilities towards making them absolutely free.

The people could have large lots to build houses and factories upon at a rental of only a few dollars per year, and no more than they must now pay in annual taxes on their city lots, even if they own them. The colonists would not be required to pay anything else for their ground, except the State and county taxes, which would be dis-

tributed according to the land values, exclusively.

Of course, the land would have to be bought first by the colony as a whole—but it could be bought at acre prices, say \$100 per acre or less. And an acre cuts up into ten city lots, 25 by 100 feet, with ample provision for streets, parks, schools, churches, and other public requirements. None of the Single Tax arguments need to be repeated here, as this article is intended for those who are familiar with this subject.

But we could offer the public the concrete facts, and let them learn the benefit of the Single Tax by its operations as exemplified in the colony. We could say to manufacturers, come and build factories with us. You need pay only the annual rental on the land occupied at acre prices. To the farmer, similar offers could be made. The State and county tax would be uniformly distributed over the land alone, and according to its locality values. The public improvements and administration expenses would, of course, be similarly distributed, and all the other details equitably worked out.

The Colony could be organized under the General State Corporation laws, or through a special charter obtained from the State.

The site, say 1,200 to 2,500 acres, could be bought at farm prices before settlement was made thereon, and the "unearned increment" of the enhanced value due to the settlement, would all go to the Colony as a whole, instead of to land speculators as now, when new towns or "suburbs" are developed.

This proposition can be so favorably presented to the public by a plain statement of the facts, that it is believed that it will receive a large and hearty support from the outset, and that in a very short time a city of from 5,000 to 10,000 population would be the result.

The immense and rapid development of the City of New York, while increasing the population, is expanding the business area and correspondingly reducing the residential territory, and to such an over-congested condition, that the people are forced to seek suburban homes in large numbers. The result is that large suburbs, 10 to 20 miles away, are being settled everywhere around the city, although the lots are sold at prices ranging from \$500 to \$3,000, and finding ready buyers all over the country on the instalment plan even at these inflated values.

Of course, the profits of the promoters of these "suburbs" are very great, but the purchasers never think of the immense ground rent tribute involved, unless they happen to understand the iniquity of private land ownership and have some comprehension of the Single Tax theory.

Now, it is believed that when the proposed settlement is properly presented to this vast community as a plain business proposition, it will be well received, because, in reality, it is substantially the same as asking the public to become stockholders

in a sound and profitable corporate enterprise, such as a railroad or the like, and in which public ownership is an established fact, only the "public" in corporations consists of the members who happen to be stockholders. This similarity can be so illustrated by arguments that the private ownership of the ground (or lots) in the colony will be shown to be nearly the same as now exists under present conditions, and the delusion of the fee simple ownership thereof would, in practice, work out its own destruction.

To put it in another way, it is as though a man rented a lot from, say, the New York Central Railroad in perpetuity for \$10 per annum, while the lot would be worth \$1,000 to a private owner in fee simple. Now, the lessee can, however, invest \$1,000 of his savings in improving his lot or else in the general stock of the railroad company, and thus derive indirectly his proportionate interest in his own lot and those of all the other lots of the railroad similarly held by others, as well as all the other property and assets of the corporation. If such a proposition were made by the New York Central Railroad it would be accepted with alacrity by the whole community. Now the inducements of the proposed colony are of an analagous character, only people start at the beginning with acre values, and secure to themselves collectively all the increased values which their presence would bring to the settlement.

Many other substantial reasons could be presented showing that such a project ought to be well received by the community and that it will prove a success from the beginning when properly organized and its merits explained. But these must be omitted in this article for want of space.

It is hoped a sufficient number of persons who believe in the importance and practicability of this suggestion will respond by communicating with the undersigned, and that a meeting for organization purposes can be called in the near future.

T. F. GAYNOR,
18 Broadway, New York.

WOMEN'S WORK IN WASHINGTON, D. C.

The first meeting of the season of the Women's Single Tax Club of the District of Columbia was held Monday, Oct. 3rd, 1904, and its regular meetings will be held the first Monday in each month until May, 1905.

Mrs. Annie E. George, widow of Henry George, having died during the recess of the club, it was voted that the president appoint a committee to draw up a suitable resolution, the same to be spread on the minutes of the club at its next meeting.

Mrs. M. Lora Coope gave an interesting report of the Women's National Single Tax League, held at St. Louis, Mo., the 11th,

12th and 13th of July, 1904, at which meeting Mrs. Coope represented the club, and also the National Treasurer, Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe, who was prevented from attending the annual meeting, being called to Colorado on business.

On July 12th, 13th and 14th Single Taxers and others in Washington had the pleasure of meeting and hearing Mr. John Z. White, first at an informal banquet held on the evening of July 12th; on the 13th at a joint picnic held under the auspices of the Equal Suffragists and Single Taxers; and on Sunday afternoon, July 14th, at the People's Church, Dr. Alex. Kent, pastor of the church, presiding.

From the platform of this church anyone having a message in behalf of humanity can be heard at any time.

Thursday, Oct. 27th, 1904, the Washington Single Tax Club will consider the mass meeting to be held in January, 1905, at which time Mr. White is to speak.

The matter of holding a conference of Single Taxers in February or March, 1905, at Fairhope, Ala., has not been discussed generally by Single Taxers of Washington, and it is unlikely that any considerable number would be able to attend. Some would, however, and nearly all Single Taxers of Washington are friendly to Fairhope.

JENNIE L. MUNROE.

News—Foreign.

AUCKLAND, NEW ZEALAND.

The National Single Tax League of New Zealand held a social on the evening of Friday, June 24th. The President of the League, Mr. Fowlds, occupied the chair and about 100 members were present. Some excellent speeches were given and the members generally were thrilled with enthusiasm for the truth. Several clergymen took part in the proceedings. The League's programme on the land question has been very ably presented to the people at a large number of meetings during the last quarter, chiefly by the efforts of Mr. G. Fowlds and Mr. G. Lawrenson, both of whom are members of parliament. During the month of June a series of meetings were held, extending widely over the Auckland Province. The first was held at Devonport, the marine suburb of Auckland, on May 29th. The hall was well filled and the speakers were attentively listened to. The arguments of the two speakers struck deep into the minds of the hearers, and those who attended that meeting will remember it for many years. It must be gratifying to Messrs. Fowlds and Lawrenson to see how effective their work has been, for this meeting undoubtedly influenced the voting at the Rating Unimproved Values poll which was held eight days later in the same borough. Devonport has enjoyed the operation of

Rating Unimproved Values for three years, and it has prospered exceedingly during that period. But the land speculators are mortified at the operation of this system and they made a very determined effort to upset it, but they were disappointed and are doomed to further "outrageous taxation," as they call it. The system of Rating Unimproved Values was maintained by a majority of nearly 8 to 1. This result is very encouraging to land reformers, for it shows not only that Rating Unimproved Values has the beneficent effect that we claim, but it also shows that the people are prepared to appreciate that effect when they see it and that they will firmly uphold the system once it is adopted.

GEORGE STEVENSON.

TORONTO.

There is great news to report from Toronto. We have Single Tax in sight! At least such is the opinion of our more optimistic propagandists. The most conservative of the association's members, however, agree that the tide is flowing our way as it never did before.

To give a clear idea of the advantages of our position it must be recalled that two years ago Mr. Robert Tyson started a movement to secure direct legislation in Toronto municipal affairs by the Winetka system. Ably assisted by Mr. James Simpson, the Socialist ex-president of the District Labor Council, practically all of the aldermen were induced to pledge themselves to grant the request of 3,000 voters to submit any specified measure to the people. These pledges were renewed at the last municipal election, and the promise was made that this obligation should be incorporated in the council's rules of procedure.

The Toronto Single Taxers in common no doubt with their fellow land reformers in other places, have for years been told by politicians that their demands were too radical for practical politics.

"Would you support us were we to reduce our requirements to a request for an exemption of \$700 from the assessment of houses?" asked Mr. Alan Thompson after listening to a statement to this effect made some two years ago by our assessment commissioner.

The commissioner consented to lend his aid to the carrying of such a proposal.

Ald. Dr. Noble had recently been elected to council on a Single Tax platform and the association sought his aid. A measure seeking from the local legislature the necessary power to grant the exemption was introduced in the municipal chamber and referred to a committee. The assessment commissioner then took advantage of an opportunity offered him to throw the weight of his department against the idea by submitting a report full of spurious arguments as to the working out of the scheme. The Single Taxers appeared before

the committee and so punctured his report that it was sent back for repairs. The measure was next sent to council and pigeon-holed.

But now the curtain rises on the third scene of the drama. Our present "good times" have resulted in a very serious house famine in the City of Toronto and the \$700 exemption has become a popular measure. In a series of editorials advocating the scheme, the Toronto *Daily Star*, our possibly most widely read evening paper, points out that such an exemption would reduce the rent of a house assessed at \$1,000, providing the land was valued at not more than \$800, by \$12.65 per annum. A house assessed at \$2,000 would receive a reduction of \$8; one valued at \$3,000 would be benefited to the extent of \$3.65, while a dwelling assessed at \$3,800 would pay the same tax under one system as the other. The taxes and therefore the rents of houses still more valuable would be increased so that a dwelling valued at \$5,000 would pay \$5 extra and one assessed at \$10,000 would pay \$28 extra. The explanation of this apparent discrimination in favor of the much needed small house is that the reduction in the city's total assessment would require an increase in the general mill rate which applied to the remaining assessment would offset, in a greater or less degree, the direct result of the exemption. The fact that over 18,000 of our 37,000 dwellings in the city of Toronto are assessed at \$1,100 and under shows that the great majority of houses would be benefited. So apparent is this and so easily seen by the workmen that one of the aldermen declared himself opposed to submitting the proposition to the people on the ground that "they would all vote for it."

The Single Taxers, like good sailors, are running with the wind and tide. All thought of Sunday meetings or other propaganda is for the moment forgotten; the referendum petitions are already printed and every effort of the association is being strained to secure the necessary 8,000 signatures in time for the next election.

ARTHUR W. ROEBUCK.

NOTES OF PROGRESS ABROAD.

At the very time we go to press the Land Reform League of Germany, which includes the active Single Taxers of that country, are holding their Fourteenth Annual Convention. At Darmstadt on October 15th and 16th, those who are active in the movement for the restoration of the rights of the German people to the land of their country are discussing ways and means for advancing the cause of industrial emancipation. One hundred delegates from Germany will be present, but representatives from France, Sweden and Switzerland will also be in attendance. Professor Schaer is the leader of the move-

ment in the last named country, and he will speak on its progress among the people of that sturdy little republic. The governments of German cities, which are now engaged in introducing modifications of the Single Tax System, some account of which has appeared in the REVIEW from the pen of Miss Grace Isabel Colbron, have been invited to send delegates. The president of the League is Adolph Damaschke, whose name is well and favorably known on this side of the water. Miss Colbron is in attendance and will speak of the progress of the Single Tax movement in America. In the next number of the REVIEW will appear an article from Miss Colbron, which will include an account of the League's meeting and her impressions of the leaders present at its convention, with whom it is hoped Single Taxers in this country will in time become better acquainted.

At the recent annual meeting of the Single Taxers of Melbourne, Mr. E. Lonsdale, M. H. R., of New South Wales, gave an account of some of the battles he has fought for the Single Tax. During his campaign in the last state contest he was "charged" with being a Single Taxer. Here is his reply, and it is a model of its kind.

"What is a Single Taxer? Ask my opponent. He cannot tell you, for he does not know. What is a Single Taxer? I should imagine it some sort of wild animal which ought to be captured and put into an iron cage and taken around on exhibition. What is a Single Taxer? A Single Taxer is a man who fights under a banner on which is inscribed, "To every man his own." Now get up any of you in this hall and tell me that that is wrong. Let us see the man who will say that a man should not have his own. What a man earns or produces belongs to himself, and no man, not even the State, has the right to take any portion of it from him without giving him a fair equivalent. A Single Taxer is a man who fights under a banner upon which is inscribed, "Equal rights to all men; special privileges to none." Get up, any of you, and say that that is not correct. Let us look on the man who says there are some men who should not have equal rights with others. That there are some men who ought to have special privileges and be in the position of levying tribute upon the community. A Single Taxer is a man who fights under a banner upon which is inscribed "Taxation, according to advantages received." Now, again let us look at the man who says that that is wrong. That a man who gets the largest advantage shall pay the least taxation. That the man who gets the least advantage should pay the largest taxation. You know my opponent. He believes in getting all for nothing. If you believe in that, vote for him. If you believe that justice should be meted out to all; if you believe

n these principles I have enunciated you must vote for me."

In a recent article the *New Age*, of London, England, pays this deserved tribute to a true and tried friend of the movement whose work, after long waiting and patient self-sacrifice, has aided in bringing the cause in Great Britain from its obscure beginnings to popularity and power, where it must now be reckoned with as a political force.

"Some recent bye-elections have been significant, and some divisions in the House of Commons on the Fiscal question have been remarkable, but nothing in our recent political history surpasses, or even equals, in importance the fact that in a Tory House of Commons a Bill embodying the principle that land values are a proper subject of rating apart from buildings and improvements has been carried by a majority of sixty-seven. It is true that the proposal is limited to municipal areas, but it is certain that its application must quickly be extended to the whole country. It is a great triumph for those who have given the best years of their lives to the education of public opinion upon the question, and common justic demands that one man should be named in this connection as deserving above all others honorable mention in this campaign—Mr. John Ferguson, of Glasgow. Mr. Ferguson has been an ardent land reformer for half a century. When Henry George came to this country he found a warm supporter in Mr. Ferguson, and from that day to this Mr. Ferguson has been unwearied in his endeavors to persuade the Glasgow Corporation to adopt the principle of the taxation of land values and give the municipalities of the country a strong lead. The cause has been so well served by Mr. Ferguson and those of like mind that the measure presented to the House of Commons on Friday last, by Mr. Trevelyan, had the hearty support of no fewer than two hundred of the principal rating authorities of the United Kingdom."

George's birthday was observed in Glasgow, where a meeting was held under the auspices of the Scottish League. A meeting at York, England, was addressed by Peter Burt, Mr. B. Seeborn Rowntree presiding. Mr. Burt is ex-president of the Scottish League for the Taxation of Land Values. At Keighley, England, where Mr. F. Skirrow resides, a meeting was organized under his direction and was well attended. Here, too, Mr. Burt spoke, giving his personal recollections of Mr. George and dwelling upon the lesson of his life. The occasion was observed in London by a dinner, at which 54 guests sat down, among whom were J. H. Whitely, M. P., president of the English League for the Taxation of Land Values; L. H. Berens, one of the joint authors of "The Story of My Dictatorship;"

Harold Rylett, of the *New Age*; Frederick Verinder, and others whose names are more or less familiar to readers of the REVIEW.

P. J. O'Regan, of Wellington, New Zealand, than whom no more devoted and able advocate of our principles is to be found, sends us the Report of the Town Clerk in which the following reference is made to the system of rating on unimproved values which has now been in operation in that city for nearly fifty years:

"An objection, however, may be reasonably raised (where rating on land values has been adopted) to the present method of raising general rates on the unimproved value while the Charitable Aid and Water Rates are raised on the annual and in some cases the capital values. The whole rating power should undoubtedly be on one basis of value to prevent cumbersome duplication in bookkeeping and confusion in the minds of the rate-payers. It is probable that the next municipal conference will endeavor to obtain such an amendment to the present law.

"It has been contended that the water rate cannot without hardship be raised on the unimproved value but the contention does not on examination appear to hold. For domestic use water has in Wellington been charged at 4 per cent. on the annual value. Stores have been granted half such rates, and extraordinary services are being paid for by meter, consequently a rate on the unimproved value equivalent to the percentage on the annual value can be readily calculated, and half this rate be charged on stores, the extraordinary supplies being still charged for by meter, and thus save the whole cost of making an assessment of the annual values. The capital value should, however, be still taken, as the information serves statistically many practical uses."

In his communication to the REVIEW, Mr. O'Regan adds:

"You will be glad to learn that the cause of land value taxation continues to make satisfactory headway in this country. We are concentrating our efforts on bringing the rating on unimproved values act into force, and it is very seldom that a poll fails. Several attempts have been made of late to revert to the old system, for which the act makes provision; but in every case the rate-payers by an increased majority declared in favor of the new. It is very doubtful if a similar attempt will be made in any district again, and it is quite certain that no such attempt will succeed."

The value of land in the city of Paris is slightly less than 71 cents a square meter (about 10¼ square), or a total of \$1,402,892,-600.

L. P. CUSTER.

(See Portrait)

L. P. Custer was born at Dublin, Wayne County, Indiana, August 20, 1854. He didn't receive a college education or much of any technical education, having been permitted by his father, at the age of fourteen, to quit school and enter the local railway station as an all-around hustler and general utility boy, with the promise of being taught telegraphy. He was taught by doing nearly all that was to be learned of telegraphy, and in due time emerged as a full fledged operator, with more or less knowledge of the art, and soon started on his career in the service of the "Panhandle" railroad, at Cambridge City, Ind., in the fall of 1869.

As with the average man who has not had an elongated, parted-in-the middle name and a coat-of-arms from a cabbage patch ancestry conferred upon him, by which he might secure entry into the first families of aristocracy and graft, his life passed without particular incident until one day in the summer of 1885, while he and half a dozen other Knights of Labor were sitting in the office of the *Labor Signal*, in Indianapolis, discussing politics and political economy, one Gilbert Seibert, who subsequently moved to Seattle, gave utterance to this sentence: "Prof. Ridpath, (then Principal of what is now known as Depauw University) says Henry George is the Moses of the nineteenth century." There was nothing startling in the statement, but it served to bring into the field a working disciple, who has remained constantly on guard, doing what he could, to spread the gospel of truth. Theretofore, although he had frequently been a listener to Seibert and others on the land question, no impression had been made, but this utterance seemed to have touched the right chord, and when the party broke up, Custer sought a book store, purchased a copy of "Progress and Poverty," and that night read "The Problem." From that time dates his conversion. He was one of the six who organized the first Single Tax organization in Indianapolis, and he served as an officer of the League for the greater portion of its existence, previous to his departure from that city in 1890. In 1891 he joined the St. Louis Single Tax League, and has served at one time or another as president, recording secretary or financial secretary, which latter position he now holds. Mr. Custer is an employee of the Western Union Telegraph Co., holding a subordinate official position. The superior officers know of his "crankiness" and seem to think he is a pretty good fellow and entirely harmless.

We can all turn a nice phrase about the nobleness of honest toil. Yet, when a man fails as a merchant and becomes a street-car conductor, we commiserate his fall.

Rev. HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

LAND VALUES OF NEW YORK.

A STUDY OF THE LATEST REAL ESTATE ASSESSMENT LISTS.

(For the REVIEW.)

The real estate assessment lists for the city of New York have been issued, showing the assessed value of each parcel of real estate, with the land value stated separately, also the size of lots, height of building, owner's name and location. These lists can be bought at the City Hall separately for 25 cents each, one for each section or ward; for Manhattan the total cost is \$2.00, and for the entire city \$10.50. Every resident interested in taxation should have at least the list for his section.

As the land values are stated only as a basis of comparison and do not affect the tax, the figures have not always been changed when a reduction has been allowed. Nor are all the volumes added up, while some totals include exempt land. It is impossible to give the exact assessment of land value, without examining the tax books and adding the entire roll. However, the total can be computed within \$20,000,000, and the following table gives in round figures the taxable land value at the lowest estimate, (which is probably within \$5,000,000 of the exact amount) and the percentage to the total assessment of taxable ordinary real estate.

Manhattan Boro.	\$2,410,000,000	69 percent.
Bronx	150,000,000	67 "
Brooklyn	400,000,000	47 "
Queens	70,000,000	57 "
Richmond	20,000,000	48 "
New York City	\$3,050,000,000	62 "
Improvements, estimated,	\$1,681,000,000.	

(The value of improvements is not officially stated, but is computed here by deducting the land value from the total realty.)

The most valuable sites are in Manhattan, as is also most of the high value land, and the assessments for that borough correspond to those for the central portion of a large city, while Brooklyn is largely a residential and manufacturing section. In Brooklyn, were it not for the vacant land, the percentage of land value would probably be only 85 percent.)

Besides the above sum there are about \$100,000,000 of improvement values included in the special franchise assessment. If all improvements were exempted from taxation, the present total assessment of all taxable property for 1904 of \$5,640,542,-657 would be reduced to \$3,858,762,963.

To raise the same amount as at present the tax rate would have to be changed as follows (omitting decimals):

	Present rate.	New rate.
Manhattan and Bronx	1.51	2.21
Brooklyn	1.57	2.35
Queens	1.57	2.31
Richmond	1.50	2.37

(Variations between boroughs are due to county expenses. City expenses are paid from one treasury.)

To state the change in another way: Every property owner whose land value is less than two-thirds of the total value of his real estate will be benefited. Every owner whose land is only one-third of the total value will pay but one-half the amount of tax he now pays.

Land in Manhattan, which contains about 22 square miles, has become too valuable to be used for private dwellings, except costly ones. The cheapest city lot at street grade, 25x100 feet, is worth \$3,000 to \$4,000. Consequently many of the older dwellings are occupying such valuable land as to be themselves practically valueless. There are rows and rows of houses where the assessments run \$8,000 for the lot and \$9,000 for the total value, when the building could not be reproduced for \$4,000. On other rows off Fifth Avenue land is assessed as high as \$60,000 and the total only \$65,000. Were improvements exempted, owners of such poorly improved property would be encouraged to put up buildings suited to the site.

Lower Fifth Avenue, changing from residence to commercial use, affords a striking illustration of the extent to which improvers pay the taxes of non-improvers. Adding all properties in four blocks (18th to 22nd Streets) shows these totals for the two classes of property:

	Recently improved.	Old improvements.
Land value	\$5,980,000	\$4,007,000
Improvement value	4,495,000	806,000
Present taxes	158,528	72,840
Taxes under exemption	132,148	88,554

Although these recent improvements are fine modern 8 to 14 story buildings, they do not in the aggregate or in individual cases equal the value of the land on which they stand (with one exception that is only a trifle more valuable.)

Likewise the finest office buildings, department stores, and Fifth Avenue residences with rare exceptions, do not equal the value of the site on which they stand. Here are some typical high values:

	Land.	Building.
Empire Building . . .	\$2,050,000	\$1,700,000
Flat Iron " . . .	1,500,000	1,200,000
Hanover Bank	1,985,000	1,015,000
R. H. Macy & Co. . . .	3,500,000	2,800,000
Stiegel & Cooper	2,600,000	1,500,000
864 Fifth Ave., res..	750,000	400,000
973 Fifth Ave., res..	160,000	100,000

And here are a few contrasts:

Broadway & Wall, 4 story	530,000	5,000
Boreel Bldg., 8 story	2,414,000	390,000
Fifth Ave. Hotel . . .	4,000,000	500,000

This article is written as the REVIEW is ready to go to press, and space does not permit more detailed instances of valuations of business properties. But everyone is interested to know how small homes will be affected by proposed changes in tax rates. The following assessments are typical of large areas unaffected by abnormal speculation, and show various classes of homes in Brooklyn, with the amount of the tax now paid and the amount which would be paid were improvements exempted;

Street.	Land.	Bldg.	Present tax.	New tax.
Troy	\$340	\$2,460	\$44	\$8
52nd Street..	80	2,400	50	19
Moffat	800	3,000	60	19
41st	700	4,800	79	17
Old flats	1,600	3,900	86	38
New "	1,600	7,200	139	38
New "	3,000	20,000	361	70
Manhattan:				
W. 88th res..	8,000	7,000	227	176
" " " . . .	12,000	18,000	460	266
Old flats	10,000	5,000	227	231
New "	11,000	27,000	575	248

The last items show the only class of "small" houses now being built in Manhattan, and typical flats in which persons of moderate means reside.

Vacant land in the outlying districts is generally under-assessed, sometimes at less than half its value. In Brooklyn the land value of improved property has not always been carefully computed. With an exact assessment of land values it is not unlikely that personal property could be exempted as well as improvements without raising the rate above \$2.25.

But on the whole the work of assessing has been well done, in Manhattan especially, where in most sections the values fixed for real property seem to be from 90 to 95 per cent. of the normal selling values, and the land values have been stated with care and accuracy. Despite some obvious inequalities and typographical errors in the printed lists, the Tax Department must be congratulated on having conscientiously complied with the spirit as well as the letter of the new requirement of separate assessment of land and publication of the lists.

A. C. PLEYDELL.

A man may be unlearned. The word "philosophy" or "ethics" may not be in his vocabulary. Yet he lives and the manner of his life shows his philosophy. What he thinks, that is what he is.

Rev. HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

THOMPSON'S POINT: A SUMMER RESORT ON SINGLE TAX LINES.

(For the Review.)

With the continuous and rapid growth of our cities, both large and small, the multiplication of our factories and population, the wear and tear on the nervous and physical system as a result of the strenuous pursuit of fame or gold—but more often of a bare living—comes a growing need for rest and recreation.

With exasperating fidelity to detail there is conjured up in the memory a vision of a little lake nestling among the hills of old New England. A gentle wind fans the flow and wrinkles the cool water. Lounging in a hammock, one looks out over the water at the foot-hills and mountains in the distance. The sun is slowly sinking in the west and the stillness that precedes a summer's night is fast approaching. The air seems charged with a soothing, subtle tonic. Everywhere there is rest and peace. Rest for the weary body, peace for the perplexed mind.

The great majority instinctively long for such a retreat as this, and the lakes and ponds of New England offer many such.

It is a fact, however, that the most desirable locations for summer cottages and camps are fast being pre-empted.

Already the shores of our most beautiful lakes and ponds are very largely taken up and to quite an extent by land speculators. Every year it is becoming more and more difficult for a man of moderate means to secure a suitable location for a period of rest.

If this is true now, what of the future? Are the most desirable locations along the shores of the lakes and ponds of New England to be accessible only to those who possess wealth? If present methods of dealing with this matter are to be continued the answer must inevitably be yes, for the number and extent of such locations will never be any greater than now, while it is possible to conceive of the United States supporting a population many times in excess of its present number.

It seems to me that in justice to future generations this matter should be taken up and dealt with from the standpoint of the greatest good to all.

As an example of what can be accomplished even under present social conditions the policy of the town of Charlotte, Vermont, in dealing with the resort known as Thompson's Point, situated on Lake Champlain, may be interesting and also instructive as pointing to the method of dealing with this problem that might be adopted by other local communities and with equally good results.

Thompson's Point adjoins the town's poor farm and was formerly a part of it.

The property came into the hands of the town about 1848, but it is only within the

last fifteen years that it has been used to any extent as a summer resort, although before that time, such was its natural beauty, that it was a place much frequented by the townspeople as a picnic ground.

About fifteen years ago there were many who desired to secure lots on which to erect permanent cottages for summer use, and very wisely the town decided that, instead of selling these lots outright, they would rent them.

Accordingly a survey was made, and the Point divided up into goodly sized lots, and a rental of ten dollars a year for each lot decided upon. The plan was successful and the wisdom of this decision abundantly justified by the much greater income that the town now enjoys over what it would have received from a sale of the property.

In rentals the town now receives about \$450 a year and the lots are not yet all taken. In addition to this the Point furnishes an excellent market for the products of the town's poor farm.

Many of the cottages are handsome residences, and among these is the cottage of Justice Brewer of the Supreme Court. A great many of the cottages are owned by parties who use them only a part of the season and these have no trouble in renting them the balance of the season when they so desire. The great beauty of the scheme to a Single Taxer is, of course, that it follows to a certain extent the lines laid down by Henry George, and no doubt to this also may be attributed the democratic spirit that prevails at the Point. As time goes on the land will increase in value and the income to the town will increase accordingly. Even now some of the lots that were first taken, being more desirable than others, should command a higher rental and this is a point that will, no doubt, be taken up by the town authorities later. At present the rent is the same for each lot.

J. F. COWERN.

ENFORCED PEACE.

(For the Review.)

The report for Thursday, October 6th, of the 13th International Peace Congress, held in Boston, was headed in the leading daily, "Would Force Peace." It was a clever comment by the reporter on Andrew Carnegie's proposition for stopping war immediately. Carnegie's letter to the congress proposes the most extreme war measure possible for the obtaining of peace, that of slavery. He says, "Suppose, for instance, that Great Britain, France, Germany and America, with such other minor States as would certainly join them, were to take that position (binding themselves to settlement of all disputes by arbitration), prepared, if defied, to enforce peaceful settlement, the first offender, if there ever were one, being rigorously dealt with, war

would at one fell swoop be banished from the earth."

This has an exact parallel in the proposition of the father who took his son to enter Sunday school and thus directed the teacher, "If he don't get his lesson you just tell me. I'll lick it into him!"

How that boy must have loved the Bible, "licked into him" by his zealous father! And how those lesser States will love the bonds of "peace" in which they writhe in the iron grasp of the Great Powers!

But let us not ourselves make war upon Mr. Carnegie while we are testifying to the need of a peace interior to the external form of it. Therefore, let us realize how he came to make such a singular proposition. He probably gave way to that extremely human tendency to be carried off one's balance by enthusiasm for some longed-for condition, forgetting that the mere external has absolutely no power for good without the presence of corresponding underlying causes.

Such enforced peace would result in the bondage and consequent inevitable oppression of the weak nations by the strong. War, in freedom, horrible as it is, is a mild hell compared with bondage made peaceable by force. Every person or people has a Divine Right to self defense, and no abuse of that right can make slavery a virtue. The word "peace" is desecrated by giving it as a name to such a condition. The picture rises involuntarily in one's mind of the horrors of the situation of a little nation, oppressed by the united powers, unconsciously often, because those powers will be absorbed in arranging their own affairs to their best possible advantage, and the little nation will not be able to lift a hand in self defense. Have we not seen enough of such oppression to warn us against its systematic perpetuation throughout the earth?

Much more to the point are the words of the British workingman, Pete Curran, to the Congress: "War is caused by greed of territory." Every Single Taxer knows the truth of that, and it gives us a new impetus for work. Much more has been written and said of national and individual benefits of the Single Tax than of the international. Now the time is ripe to press that aspect of it, and it will further the knowledge of the lesser ones. Arbitration is in the air. Ten treaties in ten months have been made. More are about to be concluded. This kind of peace may come much sooner than we have anticipated. It will be a step onward, but it will soon result in enormous injustice unless it can go further. International peace, with special privileges to the few, will soon cease to appear even as peace and will become a new form of slavery. Internationally, the world must establish itself on the rights of all men to use of the earth, before international peace can be anything

but a new name for larger special privileges. Now is the time for Single Taxers to spread abroad this truth.

JANE DEARBORN MILLS,
Newtonville, Mass.

THE RIVER.

(For the Review.)

One day a young man came to my banks and gazed at me for many hours. From the clear waters I reflected the high banks of both my shores. My strength was flowing in shining profusion over the pebbly bars like the red blood through his veins. Many years ago I cut a channel through the high ridge so that I might be harnessed by a dam from shore to shore to do the work that I knew to be my destiny. Would this young man recognize my strength? The savages were disappearing. Their birch bark canoes lay tangled in the drifts. I was glad, for I knew that they would never open the gates of destiny for me. I saw no hope in their stolid faces, but this young man was of a new race. The discipline of centuries of civilization was in his face. I called to him in a hundred voices, and at last I saw the gleam of recognition in his face. He humbly asked: "May I build a dam here?" "Just as well as not," I replied. "Construct your dam and wheel and I will never tire. I will grind corn for all your people."

I gloried in my work. The task was never hard for me, I could have turned a dozen wheels as easily. I thundered over the dam night and day to attract others. The young man builded a beautiful home and I was glad, for I believed that others would now follow his example, but in vain I beat the flood into foaming breakers over the dam to attract them. Many times I saw them look wistfully at the falling waters and at the home of the mill owner only to see them turn away with disappointment written on their faces.

The mill owner was no longer humble, and the human light in his eyes gave way to sinister gloating. He destroyed the boats that the boys launched on the stream, and sometimes I saw him drive them away. I grew angry. He put strange signs along the river bank, and great strong men would turn away when they saw them, and boys would hide when he came near. I saw him enclose vast tracts of land with his fences. What necromancy did he employ? Why did his fellow men fear him? I could not understand. Sometimes I saw strong bearded men near him. Men who were his masters in will, intellect and strength. Surely they would break the strange power he held over the new race, but his strident voice always drove them to defeat. Sometimes it was only a battle of eyes, but always he won.

A great city grew near my banks, but he

seemed mightier than the city, for one day many of its citizens came with him and measured my banks and the height of the dam. I believed that my destiny was to be fulfilled, but they went away with the same expression that I had noted on the faces of the others. I did not know what work they planned for me to do, but when I saw a great engine pumping the foul water from a muddy creek to the inhabitants of the city, I knew that a new slavery had come. Everywhere men had sold their inheritance for a mess of pottage, and must now beg for the right to live, and be scourged to their tasks by the whips of hunger and cold in the hands of their taskmasters.

N. O. VYNE,
Emporia, Kans.

HOW I BECAME A SINGLE TAXER.

(For the Review.)

I often look back with interest on the extraordinary change that has come over my manner of looking on questions economic, social and religious. Brought up as I was to regard with profound reverence the extortions of the squire of the parish as the sacred "rights" of property, trained as I was in the schools to regard the present system of government and our present status of civilization as well nigh the acme of perfection, it required no small amount of study and thought to lead me to do as Saint Paul did, to abandon these "childish" things and to grow into a comprehension and acceptance of better and truer ideals.

After fifteen years spent in the teaching profession, including a year at the Teachers' Normal School and four years at college, I entered the employment of a financial institution. The business was principally the lending of money and taking mortgages in security. This led me to a study of economics. The text books on the mechanism of exchange, on banking and currency, gave me an introduction to the marvels of the mechanism of human society, a mechanism whose wonderful adjustments and relationships are as beautiful as anything in the whole of the adjustments of this physical universe.

At one time I was preparing an address for the teachers of this city on the subject, "The Education of the Citizen." Of course I was searching out such books and magazines as would afford me any assistance. In a copy of the Popular Science Monthly I found an article by a California writer named Henry George. The reading of this affected me profoundly. The dignity and refinement of the style, the masterly grasp of the subject, the logical sequence of the paragraphs, all impressed me in such a way as to make me anxious to read anything that this Henry George might write. Thus was I prepared to read Progress and Pov-

erty as soon as it appeared. It may be of interest to state that the first copy of that work which I had the opportunity to see, was loaned me by a gentleman who afterwards became one of our largest land speculators, while I developed into an ardent Single Taxer.

Some time after this I was requested to give an address on the subject of Economics to the Chautauqua Circle in the Metropolitan Church of this city. In the preparation of this address I met with an unexpected difficulty. Without any questioning I had adopted the definition of wealth given by most of the writers on this subject, namely: wealth consists of those things which possess exchange value. Thus wealth and value were often treated as identical, increasing and diminishing concurrently. But the moment I commenced to analyze exchange value I found myself for the time being non-plussed. With part of the definition there was no difficulty, but with the other part there was apparently a flat contradiction. Exchange value must have at least two conditions, utility and limitation. Bread has utility and at the same time it is limited in quantity, so that labor must be expended to keep up the supply, therefore, it forms part of what we call wealth. From the moment that the farmer begins to stir up the soil till the loaf is turned out of the oven, each step of the process is an addition to the utility and, therefore, an increase in wealth. All that was clear enough. Here we had three things concurrent, increase in utility, addition to the stock of food and increase in value. But this was giving heed only to one condition of exchange value, namely, the utility. As there are two conditions, we may increase the value by commencing with any one condition and then adding the other. In the case of the bread we had commenced with the limitation and had added the utility. Suppose now we commence with the utility and then increase the limitation. Air possesses utility. We cannot add thereto; but we may imagine that the limitation increases till we have to employ labor to supply the deficiency. At first there was no value, for a sufficiency could be obtained simply by opening the mouth and breathing. But into a diving bell it must be pumped, and now it has a value, and as the bell goes deeper and requires more pumping so the value advances.

Is this increase of value an increase of wealth? Not by any means, just the contrary. As food becomes more valuable during a siege with the increased scarcity, this increase of value, instead of indicating greater wealth, is the sign of greater poverty.

In the first case when labor added utility, the increased value indicated greater wealth. In the other case when the value increased because of greater scarcity, the increased

value was the indication of greater poverty.

Here were two things utterly different, of which I had found scarcely so much as a hint in the various works on Economics which I had read.

How was I to teach that value was the distinguishing characteristic of wealth when I found that in some cases value was just as truly the sign of greater poverty.

When the early settlers found an abundance of fuel at their doors, they were wealthy in that commodity. But with the clearing of the forest and the enormous increase in population, the supply of fuel relatively diminished, so that the value advanced. No one would dare to call that advance indication of an increase in wealth. The same is true of the value of the land. The enormous value to which it reaches in the large cities is the indication of its scarcity and consequently of poverty in land. That is the one thing which society must economize more and more.

Was not the proof here overwhelming that instead of value being homogenous, as had been taught by the text books, it was of two distinct kinds, the increase of the one value being concurrent with an increase in wealth, and the increase of the other being concurrent with an increase of poverty.

To work out along this line of enquiry became at once a most interesting and important study. It did not take long to see that between the value of a house and the value of the land on which the house stood, there is a polar difference. The house is the product of individual enterprise, we know the name of every worker thereon and the time occupied, but who can specify the man who produced the value of the land in the center of London or New York? When a man makes a garment he can say I produced so much of the value; but when the crowd comes and increases the value of the land, then we must say "We produced that value." Therefore, it follows by inexorable logical sequence that the man who makes a garment may say: I produced this, therefore it is mine; but of the land value he must say: We caused this value, therefore it is ours.

As the one value indicated an increase in wealth, we might call it a "plus" value, while the other, indicating a diminution of wealth, must then be called a "minus" value. Consequently, in the assessment of any city, when the value of the buildings is added to the value of the land, is not that just as absurd as to add together plus six and minus six and say the result is plus twelve. Is it not scientifically as outrageous as to confound assets and liabilities or debits and credits.

Then again, it did not take long to see the extraordinary difference between the duration of a labor produced value and the duration of the value of a town lot. The house has its maximum value when it is new. From that time the value begins to decline

till at last it passes away to dust and ashes. But the value of the lot keeps increasing and increasing year after year and age after age. A few years ago one of our prominent divines, editor of a paper, defied us to show that there was any difference between the value of the land and any other value. I called his attention to the enormous growth of the value of the land of New York since the time of Peter Stuyvesant, the old Dutch Governor, then I asked the reverend gentleman what he would pay for the old boots of that long-deceased governor. In a conversation with one of the best known writers of this continent, the gentleman asked me if I proposed to take for the public use all unearned increment, the unearned increment of wheat as well as that of land. "All the wheat in the world at the present time," I replied, "will be consumed before a couple of years expire; but the value of the site of the City of London has grown since the time Julius Cæsar landed on that island." The value of labor products is marked with transition and death, while the value of the land abides practically for ever. The value of the building is a declining one proceeding by a diminishing progression to the vanishing point, while the value of a town lot is an advancing one growing and growing with every accretion to the population.

But there is also another remarkable difference between these two values. In my youth I have seen men make nails by hand. It is probable that a blacksmith could not make them faster than one per minute. A few weeks ago I watched a machine make nails at the rate of four hundred per minute. It is quite safe to say that the cost of converting the rod or the wire into nails has been reduced one hundred fold. In the use of photography, the introduction of the steam press, the locomotive and the steamship, humanity has increased its productive power a thousand fold. Wherever for the power of the hand we can substitute some mechanism, there the improvement will be made.

But this can be accomplished only in the case of labor products. By no possible device can we reduce the price in town sites. So long as New York is the best place on this continent to conduct business, so long will the value of the land in that center stand at the highest figure.

From the initial difference which I had observed between the two values, thus I traced a series of other differences. All these differences were so great, that what we would assert positively of the one value, we had to assert negatively of the other value. The one value indicates an increase in utility, the other does not. The one value is the product of individual energy, the other is not. The one value is concurrent with an increase in wealth, the other is not. The one value is transient, declining from its maximum point till it finally disappears, while the other value does not

thus pass away, but continues to increase for all time as population grows; the one value is capable of diminution by inventions, while no possible invention has ever reduced the other.

But the climax to all this investigation was clear and overwhelming when I saw the relationships that must result in society in dealing with these values. We have allowed individuals to appropriate as their private property the value which the community causes to the land. Consequently one portion of society has grown to immense fortune simply by placing industry under a greater and greater tribute. The two extremes of society have grown further and further apart and the gulf is continually widening. Let this continue and the result on society must be disastrous. But on the other hand, when two men produce utilities and then exchange their products, there are all the indications of equity and beneficence. It is to the existence of this exchange of product for product that all the blessings of civilization are due. Let any one once get a proper apprehension of the difference of these two relationships and the question of taxation can for him have but one solution. Where should the taxes be placed? Should it be so as to harass and hinder the production or exchange of those products on which man depends for his existence and his comfort, or should they be placed so as to prevent that relationship, which begets the lord and the serf, which inevitably divides humanity into producers enriching and extortionists impoverishing?

This gave me a new vision of political economy and led me to enlist in the crusade for the emancipation of humanity.

W. A. DOUGLAS.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Reading, Pa.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

My experience indicates that it would be a great benefit to the Single Tax cause if prominent Single Tax writers would more frequently present and emphasize the real conservatism of the proposed remedy in such a way as to appeal to reasonable conservatives who are now generally repelled by the air of radicalism that has naturally but unfortunately gathered around it. It is radical in the sense that it is fundamental, not superficial; but it is commonly put in the same class with Anarchism and Socialism, and is greatly discredited by the association. If its conservatism be shown by impressing its real relation to these opposite extremes of radicalism, it will more easily attract the favorable consideration of men of standing who otherwise shy at the mention of it.

W. G. STEWART.

College Hill, Ohio.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Many Single Taxers are in the habit of

using an expression which I think is an unfortunate kink in their terminology. It is the phrase, "Wealth produced by the community as a whole."

When used to designate the sum of individual productions it is not objectionable, but this is not the meaning which Single Taxers attach to it. "Give to the individual what he produces and to the community what it produces," is an expression frequently heard, which shows that those who use it have in mind a kind or form of wealth which is over and above and distinct from that produced by individuals.

This is unscientific and a weakness. It is inconsistent with the Single Tax premise that wealth is produced by labor; for the reason that if each individual worker is given or retains the produce of his or her labor *nothing remains*.

Looked at in this way the wealth produced by the community as a whole is seen to be a myth.

What Single Taxers propose is that the community take economic rent, but there is no need to pretend that individuals will not be called on to part with a portion of the wealth produced by their labor. True, it will be that part which measures the natural advantage under which they work, but this does not change the facts, and for the good of the cause I think the use of the aforesaid expression should be discontinued.

JAMES BANN.

Los Angeles, Cal.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

As to the proposed Single Tax Conference at Fairhope, Ala., next February, I am inclined to regard it favorably. It would be impossible for many Single Taxers of California to attend it. But that is no reason why hundreds of others, who live nearer Fairhope than we do, should not be there, and get up a rousing revival that would echo around the world.

RALPH HOYT.

Toronto, Canada.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Fairhope is so far from Canada that I fear we could not send a special representative. Mrs. Graham intends taking up her permanent residence in the Single Tax Mecca shortly and Mr. Robert Tyson talks of paying a visit to Cuba. There is a possibility that both could be present at the proposed gathering. Railway fares are so high and Single Taxers are so busy that it would be well to know that a sufficient number could attend before declaring the gathering a general conference.

A. W. ROEBUCK.

Mt. Pleasant, Tenn.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Regarding a Single Tax conference, while a better attended and more widely repre-

tentive convention might have been gotten up at St. Louis during the progress of the World's Fair, it is now too late. A convention at Fairhope in the late winter or early spring would probably be the next best thing. Doubtless the colony would show up the best in the garb of spring.

A. FREELAND.

Cleveland, Ohio.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Relative to a Single Tax Conference in Fairhope, I should be delighted to see the plan carried forward, even though I may not be able to attend. In case the conference is agreed upon, I will see that the Ohio friends are notified. To visit Fairhope and possibly cast my lot with the friends there, is one of the longings of my heart.

J. B. VINNING.

Parkersburgh, West Va.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Could you or some of your readers suggest a window display to represent or illustrate the land monopoly workings and the effect of how taxation of various kinds work or should work?

Some of us are storekeepers and occasionally could rig up a moving picture. It attracts the attention of people to our great reform.

The proposed conference at Fairhope strikes me about right as I have been planning a trip south in January or February.

If any reader of the *Review* will kindly send me the assessment and tax laws of his state or his county I will be greatly obliged to him; or if he will drop me a postal giving me a hint as to when or how I can get them it will be appreciated. Our state of West Virginia is red hot and boiling over the new tax laws.

The Republicans are in power and as usual through letting off the big public service corporations from a fair assessment are behind in funds for state expenses. They are trying by a drag-net plan of assessment on all tangible property to get on their financial feet.

In consequence they have stirred up forty nests of angry hornets. Every one who has farm produce or store goods or bank stocks, money in bank or furniture in their homes, every bit of improvement on the place or any kind of property except leases or franchises is to be caught. Whoop! What a chance for the Single Taxer, and he's taking advantage of it.

I would like to have your readers write letters to any paper in the state, short letters asking all the questions they can. Don't try to teach them too much. They know it all now. Just stir up the animals till the Legislature meets in January. If there are any tax laws in your state exempt-

ing improvements on personal property tell me about them with facts and figures. Has not Kansas an exemption clause of some kind to an amount worth while?

We are going to circulate a petition through the state asking the legislature to submit such an exemption clause as an amendment to our constitution. Of course they will not do it, but it will keep the pot boiling.

W. I. BORNEMAN.

PERSONALS.

The *New York Journal* in a recent commendatory article on Hon. Robert Baker says, "He is sound on the income tax." Yes, he is. He is also sound on the protective tariff and all other kinds of taxation.

Hon. Jerry Simpson, who is now a resident of Roswell, N. M., addressed a large meeting on Labor Day at Amarillo, Texas. One of the local papers reports his speech, a portion of which we quote:

"Mr. Simpson declared himself indeed an advocate of labor, but as he loved capital, too, he did not have the heart to abuse it. Heretofore, he said, he had had too much of one and too little of the other. 'just like the rest of this crowd.' But that his mission these latter days is to see that the labor fellows should be getting busy to know the reason why. He said that as long as laborers were not also the capitalists there was something wrong, and that that question is now the pressing, paramount issue. He saw but one way of settlement, and that was for every one to work for his own living, be his own master—a free man—and not be obliged to go to any man for a job; that nature gave men strength to do jobs and the lands to job upon. They had the one, the Single Tax would give them the other."

Congressman Robert Baker has an admirable article in the *Arena* for September on "The Reign of Graft and the Remedy."

Charles H. Govan has returned from his trip abroad. In London he met Berens and Verinder, and in Glasgow, Ferguson, Burt, Hamilton, Orr and others of the stalwart British workers for the great cause.

Mr. Henry George, Jr., in an open letter to Mr. George Foster Peabody, Treasurer of the National Democratic Committee, protests against the nomination of an unfit man for the governorship of New York, and strongly urges the candidacy of Edwin M. Shepard. This letter has been widely commented upon by the press of the country.

Mr. Joseph R. Buchanan, the well known labor leader, has an appreciative article in

a recent number of the *New York Journal* on Albert J. Boulton, Single Taxer, and Populist candidate for governor of New York.

George L. Rusby is a candidate for Congress on the People's Democratic ticket for the Seventh Congressional District of New Jersey.

Mr. Barney Cohen, who is president of the Illinois Federation of Labor, has made a report which shows that he is among the few prominent labor leaders who are fully aware of the causes of low wages, strikes and labor troubles. He also knows the remedy, and courageously and clearly states it in his report.

MR. BOLTON HALL'S NEW BOOK.*

Any new work on the Single Tax should come strongly recommended by some inherent qualities of its own. The great argument is practically closed, and the final word has probably been said. There are the ten volumes of the master, Mr. Shearman's "Natural Taxation," two works of Mr. Louis F. Post and a variety of useful pamphlets covering the different phases of the question. To these must now be added Mr. Trowbridge's "Bisocialism." All these are addressed to different orders of mind, and are calculated to meet all conceivable objections. To one who has mastered this library there is little that needs to be added.

But this little work of Mr. Hall's has perhaps its justification. It is possible that it will attract where others of the volumes named will repel. It is told in plain and simple language, is almost conversational in tone, and is entirely without rhetorical flourish or passion. There are some very careful studies of statistical tables, and social conditions are pictured as they are without exaggeration and occasionally with shrewdly humorous observation.

The opening sentence of the introduction smacks a little of affectation when it says, "This book is not an appeal merely to thoughtful people. The great majority of people do not think." Mr. Hall's book is an argument addressed to the thinking faculty. If it were not, it would be of small value. Mr. Hall recognizes this when he says, "Before anything can be done the people must think," (page 65) and again on page 89, when he says, directly addressing the reader, "You are a thinking man or woman. If you were not you would not be reading such a book as this."

We must take very earnest exception to Chapter XIII, and especially to this statement:

"Under present conditions, to reform the large part of our community, a who

because of drink, are more or less incapable of work, would greatly increase the number of laborers and by increasing competition, would reduce wages."

We are aware that numbers of Single Taxers hold this opinion, but it is nevertheless a fallacy. It springs originally from the belief that the advantages arising from whatever cause are swallowed up in increased land values. This, of course, is the tendency. But all such gains are not immediately absorbed. For a long time they are diffused among the masses of the people, and are lost to them in the degree that population increases and the supply of land diminishes. Obviously, this is a law dependent upon the element of time for its operation, and the masses of the people enjoy a measure of such gain until the operation is completed. Some social gains are of such a nature that they require generations for their full absorption by the classes to whom Mr. George was correct in saying all social advantages must *ultimately* go. But ultimately may be a long time.

However plausible Mr. Hall's contention may seem at first blush, a little reflection will show us that it is baseless. As Mr. Hall has said elsewhere, touching upon another matter, "We know it is not so because we have seen it for ourselves."

We receive at our ports some ten thousand emigrants a day, mostly workers, yet the number of the unemployed do not increase ten thousand a day, nor do wages drop at the alarming extent they would if this contention were correct. And the reason is plain.

For though every emigrant brings two hands with him he also brings a mouth to be fed and a body to be clothed. And the intemperate man who should become temperate and work six days a week where he now works only three would develop new wants and new consumptive power along with his increased productive power. These would benefit the community as well as the workers long before the gain could be wholly absorbed. It is a monstrous doctrine which pushed to its final analysis would show wages highest where intemperance is greatest, a doctrine the mere statement of which is its own best refutation.

Curiously enough, Mr. Hall in another part of the work demolishes his own theory, and we leave him to reconcile with what has gone before these two paragraphs with the lines which we *italicize*.

"If to have many people is a bad thing, then it follows that increasing population, whether from home or abroad, should be discouraged or forbidden. To be consistent we should also pass laws limiting the number of children that parents should be allowed to rear, the surplus to be deported, or thrown into the rivers as in India or China.

"But the restrictionists do not pretend to be consistent. They talk of the harm to American workmen caused by the competi-

* Free America, by Bolton Hall, paper, 216 pages. Price 25 cents. L. S. Dickey & Co., 79 Dearborn street, Chicago, Ill.

tion of foreigners in our labor markets, while, as a matter of fact, each new comer who can find work helps to make markets for surplus American products. If the immigrant is to live he must have food, clothes and shelter. This means that the Americans who grow food, and make clothes and houses, find a customer for what they have to sell."

We regret to find Mr. Hall so badly tripping in his economics. There is so much that is valuable in the work, the most of it has been so well and carefully done, that defects of this sort would with the next edition of the work be remedied. For it is a useful little book and will do good because of its simple and direct appeal, and the perfect clarity of its style. J. D. M.

We have received from the Hammersmark Publishing Company of Chicago, Tolstoi's famous letter on the Russian-Japanese War, bound in neat and attractive pamphlet form of 64 pages, and sold for 10 cents. This is perhaps the most powerful indictment against war yet written. The same publishers also announce the publication of a work on "William Lloyd Garrison, Non-Resistant and Abolitionist," from the pen of Ernest Crosby, which book (16 mo., about 120 pages) will be sent for 50 cents, postpaid.

Important Information to Single Taxers.

A. G. Bucher & Co., Warren, Pa., publish an excellent assortment of Single Tax tracts in very cheap and convenient form for enclosing in business and other correspondence.

Send 25c. for 1000 pages assorted tracts. Address:

A. G. BUCHER & CO.,
WARREN, PA.

Interesting Literature explaining a state of society in which there will be work for all, leisure for all and an abundance for all, mailed free upon request. Address: Anton S. Rosing, Secretary Western Economic Information Bureau, 737 No. Pine Ave., Austin, Ill.

Ethics of Democracy

A Series of Optimistic Essays on the Natural Laws of Human Society

By **LOUIS F. POST**

This book is instructive without heaviness, and interesting without frivolity. It appeals with peculiar force to the devoted clergyman who shrinks from the growing pressure of commercialism and materialism. It brings relief to the business man who has a soul above dollars yet feels the necessity for struggling and straining for dollars. It is a guide to the baffled citizen who recoils from socialism yet sees no other escape from something worse. It invites and will hold the attention of any intelligent man or woman who is disposed to reflect upon social, industrial and political conditions. The author has applied fundamental democratic principles (generic, not partisan) to the greater problems that confront men as the false optimism of youth fades away before the disappointments of mature life. He holds aloft the standards and recalls the objectives of a rational democracy, a sane optimism, and individual responsibility. He leads his reader onward and upward, through appeals to reason and the moral sense, toward a realization of that great and beneficent order in the universe which neither individuals nor communities can ignore with impunity. The book subjects popular materialism to new tests, it gives to idealism a modern and popular setting.

The volume is beautifully bound in rich blue cloth, printed on high-grade hand-laid paper; gilt top, deckle edges, 398 pages. Price, per copy, \$2.00 net.

L. S. DICKEY & CO.

.....Publishers.....

79 DEARBORN STREET,

CHICAGO, ILL.