

THE
**SINGLE TAX
REVIEW**

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

SUMMER NUMBER

July 15th 1904. Vol. 4, No. 1

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

PUBLISHED AT NO. 11 FRANKFORT STREET

NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

(RECAP)

HO 1713

A35

v. 4
1904-05

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



TABLE OF CONTENTS.

PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND	<i>James A. Warren</i>	1
ECHOES OF THE INTEREST "SYMPOSIUM" IN SPRING NUMBER <i>James S. Paton, James Bann, A. Freeland, S. J. Chubb, Alan C. Thompson, Robert Cumming, Michael Flurschein</i>		6-18
ECHO-NOMICS AND THE SCHOOLS	<i>James Love</i>	19
THE MOVEMENT IN NEW ZEALAND	<i>Mervyn J. Stewart</i>	23
COLORADO'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS	<i>James W. Bucklin</i>	27
THE SINGLE TAX AS A PEACE MEASURE	<i>Jane Dearborn Mills</i>	29
VERSES, <i>Rosalie M. Jonas, Joseph Dana Miller, Jay Hawkins, Frances M. Milne, O. Owen</i>		31-33
PUBLISHERS NOTES AND EDITORIALS		34
TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE		36
NEWS—DOMESTIC		39
NEWS—FOREIGN		46
REV. HERBERT S. BIGELOW		49
EXTRACTS FROM SERMONS OF MR. BIGELOW		50
A PLEA FOR ORGANIZATION		52
BOOK REVIEWS		53
PERSONALS		57
WOMENS NATIONAL SINGLE TAX CONFERENCE		59

THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

(For the Review.)

By JAMES A. WARREN.

"Heroes and Hero Worship" furnishes no essay more absorbing than the study of Martin Luther. The touch of the master delineated the character of the great reformer as none other has ever done. D'Aubigne, as the historian, presented the panorama of Luther's life and works. With consummate genius the Sage of Chelsea drew a real picture of the Monk of Erfurt. Cynical as was Carlyle at times, there is no trace of the iconoclast in this portrayal. For illustration Norse mythology was invoked, and we see "A youth nursed up in wintry whirlwinds, in desolate darkness and difficulty, that he may step forth at last from his stormy Scandinavia, strong as a true man, as a god; a Christian Odin—a right Thor once more, with his thunder-hammer, to smite asunder ugly enough *Jotuns* and Giant-monsters." It was after Carlyle had seen Kranach's portrait of Luther that he could, too, portray with superb imagery and analytical art: "A rude, plebeian face; with its huge crag-like brows and bones, the emblem of rugged energy; at first, almost a repulsive face. Yet in the eyes especially there is a wild, silent sorrow; an unnamable melancholy; the element of all gentle and fine affections, giving to the rest the true stamp of nobleness. Laughter was in this Luther, as we said, but tears also were there. * * * I will call this Luther a true Great Man; great in intellect, in courage, affection and integrity; one of our most lovable and precious men. Great, not as a hewn obelisk, but as an Alpine mountain—so simple, honest, spontaneous, not setting up to be great at all; there for quite another purpose than being great! Ah, yes, unsubduable granite, piercing far and wide into the Heavens; yet in the clefts of its fountains, green, beautiful valleys with flowers! A right Spiritual Hero and Prophet; once more, a true Son of Nature and Fact, for whom these centuries, and many that are to come yet, will be thankful to Heaven."

A soul-refreshing view of a hero of the sixteenth century given in the nineteenth. More majestic do they appear and more inspiring are the towering glaciers of the Alps as we leave the foothills and view their glittering pinnacles from afar. There stands Luther replying to the overtures of a Roman Pontiff. "Standing on this, I, a poor German Monk, am stronger than you all. I stand solitary, friendless, but on God's Truth; you with your tiaras, triple hats, with your treasuries and armories, thunders spiritual and temporal, stand on the Devil's Lie, and are not so strong." Luther feared nothing earthly. He stood on the Rock of Ages—Truth. Here was the renaissance of thought. Luther's torch spread its light. Imprisoned thought was liberated.

In every great epoch in our own national history have the splendid figures risen: Jefferson, to teach the rule of life; Lincoln, to free a race; Garrison, whose love for human liberty drew upon himself the vindictiveness of ignorant selfishness and the tigerish ferocity of an entrenched oligarchy; and the gladiator Phillips, born and reared in the atmosphere which is enervating to the growth of a love for all mankind, sprang into the arena to do battle with a giant wrong. These knights never sounded a truce that untruth might confer with a hope to temporize.

"On the night on which I had finished the final chapter of 'Progress and Poverty' I felt that the talent intrusted to me had been accounted for—felt more fully satisfied, more deeply grateful than if all the kingdoms of the earth had been laid at my feet; and though the years have justified, not dimmed, my faith, there is still left for me, something to do." So wrote the great teacher in the preface to his last work. Other abler pens have paid tribute to Henry George. To his memory the choicest blooms have been plucked to form a fitting wreath, and as the above words are re-read one feels exalted by the sublime faith, the unselfishness, the love for his fellow—the virtues of Abou Ben Adhem, whose name, on a shining page, led all the rest.

The splendid advance of the Single Tax movement since Mr. George's death is a source of wonderful cheer and hope to all those who in all parts of the world have been unceasing in their labors to enlighten men. There are times when the bravest falter. It is now, just as Mr. George wrote twenty-five years ago, of human desire, in the fullness of that marvelous faith, which with him was a thing that had no end:

"* * * He works for those he never saw and never can see; for a fame, or maybe but for a scant justice, that can only come long after the clods have rattled upon his coffin lid. He toils in the advance, where it is cold, and there is little cheer from men, and the stones are sharp and the brambles thick. Amid the scoffs of the present and the sneers that stab like knives, he builds for the future; he cuts the trail that progressive humanity may hereafter broaden into a highroad. Into higher, grander spheres desire mounts and beckons, and a star that rises in the east leads him on."

Of the great work of the Massachusetts State Single Tax League and its indefatigable president no one can be unmindful, but the writer desires to register an unequivocal protest against the reason given for annulling a resolution adopted in 1902 by the league, as published in *The Review* of last January, and as printed was as follows:

"The reason for annulling the first resolution was stated by those in favor of such annulment, notably President C. B. Fillebrown, as being that the declared object of the league, stated in the constitution, is the propaganda of Single Tax principles. No mention is made in the constitution of what any of these principles are; and there are those in the League who see in the statement that private property in land is unjust, an exaggerated declaration of Henry George's avowed principles, and, in that sense, an untrue one. Mr. Fillebrown is the leader in this view. He holds that only one condition of private property in land is unjust, namely, the private appropriation of ground rent; that all other conditions will remain the same under the Single Tax as now, except the one necessarily disappearing under the equal taxation of unoccupied and occupied land—land speculation. Hence, a false impression of the practical application of the Single Tax is given to the uninformed by the wholesale assertion, 'Private property in land is unjust,' since this condemns those conditions of the present system which are equally conditions of the Single Tax System."

Shade of Herbert Spencer and his transcendental ethics! To this resolution the following bill of exceptions is filed:

It is an unconsciously framed indictment of Mr. George's philosophy.

Such interpretation could only be made by a confusion of thought, and one which would cloud the clear teaching of the distinction between private possession of land and the private ownership of land.

The justice and righteousness of a great cause is veiled by such suggested limitations of speech.

A conservatism not justified by ethical reasoning or the demands of expediency.

A timidity of propaganda wholly at variance with Mr. George's teachings and definite declarations.

Space forbids more than a brief argument in support of these exceptions, and it must necessarily be fortified by Mr. George's own words. In "Progress and Poverty," Book VII, Chapter I, is devoted to "The Injustice of Private Property in Land."

"When it is proposed to abolish private property in land," says Mr. George, "the first question that will arise is that of justice. Though often warped by habit, superstition and selfishness into the most distorted forms, the sentiment of justice is yet fundamental to the human mind, and whatever dispute arouses the passions of men, the conflict is sure to rage, not so much as to the question 'Is it wise?' as to the question 'Is it right?' This tendency of popular discussions to take an ethical form has a cause. It springs from a law of the human mind; it rests upon a vague and instinctive recognition of what is probably the deepest truth we can grasp. That alone is wise which is just; that alone is enduring which is right. In the narrow scale of individual actions and individual life this truth may be often obscured, but in the wider field of national life it everywhere stands out. I bow to this arbitrament and accept this test."

Has ancient or modern philosophic teaching ever furnished an example of the patience exhibited by Henry George in his search for truth? The key to the whole character of this remarkable man is given in the following words: "I propose to beg no question, to shrink from no conclusion, but to follow truth wherever it may lead. Upon us is the responsibility of seeking the law, for in the very heart of our civilization to-day women faint and little children moan. But what that law may prove to be is not our affair. If the conclusions that we reach run counter to our prejudices, let us not flinch; if they challenge institutions that have long been deemed wise and natural, let us not turn back."

We are told that there are those in the Massachusetts Single Tax League who see in the statement that private property in land is unjust, an exaggerated declaration of Henry George's avowed principles, and, in that sense, an untrue one. Misrepresentation or misconception does not alter truth. Let us briefly consider the statement that private property in land is unjust is an exaggerated declaration, and as used by Mr. George is wrongfully interpreted to-day. Here are a few quotations from "Progress and Poverty" which may be reviewed with interest and benefit:

"There can be to the ownership of anything no rightful title which is not derived from the title of the producer and does not rest upon the natural right of the man to himself. There can be no other rightful title, because (1st), there is no other natural right from which any other title can be derived, and (2d) because the recognition of any other title is inconsistent with and destructive of this."

"What most prevents the realization of the injustice of private property in land is the habit of including all the things that are made the subject of ownership in one category, or, if any distinction be made, drawing the line, according to the unphilosophical distinctions of the lawyers, between personal property and real estate, or things movable and things immovable. The real

and natural distinction is between things which are the produce of labor and things which are the gratuitous offerings of nature ; or, to adopt the terms of political economy, between wealth and land."

" The moment this distinction is realized, that moment is it seen that the sanction which natural justice gives to one species of property is denied to the other ; that the rightfulness which attaches to individual property in the produce of labor implies the wrongfulness of individual property in land ; that, whereas the recognition of the one places all men upon equal terms, securing to each the due reward of his labor, the recognition of the other is the denial of the equal rights of men, permitting those who do not labor to take the natural reward of those who do."

" Whatever may be said for the institution of private property in land, it is therefore plain that it cannot be defended on the score of justice."

For the late Mr. Faidy the writer had an affectionate regard, a sentiment inspired by his devotion to the cause of educating men, because of his earnestness, his sincerity, and for the many intellectual gifts with which he was endowed. It was provocative of pain and deep regret, therefore, when this gifted young man became so entangled in a mental morass, so clearly evident by his conclusions regarding interest and the compensation of land owners. There was not an uneven note in the clarion voice of Henry George as he considered the question of compensation, when he said :

" It (private property in land) is not merely a robbery in the past ; it is a robbery in the present—a robbery that deprives of their birthright the infants that are now coming into the world ! Why should we hesitate about making short work of such a system ? Because I was robbed yesterday, and the day before, and the day before that, is it any reason that I should suffer myself to be robbed to-day and to-morrow ? any reason that I should conclude that the robber has acquired a vested right to rob me ? If the land belongs to the people, why continue to permit land owners to take the rent, or compensate them in any manner for the loss of rent ? Consider what rent is. It does not arise spontaneously from land ; it is due to nothing that the land owners have done. It represents a value created by the whole community. Let the land holders have, if you please, all that the possession of the land would give them in the absence of the rest of the community. But rent, the creation of the whole community, necessarily belongs to the whole community."

Of the operation of the common law, whereby the individual must surrender all his property in case of the discovery of a defective title, Mr. George says:

" Now if we apply to this case of *The People vs. The Land Owners* the same maxims of justice that have been formulated by land owners into law, and are applied every day in English and American courts to disputes between man and man, we shall not only not think of giving the landholders any compensation for the land, but shall take all the improvements and whatever else they may have as well. But I do not propose, and I do not suppose that any one else will propose, to go so far. It is sufficient if the people resume the ownership of the land. Let the land owners retain their improvements and personal property in secure possession. And in this measure of justice would be no oppression, no injury to any class. The great cause of the present unequal distribution of wealth, with the suffering, degradation, and waste that it entails, would be swept away. Even landholders would share in the general gain. The gain of even the large landholders would be a real one. The gain of the small landholders would be enormous. For in welcoming Justice, men welcome the handmaid of Love. Peace and Plenty follow in her train, bringing their good gifts, not to some, but to all."

In concluding the argument for our bill of exceptions the following is taken

from Mr. George's great work, "Protection or Free Trade." This is given to show that the Single Tax philosophy is something more than a question of scientific taxation, for in its depths lies the soul of a new life that will yet come forth to renew and regenerate the hearts of the sons of men:

"Property in land is as indefensible as property in man. It is so absurdly impolitic, so outrageously unjust, so flagrantly subversive of the true right of property, that it can only be instituted by force and maintained by confounding in the popular mind the distinction between property in land and property in things that are the result of labor. Once that distinction is made clear—and a thorough discussion of the tariff question must now make it clear—and private property in land is doomed."

To those earnest and sincere Single Taxers who urge with a tinge of impatient speech the formation of a party and reproach our leaders for their seeming lack of zeal, a word. The greatest enemy of our cause would rejoice in the launching of a Single Tax party. True progress of the Single Tax movement can be made only by the process of education. The creation of a political party would, to a large degree, vitiate the magnificent work of those teachers who are consecrating their lives to the education of men. All we, who are proud to be in the ranks, may do, is to faithfully follow these lines for propaganda work. It is not for us to anticipate the full fruition of our labors in that we may in our day see the standard of equal freedom floating over the fallen citadel of injustice. The plan outlined by Single Taxers of Chicago is the true and intelligent beginning of outpost work. Of this, quotation is again made from Mr. George's "Protection or Free Trade:":

"In the United States the most direct way of moving on property in land is through local taxation, since that is already to some extent levied upon land values. And that is doubtless the way in which the final and decisive advance will be made. But national politics dominate state politics, and a question can be brought into discussion much more quickly and thoroughly as a national than as a local question. Now to bring an issue into politics *it is not necessary to form a party*. Parties are not to be manufactured; they grow out of existing parties by the bringing forward of issues upon which men will divide. We have, ready to our hand, in the tariff question, a means of bringing the whole subject of taxation, and, through it, the whole social question, into the fullest discussion."

Of all of Mr. George's writings no one sentence or paragraph furnishes a truer guidon. In that single paragraph is concentrated the wisdom of a true philosopher and matchless generalship in statecraft. When we see the Democratic party raising any other issue than the tariff question we can feel that once again are the people betrayed by false leaders. There can never be any advance by the raising of any other issue. There is, in truth, no other issue before the American people. Until the tariff question is settled, and carried to its logical conclusion, all efforts of the party of the people will prove abortive.

A great artist, some twenty years ago, gave to the world the product of his genius. Who cannot recall the "Christ Before Pilate," the masterpiece of Mikhail Munkacsy, the Hungarian painter? To the left, held back by a centurion, was the mob led by a Jerusalem ruffian, whose brutalized face denoted the predominance of the lowest passions as his cry of "Crucify Him" rang through the praetorium. What a contrast with the figure of the Christ, idealized by the artist, standing in majestic dignity before the weak and vacillating Roman governor; Caiaphas, the high priest, to the right of Pilate, denouncing the "dangerous" Nazarene, stood boldly out; but the one figure whose face bore the look of hatred and vindictiveness combined with arrogant assumption, as his gaze was fixed upon the Christ, was the richly appareled

Pharisee. This was the central force arrayed against the Redeemer of Men. This was the type of the "special powerful interest" crouched behind the cries of the mob and the real voice of the inflamed Caiaphas. This was "the lion in the way." Distorted with malignancy was the face of the Pharisee as he glared at the prisoner who was deemed a disturber, a person to be suppressed, aye, one to be crucified. And so was led away that figure of the ages.

How many since the world's tragedy on Calvary have died to make men free? Yet man is still in bondage. How soon dies away the real battle cry of the world's great reformers when life's labors for them have ended. In this brief review of a few of Henry George's declarations there has been no thought of hero worship, for any approach to adulation would be quickly condemned could the dead but speak. There would, however, ring out true and clear that voice we loved so well, in its plain condemnation of private property in land, and of this how fitting are the words of Dryden:

"Through all the compass of the notes it ran,
The diapason closing full in man."

Henry George worked not for a day but for all time. In the valley he toiled to reach the mountain top; the summit gained, unsatisfied, he looked toward the stars; he would have penetrated the heavenly arcana and lifted his fellow man to all the glory of the vision. There is inspiration in his life for all who would become true servants of the Most High, and in the work we have to do let our watchword be:

"In the beauty of the lilies Christ was born across the sea,
With a glory in His bosom that transfigures you and me;
As He died to make men holy, let us die to make men free,
While God is marching on."



ECHOES OF THE INTEREST "SYMPOSIUM" IN SPRING NUMBER.

THE LAWS OF DISTRIBUTION.

BY JAMES S. PATON.

The symposium on Henry George's theory of interest in the Spring number of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW shows that there is a great difference of opinion among Single Taxers in regard to at least one of the laws of distribution, and I hope the interest aroused by Mr. Faidy's article will be kept up until we discover the true laws of distribution. I believe that I can point out the stumbling block over which Henry George fell, and although I do not think he succeeded in working out the laws, he not only made the most successful attempt of any political economist up to his time, but he showed so plainly how the laws may be traced that I have found it a very easy matter to work them out—to my own satisfaction, at least.

The laws of distribution are the laws that govern the division of all wealth, between landlord, laborer and capitalist, who represent the three factors in production, land, labor, and capital. The proportion that each receives varies. Under certain conditions one of the parties will receive a very large share, while if the conditions are changed, one or both of the other two

may receive large shares and the first a very small share. In order to discover the laws of distribution all that we have to do is to discover the conditions that give one party the power to claim the largest share, and the conditions that compel one of the two remaining parties to accept the smallest share.

In my attempt to work out the laws of distribution, I took the following quotation from page 160 "Progress and Poverty" as a rule to work by: "The laws of the distribution of wealth are obviously laws of proportion, and must be so related to each other that any two being given the third may be inferred. For to say that one of the three parts of a whole is increased or decreased, is to say that one or both of the other parts is, reversely, decreased or increased. If Tom, Dick, and Harry are partners in business, the agreement which fixes the share of one in the profits must at the same time fix either the separate or the joint shares of the other two. To fix Tom's share at forty per cent. is to leave but sixty per cent. to be divided between Dick and Harry. To fix Dick's share at forty per cent. and Harry's share at thirty-five per cent. is to fix Tom's share at twenty-five per cent." It will be observed that according to the laws of proportion each party is opposed to the other two. If Tom only receives twenty-five per cent. it is not simply because Dick gets forty per cent., but also because Harry gets thirty five per cent. and a decrease in either Dick or Harry's share would increase Tom's share.

In working out the laws of distribution and in considering the relations of landlord to laborer and capitalist all that Mr. George wrote is in harmony with his illustration.

He first looked for the law of rent. He says, on page 167 "Progress and Poverty:" "The law, or relation, which under these circumstances of free competition among all parties, the condition which in tracing out the principles of political economy is always to be assumed, determines what rent or price can be got by the owner, is styled the law of rent. This fixed with certainty, we have more than a starting point from which the laws which regulate wages and interest may be traced. For, as the distribution of wealth is a division, in ascertaining what fixes the share of the produce which goes as rent, we also ascertain what fixes the share which is left for wages, where there is no co-operation of capital; and what fixes the joint share left for wages and interest, where capital does co-operate in production. Fortunately, as to the law of rent there is no necessity for discussion. Authority here coincides with common sense, and the accepted dictum of the current political economy has the self-evident character of a geometric axiom. This accepted law of rent is: *The rent of land is determined by the excess of its produce over that which the same application can secure from the least productive land in use.*"

Rent is always low in new countries where population is sparse, and it always rises with the increase of population. The demand for land increases with the increase of population, but the supply does not. Consequently rent rises from zero at the margin of cultivation until when population increases to the highest point the landlord gets the largest share of the produce. In regard to labor and capital in new countries the case is different; they are both scarce, at least labor cannot use all the land but it can use more capital than exists in a new country, and in a thickly settled country it cannot use all the capital but can use more land. The share of the capitalist (interest) depends upon the supply of and demand for capital; where capital is very scarce interest is very high. In new countries the laborer pays very little rent, but a good deal for interest, and in an old thickly settled country he pays a great deal for rent and very little interest—providing there are no monopolies. Now, just as Tom receives in Mr. George's illustrations only twenty-five per cent. of the produce which is caused partly by Dick's getting forty per cent. and partly by Harry getting thirty-five per cent., low wages are due to the share the

landlord can claim as rent and to what the capitalist can claim as interest. The effect of a rise in rent on wages is to lower them. The effect of a rise in rent on interest is to lower interest. The effect of lower interest on wages is to raise wages. Here we have two causes at work on wages at the same time, viz., increasing rent pressing them down and falling interest raising them; but wages cannot both rise and fall at the same time; if the pressure is equal on both sides wages will not be effected, but if the pressure is unequal, wages will be forced to the weaker side, an increase of twenty per cent. of the products going to the landlord would leave twenty per cent. less of the product to be divided between laborer and capitalist. If capital is very scarce most of the loss caused by the increase in rent will fall on the laborer, while if capital is very plentiful the loss will fall principally upon the capitalist. In this case although wages and interest fall together, the fall of one is not caused by the fall of the other, but by the increase in rent, and the more that interest falls the less will wages fall. According to this theory the laws of distribution not only "meet, and relate, and mutually bound each other," as Mr. George says they must; but they may be stated as one law, viz.: *The distribution of wealth between the three factors of production, land, labor, and capital, depends upon the relative supply of and demand for the three factors, the factor which is scarcest taking the largest share; and that which is most plentiful taking the smallest share.*

This agrees with Mr. George's statement that: "The laws of the distribution of wealth are obviously laws of proportion, and must be so related to each other that any two being given the third may be inferred."

I will now try to point out what caused Mr. George to stumble, and where he fell. On the first page of Chapter I, "Progress and Poverty," he asks the question: "*Why in spite of increase in productive power, do wages tend to a minimum which will give but a bare living?*" The answer of the current political economy is, that wages are fixed by the ratio between the number of laborers and the amount of capital devoted to the employment of labor." Now this answer of the political economists is not well stated, some of them included land with capital, which they should not have done; but for them it was a true answer, and others left land out of consideration, and for them the answer was only partly true. The idea contained in the answer, that the share of the wealth produced received by the capitalist lessens wages is at least true; but Mr. George disputes it, and gives his reasons. Let us examine them. He says: "And yet, widely accepted and deeply rooted as it is, it seems to me that this theory does not tally with obvious facts. For, if wages depend upon the ratio between the amount of labor seeking employment and the amount of capital devoted to its employment, the relative scarcity or abundance of one factor must mean the relative abundance or scarcity of the other. Thus, capital must be relatively abundant where wages are high, and relatively scarce where wages are low. Now as the capital used in paying wages must largely consist of the capital constantly seeking investment, the current rate of interest must be the measure of its relative abundance or scarcity. So, if it be true that wages depend upon the ratio between the amount of labor seeking employment and the capital devoted to its employment, then high wages, the mark of relative scarcity of labor, must be accompanied by low interest, the mark of the relative abundance of capital, and reversely, low wages must be accompanied by high interest. This is not the fact, but the contrary. . . . Thus, under conditions which admit of no explanation consistent with the current theory, do we find high interest coinciding with high wages, and low interest with low wages. . . . All these well known facts, which coincide with each other, point to a relation between wages and interest, but it is to a relation of conjunction, and not of opposition."

I find no fault with Mr. George's facts, nor with his reasoning. As far

as it goes it disproves the theory he criticizes, and if there were only two factors in production, labor and capital, he would have proved the relation between wages and interest to be a "relation of conjunction." The writers he criticises left the third factor—land—out of consideration and thus their reasoning was not complete. Mr. George seems to have forgotten that there was a third factor to be considered, and he accepted a false theory "that interest cannot be increased without increasing wages; nor wages lowered without depressing interest," and his acceptance of this theory is the cause of his failure to discover the true laws of distribution. Mr. George thought that the fact that wages and interest often rise and fall together was inconsistent with the theory that the effect of high wages on interest is to lower interest, and that the effect of high interest on wages is to lower wages; but as I have pointed out if an increase in rent on interest and wages is to lower them both, the effect of lower wages on interest is to raise interest, and the effect of lower interest on wages is to raise wages. Wages and interest cannot both rise and fall at the same time; they can only divide between them the loss caused by increase in rent. An illustration may help us, if I have not already made it plain. Suppose a tug of war between rent and interest. Abundance of capital and low interest are pulling wages up, and at the same time scarcity of land and high rent are pulling wages down. If rent is the stronger it will not only pull wages down but interest also, and that must be the case with three parties each trying to obtain the largest share of their produce. I must quote one more passage from "Progress and Poverty:" "This natural relation between interest and wages—this equilibrium at which both will represent equal returns for equal exertions—may be stated in a form which suggests a relation of opposition; but this opposition is only apparent. In a partnership between Dick and Harry the statement that Dick receives a certain proportion of the profits implies that the portion of Harry is less or greater as Dick's is greater or less; but where, as in this case, each gets only what he adds to the common fund, the increase of the portion of the one does not decrease what the other receives.

In this case what each adds to the common fund increases the amount to be divided, but does not affect the proportion that each receives, and the statement that "each gets only what he adds to the common fund," is not only a pure assumption; but it is denied by Mr. George himself, page 174, "P. & P.": "That interest does not depend upon the productiveness of labor and capital is proved by the general fact that where labor and capital are most productive interest is lowest." Again, on p. 171, he says: "Thus wages and interest do not depend upon the produce of labor and capital, but upon what is left after rent is taken out." What rent takes out depends on the power the scarcity of land gives to the landlord, and what the landlord leaves is divided between laborer and capitalist in the same way; if capital is scarce, competition between laborers for capital gives capitalists the largest share, while if laborers are scarce competition among capitalists for laborers gives the largest share to the laborers. Is not this theory in perfect harmony with the facts, and is it not also in harmony with the way Mr. George said the laws of distribution should be worked out, in the first passage I have quoted? It does not tally with his statement of the laws of distribution, so he either made a mistake in saying the laws of distribution were laws of proportion and giving the illustration of Tom, Dick and Harry; or he made a mistake in claiming that the effect of high interest on wages is to raise wages; and the effect of low interest on wages is to lower them. Which of his contentions is correct?

TORONTO, Canada.

SIMPLICITY OF THE INTEREST QUESTION.

BY JAMES BANN.

Most of the writers on interest, whose productions have appeared in *The Single Tax Review*, seem to make the subject unnecessarily complicated. The answer to the question, is interest equitable, may, I think, be simplified.

Wealth is produced by labor and properly belongs to the laborer. Interest is a part of the wealth which is produced by labor, but which is obtained without labor by someone other than the laborer. The interest taker obtains labor products without giving labor products in return. This last needs no proof, and of itself should render superfluous much of the speculation in regard to the, so called, law of interest.

In proving the wrongfulness of landlordism, Mr. George imagined a landlord sleeping for twenty years, as Rip Van Winkle did, and, although there was no question of his having produced anything, he nevertheless on awakening finds himself richer by twenty years rent. But, if Rip had had his money out at interest, would he not have been similarly enriched?

Mr. George says: "The right of ownership, that springs from labor, excludes the possibility of any other right of ownership" (Book 7, Chap. 1). Again he says: "Whatever is received as the result or reward of exertion is wages." Clearly the "reward" of sleeping may be interest as well as rent. The people have been divided by Mr. George into "workmen, beggars and thieves." Under which head does the interest taker come?

The attempts of the government to fix the rate of interest proves that, collectively, we regard interest with suspicion. Between the lines of all usury laws may be plainly read the consciousness of the people that the interest taker has, somehow, an unfair advantage and needs to be arbitrarily restrained. If wheat went to \$1.50 a bushel, who would think of preventing the farmer from getting it, but if the market rate of interest rises to 10 per cent. it is a legal crime to take advantage of it. If wheat fell to 25 cents many would regard it as a calamity, not to the farmer alone, but to the country. How different would be the feeling if the rate of interest fell to 1 per cent. It seems close to a certainty that interest can not be taken without trenching on what ought to be and what might be somebody's wages. Assuming this to be true, the questions, can we rid ourselves of it and how, are the only ones to be considered. Following the subject a little further brings us to the more difficult part.

With the ground cleared as Mr. George cleared it, to identify interest as something that ought not to be, was, it seems to me, comparatively easy. To decide on a rational working plan to get rid of it is a different proposition. The first stumbling block seems to be here. While there is a strong family likeness between interest and rent as referred to above, there is also a decided difference.

We can properly say to the monopolizer of land, you must not charge another for using the earth; but we can not say to the taker of interest, you shall lend your money without interest. This would be outrageously arbitrary for it is admitted that the money is, justly, his.

This shuts us off from dealing directly with the case for the reason, as the facts seem to indicate, that land monopoly is an original or primary invasion of rights and may be dealt with directly, whereas interest is merely the result of a preceding invasion and not the invasion itself. If it is true as some Single Taxers think, that interest has its source in landlordism, then there is no separate interest problem.

This was, for several years, my own way of thinking.

Permit me to mention a few of the things which produced a change of mind. It will be noticed that interest in the majority of cases is paid for the use of money and not for the use of capital. True, to possess capital in some

form is usually the object of the borrower, but it is not to the owner of the capital, which he will use, that he pays interest, for this capital is not borrowed at all, but is bought outright with the borrowed money. The same thing occurs when capital is bought directly from the owner of it and interest is charged on deferred payment.

This last is borrowing money and buying capital from the same person. Another point is this:

A man borrows \$1,000, not because he does not possess that much wealth himself, for he must, as a rule, have more in order to furnish security for the loan.

Here then is a man with, we will say, \$1,500 in property, borrowing from one with but \$1,000 in money.

Is it not plain that it is not the greater wealth of the owner of the money, which places him in the superior position, but the form in which his wealth is embodied. (For convenience I here speak of money as wealth which, of course, it is not). The point to which I wish to give prominence is that the man who owns the medium of exchange, is, for that reason alone, placed in the superior position; and the indications are strong that it is the unnatural scarcity of the thing in his possession which furnishes him his vantage ground.

Now if the business of issuing money was, as Mr. Byron Holt (seemingly all unconscious of being, as I think he was, in the presence of the arch culprit—the money-issuing monopoly) suggests, as free as the grocery business, competition among issuers of money would, no doubt, reduce the charges, for temporarily converting one's property into money, to the cost of the transaction, interest proper disappearing.

That interest is here traced to the government monopoly and restrictions on the issue of money, at least gives the solution an air of probability, for is not monopoly of some kind the cause of all economic ills?

Under present conditions the lender may be said to do the borrower a service and interest is a fair price for it. As to this, a service which represents no burden to the server, may properly be regarded with suspicion and besides free money, as here assumed, would relieve the borrower from the necessity of seeking the service *at the price*. Money, meaning good money, costs next to nothing to produce, so that where men are willing, apparently, to pay \$1.06 for \$1.00 borrowed, the security being unquestioned, it seems certain that money lacks fluidity, or its natural flow is being interfered with. If where the city government furnished water, we found a large number of people buying water from others and paying a premium, we would be justified in thinking that there was something wrong with the government's methods and we would feel sure there was favoritism somewhere. Whether what has here been said helps to clarify the interest muddle or not, the money issuing business should be free and Single Taxers, without neglecting land monopoly, should allow no one to precede them in advocating its freedom, for is not freedom the goal of the Single Tax?

No cry of "wild cat" or "rag baby" should be permitted to shake their faith, for neither "wild cat" nor "rag baby" money was free. Nothing has been said of that interest which forms a part of house rent, for this looks like a case where interest is paid, not for the use of money, but for the use of capi-

(NOTE.—We fear that the Interest question is not as simple as Mr Bann would make it. If payment for the use of capital—interest—is naturally persistent "free" money would not remedy the evil, whether such evil be real or imaginary. In such case, the quality of increased return to the lender resting upon the greater desirability for immediate use, convenience, time-saving, or whatever body of determining factors may definitely be assigned as the cause of interest, would, though still persisting, fail to communicate itself to money freely issued, and supplied on any terms we can conceive. Such money would then be worthless money. In other words what deceives Mr. Bann are the confusions arising from a consideration of money. Interest is a quality attaching to commodities and exchange; it is not a quality of money, but because it is a quality of exchange communicates itself to that which is the medium of exchange.—THE EDITOR.)

tal. However this may be, if free money will cause interest on money to disappear, all interest must go, for who would pay a house owner interest when he could borrow and build for himself, paying no interest.

COLLEGE HILL, OHIO.

INTEREST, IS IT NATURAL?

BY A. FREELAND.

Primitive man digs roots and picks berries with his fingers and climbs the tree after fruit. One fashions a sharp stick with which to dig roots and secures a club or long pole with which he knocks or pulls down the fruit from the tree. With these primitive forms of "capital" he produces twice as much as the man with his bare hands. The example set causes such capital to become common. The return due to the use of the capital is economic interest. A man by self-denial and hard work makes a spade and by its use produces twice as much as the man with the sharp stick. Who will deny this man the right to the returns due to the use of his spade? Another man comes along and offers half of the returns due to the use of the spade to its owner for its use. The offer is accepted. This is commercial interest. The borrower increases his income fifty per cent. through the use of the lender's capital. The lender foregoes one-fourth of his income, and applies himself to making another spade. So long as he has no monopoly in the manufacture of spades or of the land which yields the materials of which spades are made, all others will have an equal right to make spades.

The Single Tax on land values furnishes the only plan which will guarantee to all their equal right to make spades without paying tribute to others. If all were equally free to make spades or to exchange equivalent service for them, would any but the shiftless continue indefinitely to pay interest for the use of spades?

No law for the regulation of interest is just. Such laws are based upon a lack of knowledge of fundamental principles underlying the subject.

Labor produces all wealth, including all capital.

Through the private appropriation of rent and the shifting of taxation to labor, some men are enabled to rob other men of a part of the wealth, including the bulk of the capital they produce.

The robbers* lend the capital back to its producers for a consideration—(commercial) interest, or they hire its producers—laborers, at wages, to use their own product—capital, which has been stolen from them, and pocket the increase—(economic) interest.

If rent were appropriated by the state there could be no class (either landlord or capitalist) to rob labor of any part of its product. It follows that labor would be left in undisturbed possession of *all* its product—wealth, including capital. Then labor, the producer of all capital, would receive the return from the use of such capital—(economic) interest.

Under the Single Tax it is highly probable that voluntary co-operation of laborers in production would be the rule. Co-operating laborers would displace "capitalists," (men who live without labor on interest) and the latter would be recognized, together with landlords, as parasites.

Immediate application of the Single Tax would cause a great demand for capital, which might sustain the interest rate temporarily, but the ready accessibility to the resources of nature, coupled with the unburdening of industry,

*The opprobrious terms—robbers, stolen, parasites, etc., are meant in the economic sense, and not as reflecting on individuals who profit by present conditions are no more responsible for those conditions than are those who lose. The evil is institutional.

would wonderfully stimulate the production of capital. While capital might continue to be loaned, it would be from one laborer or set of laborers to others, and not from a distinct capitalist class. The latter would tend to become obsolete.

One of the Socialist's principal failings is that he does not recognize that human desires have no limit. The fact is that all human wants can never be supplied offers the only excuse for the persistence of commercial interest under a dispensation of economic freedom. When we assume that under the Single Tax the production of wealth will be so great that few will care to borrow, while many will be able and willing to lend, and that as a result the payment of interest will cease, may we not be unconsciously acquiescing in the fallacious assumption underlying the Socialist philosophy that there is a limit to human want?

While the study of the subject of interest is fascinating, it is probable that we will have to secure the application of the Single Tax before we can be certain whether or not interest is natural. At all events there can be no question that it will persist under present economic conditions. Personally I am inclined to the opinion that under the Single Tax the time would soon come when few would care to borrow, and commercial interest would practically cease.

MT. PLEASANT, TENN.

A CORRECTION AND ELABORATION.

BY S. J. CHUBB.

Allow me to correct an error in the printing of my article on Interest in the Spring number of the REVIEW.

On page 10, near the close of the second paragraph, the word *planks* should be *planes*. As the purpose of my argument was to point out Henry George's error in neglecting in his illustration to show the application of the borrowed capital in the production of planes as well as in the production of planks, this error considerably obscures the sense.

There is also an error on page 9, the seventh line from the bottom, where the word *reversed* should be *secured*; and on page 13, in the second paragraph below the subtitle "Toward The Light," the quotation marks include too much, the first sentence only being quoted.

I will take the opportunity to point out more fully the fallacy in the illustration of the borrowed plane, as given by Henry George, for it seems to me that it was through his error at this point that he was led to seek another basis of interest than "the power which exists in the tool to increase the productiveness of labor," and proceeded to develop his theory of interest as originating in the reproductive forces of nature.

Although very clear in his definition of capital as distinct from other wealth in its use, not in its nature, he seems sometimes to have lost sight of this distinction in his reasoning concerning interest. He speaks of "directing labor to the production of capital," as though capital were a form of wealth. And in another place of its being "more profitable to turn labor into capital than to apply it directly." The supply of capital does not depend on the diversion of labor to the production of particular forms of wealth, but on the devotion of wealth to a particular use; and there is no profit in any other use of wealth.

Though certain forms of wealth may be necessary for use as capital, the question of skill in the production of these forms of wealth does not enter into the problem. A shoemaker who desires to supply himself with capital in the form of a sewing machine, will not quit his trade and turn machinist. He will merely abstain from the consumption of luxuries to such an extent as shall enable him to accumulate capital to the value of a sewing machine.

To make the illustration of the borrowed plane a true representation of actual practice in the procuring and use of capital, William, desiring to provide capital for himself, should, instead of turning plane-maker, have continued at his regular employment, setting aside out of the product of his labor so many planks as he could spare from his necessary subsistence until he had accumulated them to the value of a plane. How many planks equal this value is not shown in Henry George's illustration, for a plank there represents the result of a day's labor aided by capital in the form of a plane, while the plane represents the result of ten days labor unaided by capital, and therefore a less value than ten planks. We will assume, for the purpose of illustration, that this value equals eight planks, and that six planks are required for ten days subsistence. William will thus be able to set aside two planks every ten days, taking forty days to accumulate the value of a plane. In case he borrows the plane from James, his product being thereby increased to ten planks, he will be enabled to set aside four every ten days, and will accumulate the required amount of capital in twenty days.

We thus see that "the increased productive power which a plane gives to labor" is transferred with the loan of the plane, and it is because of this increased productive power that William is enabled to pay interest, and not because James has the option of investing in live stock, or in land, and is unwilling to lend his capital for a less return than these investments will yield.

TORONTO JUNCTION, Canada.

INTEREST HAS NO ETHICAL BASIS.

BY ALAN C. THOMPSON.

All economic laws are, in the last analysis, moral laws; and the fundamental moral law of economics, is, "Service for service." Upon this ground alone, we can see there can be no place for interest in a community founded upon justice. For if any one can get an income from past labor, while leaving the total result of such labor undiminished, it is possible for future generations, in perpetuity, to live upon the labor or stealings of dead ancestors, thus maintaining a race of parasites in no way better than present day landlords.

However, it is not sufficient to say interest is unjust and will disappear with the unjust conditions that produce it, so it will be well to consider carefully what it is and how it arises.

Interest is a payment for the use of capital (wealth used in production) over and above any allowance for depreciation. Capital is a product of labor and is really labor in another form. Its function is to aid labor and increase its productiveness. It is commonly stated that it is entitled to a share in the product in return for this aid. That under existing conditions capital does secure this return is certain, but this is not because of anything inherent in capital itself, but because of the conditions under which it is employed, as will be seen on further consideration of the matter. The rate of interest proper, eliminating insurance against risk, depends on the relative supply of capital, and the demand for it based upon the net increase which attaches to its use. It will naturally be high where capital is scarce, and low where it is plentiful. In new countries interest is high because there is plenty of land free to all comers, or at least to be had upon much easier terms than in older countries and so there are better opportunities for investing capital productively, that is to say the net increase is greater. In new and partially settled countries, the organization of labor, in consequence of the limited population, is comparatively rude, there is little accumulated wealth, and so the effectiveness of labor is much less than in older countries. Until the same development takes place that already

exists in older countries, capital, in addition to that produced in the new country will be in demand, and will be sent from older communities.

Now while this is true under the conditions of land tenure that prevails in all civilized countries to-day, it is by no means certain that the same results would follow if our land tenure was different. For the tendency always is for men, when they have free access to nature to produce their own capital in quantities as it is required. It is only when capital is required to buy the right to use land, that an artificial need for capital is created on the one hand and an artificial class of capitalists ready to supply it on the other. The capitalist first gets the capital from the worker in the shape of rent for the privilege of working, and then lends it back to him, charging him for its use. Under the Single Tax the worker would be freed from these unjust exactions and would create his own capital. If it was necessary for him at any time to borrow, he would have no difficulty in finding some one who had more capital than he could use to lend to him, for unused wealth of all kinds will sooner or later waste away and disappear if labor is not spent upon it to conserve it. So if a man cannot use his wealth productively he is under an obligation to those who will take it and use it, returning it undiminished on demand. It is evident then that the return for borrowed wealth will be something less than the capital plus the whole increase due its use, and something more than would have remained if unemployed and subject to depreciation. Thus, if the possession of 100 lbs. of wheat enabled the user to make a net gain of ten lbs. he would return something less than 110 lbs. or it would not pay him to borrow, and if the annual depreciation was 5 lbs. if unused, the owner would demand something more than 95 lbs. or there would be no object in lending. The result of the play of the laws of supply and demand would probably bring about a resultant that would give to the lender his principal intact, for the conservation of borrowed wealth is the just equivalent for its use.

To demand more than the property back is to demand payment twice and is an attempt to evade the law that every man must work for his own living. If the demand is successful the lender gets something for nothing and the producer is robbed of a portion of his product.

It is hard in a society accustomed to monopoly to get away from the idea that a capitalist is not a producer of wealth at least to the extent of his advances, and it is always assumed that he might use his capital productively himself and get the same return in addition to wages for himself if he did so. But while this is true to-day where land is treated as private property, and where the masses can only use land by buying it or by paying rent for it, it would not be true if unused land were free for anyone to use, for several reasons. First, there would be a falling off in the demand for capital, if it was no longer required to buy the privilege of laboring. Second, there would be such an enormous increase in the production of wealth consequent on the removal of restrictions to employment that more capital would be offered for loan than could find borrowers, because men would seek to have their surplus product of to-day saved for them against old age, and unless someone would take it and use it, agreeing to return it unimpaired, they would see their surplus gradually depreciate and ultimately disappear. For example, if a man has ten six year old horses and is leaving the country, say, for ten years, it is evident that if he has to pay for their keep for ten years and then has sixteen year old horses on his hands, the value of the horses, deducting charges, will be much less than when he left. If, however he finds someone who will take his horses and agree to return the same number of six year olds when he comes back, he will have received a distinct service and the borrower will have had the use of the horses for their keep and the replacing of depreciation. Thus each would be advantaged and each would receive service for service.

The cause of interest is land monopoly, and with its destruction interest will disappear.

It is because of the fact that interest is abnormal that the laws governing it do not appear to co-relate with the laws of wages and rent, and in as much as it is a product of the same cause which raises rent above the normal limit, it follows that interest must be wholly drawn from wages, practically reducing wages by whatever is paid in interest in addition to the reduction in wages which is caused by the rise in rent just mentioned. Nevertheless, should interest be abolished without the destruction of land monopoly it is doubtful if wages would be any higher, for land rents would probably rise and swallow up the gain, so, though interest really is taken from wages, yet it is a portion that would otherwise be absorbed from wages by rent. To sum up, the laws of distribution of wealth are simply the laws of wages and rent.

Thus when rent rises wages fall, and when rent falls wages rise.

TORONTO, Canada.

THE JUSTICE OF INTEREST.

BY ROBERT CUMMING.

Henry George was right in saying that interest is just, and that wages and interest rise and fall together with the margin of cultivation. As rent rises, wages and interest fall.

But after all is said that can be said against the equity of interest, who among all the dissenters from Henry George's view of the subject, will make the motion that the "Parliament of Man" issue a decree against interest, as something wrong that must no longer be exacted or paid? Who shall say that a man with capital at work aiding not only himself, but perhaps hundreds of others in mill, mine, work-shop, store or on the farm—who shall say that he shall not be allowed anything for the use of his capital? Who would have the impudence to demand or expect the use of another's capital without return? The idea is as unjust as it is absurd and foolish.

What is interest? Interest is the return for the use of capital. Capital is that part of wealth that is used to aid in the production of more wealth. Land, labor and capital are the three factors in production. That portion of wealth that goes for the use of land is called rent, that paid for labor is wages, and that received for the use of capital is interest. Profits and interest are one and the same—the returns for the use of capital. Can the natural order exist and the factors of production be other than they are? Could equity be achieved or maintained in the distribution of wealth in any other way than by rent rendered to the state, wages to labor, and interest to capital?

Men who cry out against interest and who defend their position by asserting that labor produces all wealth, and that capital is therefore not entitled to any share in production are either superficial in their conception of interest, or they are Socialists. It is superficial to think of interest merely as a return paid for the use of money. Money is not capital. It is for the thing we want to use—the horse, the cow, the machine, the building—it is for such as these that we pay hire in the form of interest on money. No one would think of borrowing money were it not that he wants the use of something else that money, like a claim check, will secure for him.

What would you think of a railroad grade contractor, in need of both labor and capital, who should say to applicants with teams: "I will pay you for your labor just what I can get men without teams to work for, but I shall expect the free use of your teams? You would say "He must be crazy."

What would you think of a farmer who, having grain to thresh, should say

to the man with a threshing machine: "I will pay you for your labor just what I can get threshers without threshing machines to work for, but I shall expect the free use of your threshing machine? You would say of that farmer—"He must be a fool!" Then what must we think of the "reformer" who says interest is unjust and should be abolished? Does he understand the meaning of the terms, "interest" and "capital?" Horses are capital, a threshing machine is capital—that part of wealth used to aid in producing more wealth—and hire for their use is interest.

It would be difficult to conceive of any student of political economy being more blindly illogical than one who should seek to illustrate his point against interest by an instance of "investing" money in land and then calling the ever-increasing income from land "interest." "Interest" derived from land is rent. "Rent" for the use of buildings and improvements is interest.

To a friend of mine who expressed a friendly doubt concerning the claim made in "Progress and Poverty" that interest is just, Henry George without attempting to discuss the question simply said: "The great fact is we must all pay interest." I have since thought how full of meaning were his words, for interest is one of the three parts into which all production is divided. If short of the millennium we stop paying interest, it will be when Socialism confiscates every store, workshop and factory and all the tools of production in the land, and then it will be about time for civilization itself to stop.

Interest is as justly and righteously due to capital as wages are to labor for the aid given by each in producing wealth.

PEORIA, Ill.

THE INTEREST QUESTION.

BY MICHAEL FLÜRSCHHEIM.

I should like to add a few words to the symposium of your Spring number, in which my writings have been repeatedly referred to. First, I want to say something about the origin of the theory that Interest is the child of private land ownership. As far as I can trace it back Calvin was the first to give expression to the idea 400 years ago, but it is usually best known as the "Fructification Theory," ascribed, it seems, to the French economist Turgot, who lived in the eighteenth century. That Mr. Berens, Mr. Faidy and I came upon the same idea independently and without knowing anything of our predecessors is probable, certain, anyhow, as far as I am concerned; for in this a man can only speak for himself. These coincidences are, anyhow, too frequent to cause any astonishment, and it certainly would have been more delicate in Mr. Berens if he had omitted the allusion to the copies of the "Commonwealth" which were sent to me before I embodied the idea in "Rent, Interest and Wages," an allusion also contained in a so-called review of my latest book "Clue to the Economic Labyrinth" in "Land Values." Though I first brought out the theory in "Der einzige Rettungsweg," written in 1883 and published in 1884, and though the best proof that Mr. Berens was not unacquainted with my earlier writings is supplied by his translating the little parable "Hans and his cakes" in the "Commonwealth," I have never held or expressed the opinion that Mr. Berens might have taken his ideas on this subject from my writings.

I have always regretted our great leader's peculiar ideas on this subject. I had taken an early opportunity of asking him to reconsider them, and thus to strengthen his means of attack against the common enemy. It must have been in 1886 or 1887, a period at which I had not as yet had the honor of becoming personally acquainted with him, for I find among my corres-

pendence the following letter from him, dated from New York, September. 21, 1888, which reached me a considerable time after I had written him:

“ Dear Mr. Flurschein—I learn through our mutual friend, Mr. Prang, that you are irritated at the manner in which I have treated your communication about interest. I am sorry for this, as I have a very high opinion of you, and a very high appreciation of the work you are doing. But the difference between us in regard to interest, though it may be a matter of great theoretical importance, is a matter, at the present time, at least in the United States, of no practical importance, and I have been so intensely occupied with pressing matters that it has been impossible for me to give that attention to any theoretical matter that I am sure you would like me to give if I were to make an answer to you. As soon as I get again a little of the leisure I so much long for, and have been for such a time deprived of, I will carefully consider your propositions and make a review ; but for the present every nerve is strained in the effort to push forward what is of immediate concern. I have never thought differences between men who hold common views on the most important propositions to be of much account. If we all work in our own way, the truth is certain to come uppermost at last. With much esteem and cordial good wishes,
I am, yours very truly,

HENRY GEORGE.”

He had not found the leisure yet to study the subject when I paid him a visit in New York in April, 1893. He still could not get over the difficulty, of seeing—as he expressed himself in a public discussion between me and some of his friends in the Single Tax Club of New York—how a tailor would ever sell a coat as cheap on ten years credit as he would for cash. My reply was that if the tailor could not find any way of investing money at interest and if his customer offered absolute security for the punctual payment of the debt, the tailor might perhaps prefer to consume or use the amount after ten years to having it on hand at once. That George had made some progress in this great question was proved to me at this occasion by the words with which he concluded the debate : “ All I can say, Mr. Flurschein, is this, if you are right, if interest disappears with private rent, so much the better!” Which would hardly have been consistent with the maintenance of his former theory that interest and wages rise and fall together.

I felt highly interested in the symposium, and wish the short time allowed just now by the departure of the American Mail from Apia, where I am penning this, would allow me to join in the discussion, but if you will permit I shall be pleased to send something for the Autumn number. I will only say here, that the main difficulty our antagonists seem to labor under is the absolute absence of any correct idea of the immense amount of wealth production now latent and ready to come forth under free conditions. When once production keeps up with productive power capital will go a begging, and capitalists will be satisfied to find their savings undiminished at the period when they want to consume them. Our tool producing power has always run ahead of effective demand even in the restricted conditions we live under. When the bone needle was the tool used for sewing, men could produce more bone needles than were in demand, and when finally the bone needle had advanced to the stage of the sewing machine, we find sewing machine manufactories taking to cycle making, through the excess of supply over demand.

APIA, Samoa, June 12th, 1904.



Liberty is not a means to a higher political end. It is in itself the highest political end.—*Lord Acton.*

ECHO-NOMICS AND THE SCHOOLS.

By JAMES LOVE, Author of *Japanese Notions of Political Economy*.

There are reverberating places where if one shouts a question, the more or less remote, sharp cut bluffs, venerable nobles, moss grown eminences, though merely echoing the question, return such a medley of loud, and feeble, and mumbling inarticulations, that one cannot even recognize his question. With this in mind, and realizing that economics consists merely of the discordant echoes of current confusions, it has occurred to me that "Echonomics" might be an orthography preferable to "Economics" as now. However, in this paper the name is unimportant. I am thinking of the study (no matter how termed), as the professors present it.

Though Professor Arthur Latham Perry, LL.D., says: "It is impossible to make discussion in political economy amusing," I had really—in mid-summer madness—thought of so doing by citing passages from his own works, and abandoned the idea, not from lack of material, but because of the soberness of my own nature that is averse to levity in serious affairs. Whereupon, seeking concise statements of current teachings, I turned to an earlier writer who, while offering no opportunity for banter, presents with *unusual clearness* what are still the *essentials* of "Economics as she is taught,"—Mrs. Marcet, whose "Conversations on Political Economy," 1817, went through many editions, was very popular for such a book, and was much used in schools. I have a liking for this lady, for when a boy of fifteen, it was the reading of her arguments that made me ever after a friend of free trade. However, while believing her to be greatly superior to the bewildered and indecisive Walker, Marshall, Seligman, and the rest, there is yet much in her writing that might well lead one—not recognizing that custom is second nature—to doubt that man is a *reasoning* being.

That the present wide inequality in possession of "wealth" is natural, and largely unavoidable, was believed by Mrs. Marcet precisely as by recent writers. But, they are so occult and incomprehensible, that to present what they really teach I must make use of her.

The talks are between Mrs. B., the preceptress, and Caroline, her pupil. Emily, who figured in the "Chemistry Conversations," too young for this more thorny study, and whose questionings might be embarrassing, is prudently left out. The bits taken here and there I have arranged under heads.

WHAT IS "WEALTH" ?

p. 27. *Mrs. B.*—Anything that can become an article of commerce; such as *landed estates*, the products of agriculture, manufactures, domestic animals. In short, *whatever can contribute to the welfare and enjoyment of man.*

HOW IS WEALTH PRODUCED ?

(Though from her definition it could be brought into being by nothing short of Creative fiat.)

p. 31. *Mrs. B.* says:—It is very true that *Labor* is a most *essential* requisite to the production of wealth.

p. 44. *Mrs. B.*—*Land* may be considered as the instrument by which *alone* wealth is created. (Produced?)

p. 86. *Caroline*—Labor seems to be the natural and immediate cause of wealth.

Mrs. B.—Very true, Caroline.

p. 98. *Mrs. B.*—Do you understand now that no productive enterprise can be conducted without *Capital* ?

CAPITAL—CIRCULATING AND FIXED.

p. 107. *Mrs. B.*—(Speaking of farm produce, manufactures, *et cet.* “Circulating Capital.”) This class of capital is transferred *first* from the master to the laborer in the form of wages and raw material. From the laborer, in products increased in value, it is returned to the master, who sells it to consumers and realizes profits. (But how the master gets the capital to start the circulation is not made clear.)

p. 108. *Caroline*—You call maintenance of laboring men Circulating Capital, and that of cattle as Fixed Capital: they seem to me to be the same.

Mrs. B.—And so they are. If laborers were bought and sold, and not hired as now, they also would be fixed capital.

NATURAL INDOLENCE OF MEN.

p. 31. *Mrs. B.*—The labor of the savage who produces no wealth is *often more severe* than that of our common plowmen whose furrows teem with riches.

p. 32. *Mrs. B.*—Men are naturally disposed to indolence. (And yet on her next page the lines quoted from Goldsmith, if true, would prove that they are not.)

p. 33. *Mrs. B.*—“Every want that stimulates the breast,
Becomes a *source of pleasure* when redressed.”

SECURITY TO THE PRODUCER.

p. 38. *Mrs. B.*—Security is the great point. It is security that stimulates industry and renders labor productive.

p. 274. *Mrs. B.*—Another considerable advantage of landed property—as the farmer increases his products *the landlord can raise his rent.*

p. 272. *Mrs. B.*—The *rent* the farmer pays for the use of land is similar to the *interest* paid for the use of capital.

p. 202. *Mrs. B.*—A landlord cannot exact what a tenant is not willing to give * * * If the produce of the farmer can be sold for such a price as will repay the usual rate of profit on capital employed, and yet leave a surplus, farmers will be found who will willingly pay that surplus to the landlord for the use of his land.

p. 264. *Mrs. B.*—Sea fishing not being private property yields no rent. But inland fisheries do. There are forty-one salmon fisheries on the Tweed. And the Duke of Gordon lets one on the Spey for £7,000 a year.

p. 42. *Mrs. B.*—Men will not cultivate the earth * * * *when the idle may reap the harvest sown by the hand of industry.*

RESULTS OF “SECURITY.”

p. 63. *Mrs. B.*—(Omits Ireland, Scotland and her own loved England to tell of “The virtuous and happy Swiss.” Thus) That the Swiss are poor is not because of idleness—it is because of *natural obstacles*. For they are uncommonly active. “I have often seen them carry baskets of manure up steep heights to fertilize some little nook among the rocks. The country women carry their knitting about their waists so as to fill up every little interval with work. If a Swiss woman goes for water or wood she poises the burden on her head and knits as she walks along. But with it all, she adds, the father of a family cannot provide for his children and many are forced to migrate. (In the Art. Agriculture, Cy. Brit. Vol. 1, p. 413—I read that the medium quality of land which in England would hardly rent for thirty shillings an acre, will in Switzerland, *because of the greatly increased production under “Petite” culture,*

rent for £6 an acre. But the causes for Swiss poverty, other than "natural obstacles," that now might arise in an *ignorant* mind, will not, we find, in one "scientifically trained," and other reasons must be rendered. Thus)

p. 412. *Caroline.*—And do you suppose that the present distressed state of agriculture is due to our *producing too much* at home?

Mrs. B.—I have no doubt it is one of the causes.

p. 156. *Mrs. B.*—That population should tend to *press upon the means of subsistence* and render exertion necessary to obtain food, appears to me to be a law of nature wisely calculated to call into activity the various powers of man.

p. 156. *Caroline.*—The miseries arising from an excess of population have left a melancholy impression on my mind.

RELATION OF THE RICH TO THE POOR.

p. 89. *Mrs. B.*—In civilized society men cannot live from spontaneous produce. The wilderness is cultivated, and land has become private property.

p. 90. *Caroline.*—And when the land is occupied by the rich there seems to be no resource left to the poor?

Mrs. B.—The poor man may be supposed to say to the rich one: "You have more than you want, whilst I am destitute. Give me some little share of your wealth for a subsistence. I have nothing to offer in exchange but my labor, but with that I will undertake to procure you more than you part with,—if you maintain me I will work for you."

p. 91. *Caroline.*—(Dubious.) This is a resource for the poor, I own; but they are left at the mercy of the rich, and would starve should the rich not employ them.

p. 92. *Mrs. B.*—True. But what could the rich do without their assistance?

p. 93.—*Mrs. B.*—The poor and rich are necessary to each other, * * * *without the rich the poor would starve*; without the poor the rich would be compelled to labor for their own subsistence.

COMMENCEMENT-DAY AND THE CURTAIN DROPS.

(And now no longer needing this restraining monition of)

p. 6. *Mrs. B.*—at the beginning—"If you can remain satisfied with your ignorance of political economy you should at least * * * forbear to talk about it since you cannot do it to any purpose." *Caroline* closes her studies and is prepared for her "Degree."

p. 465. *Caroline.*—(Graduation thesis): Formerly I imagined that whatever addition was made to the wealth of the rich was so much subtracted from the pittance of the poor, but now I see it is on the contrary, an addition to the general wealth of the country, by which the poor benefit equally with the rich."

Though in primitive societies "wealth" seems to be very evenly apportioned; in all the *civilizations*, of the present and past, a great material inequality has prevailed that, in every case being the slow outgrowth of custom, has ultimately been accepted as a matter of course; except that at long intervals some superior men have been aroused to its evils and have inveighed against it. Such men were Plato, and Aristotle, in old Greek times. Isaiah, Micah, Ezra, among the Jews. Sir Thomas Moore, and James Harrington, in England. But their efforts being mainly empirical, and their audiences small, the results seem to have been altogether nil. And it was not until the middle of the 18th century that Quesnay and his fellows, proposing to seek the cause

of this inequality in a more methodical manner, originated the science of "Political Economy." They sought to explain how "wealth" is so unevenly distributed among the members of the same community. And wealth consisted—as they defined it—of material things produced by human exertion, (or "labor,") on land, and having value in exchange. This made wealth to consist singly of valuable *products*. But later writers, all enmeshed in the customs of their times, could not free their minds from the notion that "Land" in itself is not only wealth, but the most important item in the category wealth; yet land is not produced. So that after years of controversy, during which they devoted more and more space to the *production* of wealth—and, though "It is evident," as Plato said, "That the city cannot be happy unless the whole or the greater part of the people are happy, for happiness cannot be averaged;" they more and more neglected *distribution*. And abandoning the truth that wealth is a *product*, they came to hold that *value* is the chief, if not the *sole characteristic* of wealth. In the words of Francis A. Walker "Wealth comprises all articles of value and nothing else."

But a new dilemma arose, for this definition of wealth included slaves. And, while never doubting the moral right of individuals to appropriate "*Rent*," most men had come to see that the value of a slave is really the value of the legal power to *rob* a man of his wealth. But the notion that land is wealth, though weakening somewhat in the outside world, had a tenacious hold in the schools, and would not yield to the clearest exposition of natural law. When Mahomet found that the mountain would not budge, succumbing to physical law, he sensibly went to the mountain. But when the economists found that the moral law was against them, they proceeded to *repeal* the moral law. Thus Spencer, who once used the term "God" with reverence, and had written: "Nay, indeed, so *spontaneous* is this faith in the equality of human rights, that our very language embodies it. Equity and equal are from the same root; and equity literally means equalness"—dropped God for the "Unknowable," and moral law for "Evolution." Walker cautions us that "The economist is not to be influenced by any *ethical* consideration." And Hadley suggests that in a definition of Wealth we must not be guided by a preconceived ethical code because "Every race and every generation has a different ethical code of its own." And Ely, denying the spontaneity of the idea justice or equity, exclaims "There are no natural rights"—"All true rights are rational rights," are "Habits and not compulsory necessities of nature." While Seligman assures us that "Modern jurisprudence and political philosophy . . . have incontestably disproved . . . this assumption of natural laws or natural rights."

Thus while the use of the term justice is held to be non-scientific, and God has become an exploded idea, political economy under the name "Economics" has sunk to such complete indecision that to the questions: Is "Protection" ever a benefit? Can chattel slavery be justified? Is robbery always wrong? They can only respond: "There are no *universal theories* in economics to be applied without regard to time and circumstances." So, it has even become "Professional" to laugh at Jefferson's declaration that *all men are created equal*; believing its falsity to be shown by their *actual* condition. But what Jefferson enunciated was a *moral law* which, like a physical law, never ceases to exert itself—the facts proffered as conflicting with it really proving its truth. Just as in disregarding the physical law of gravitation a tower would be weakened, and if much disregarded would fall, so in disregarding this moral law of equality that gives the product to the producer—the law "Thou shalt not steal"—ill effects ever follow. And if much disregarded—famines and death, once populous lands turning to deserts, and great cities becoming ruins. So inflexible a law that even where the producer is not aware he is being robbed,

and the robber is unconscious of robbing, the results are just the same—most likely worse. For as was observed long ago by Plato, “It is the perfection of injustice to seem just without really being so.”

But in rejecting moral law they were impelled presently (excepting the so called laws of “Malthus” and of “Diminishing returns in agriculture,”) to deny the existence of any economic laws at all “That will save the statesman the labor of *working out each case on its merits.*” Thus, “It being as good to be in the dark as without light,” they really admit their books to be worse than worthless, for the time spent in reading them must be wholly lost.

Though among the people (including economists) of Europe and America no belief for ages has been more general than that land is capital; and to be included in the term “Wealth,” some economist is ever making the “Most important discovery” that land is capital. Thus Perry finds (1881) that “The largest part of all saleable land is nothing more nor less than capital,” a discovery that will cause “The difficulties that have perplexed economists and statesmen . . . mostly if not wholly to disappear.” And John Bates Clark, of Columbia, in treating land as “Capital-goods,” “Rent as merely a part of interest,” and “Rent and interest as describing the same income in two different ways,” is thought by many of his scholastic critics, and by himself too, to have made an important discovery. In the same belief Professor Plehn, of California, in his *courteous* letter to me, “Finally land *is* wealth, land *is* capital. . . I am at present at work on a theory of distribution which does not leave room for the senseless and unbusiness-like distribution between land and capital—an elaboration and simplification both, of Senior’s ‘Analysis,’ which is hinted at once or twice in my ‘Public Finance.’”

Serious as the matter is, such Dogberry wisdom forces one to laugh in spite of himself.

* * * * *

In political economy, from the beginning, the great difficulty has been to define the term “Wealth”—the very object noun, or subject matter of the study. For, not only to the professors but to most men who have not thought upon the subject, land seems to be by far the most important item of wealth,—termed “real wealth,” as being the most secure form of all wealth. This long continued habit of estimating land caused the Physiocratic definition of wealth, which excluded land, to be rejected, and, eventually, the Ricardian theory of rent to be denied. Thus ever going from bad to worse, the writers treating capital and labor as the *two* essential, yet *antagonistic* factors of production between which there is and always must be conflict, have been fatally lost in such a labyrinth of confusions and contradictions, that should a professor of geology, or of astronomy, attempt to convince his class by means of the same “logic” that economists use, and with which economic books are filled, he could not hold his chair for an hour.



PRESENT CONDITIONS OF THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT IN NEW ZEALAND.

(For the Review.)

By MERVYN J. STEWART.

On being invited to report on the present condition of the Single Tax movement in New Zealand I am only too conscious of the higher qualifications of many of my brothers. As a farmer by occupation, a political agitator, not specially successful, by preference, and an unpaid municipal officer by relax-

ation, literary style is not a vital or constant object; but my facts are at least accurate, if the medium be not ornamental.

The Single Tax movement in New Zealand dates back to 1875, when our "grand old man," Sir George Grey, was in constant collaboration with Henry George across the Pacific. The only men of their century fully worthy to be colleagues worked together over the MS. of "Progress and Poverty," a fact which George has placed on record, and it was with the full approval of the prophet that the warrior Premier by his Colonial Treasurer, John Ballance, enacted a land-value tax in 1878 (Oct. 28th). The franchise in New Zealand was then very restricted; the first joint in the serpent's tail is the hardest to chop off. Members were apathetic, if not corrupt. Progress and Poverty was not to dawn for a year yet, and by a secession of his pledged followers the peerless Imperialist-Democratic leader was cast from office, and an amendment including all personal property and improvements on land as taxable was passed in October, 1879, almost to the ruin of the colony, and to the utter destruction, after a fair trial, of the party responsible.

In the early eighties Anti-Poverty societies were started all over the colony, mostly to wither away for lack of support. Honor to the lonely pioneers who by their failure made a way by which we may hope to succeed! In Auckland alone the Anti-Poverty Society, later the Ground Rent Revenue League, and later the Auckland branch of the Single Tax League, has survived, issuing *Justice, Forward*, and now *The Liberator* (still strong at the fifth year); and as the nucleus of a group of men with influence out of all proportion to their numbers. President Geo. Fowlds, member of the (lower) House of Representatives, Secretary Fred. M. King, Geo. Stevenson, Thos. Webb, Vice-President Edward Withy, ex-M. H. R., T. L. Stevens, Wm. Young, are some of the leaders in Auckland, now with us, besides many Government officials who have no platform politics.

In 1879 manhood suffrage was enacted by the Hall Ministry, which fell after a long fight in 1884. Sir Robert Stout, a land nationalist, succeeded, and was beaten in 1877 by Sir Harry Atkinson's Tory party, which enacted the "one man vote" franchise extension. During this term partly by reiteration of Henry George's teaching by Ballance, Sir George Grey, and partly by the large Scotch-Irish element in our people who were used to "Ulster custom" (that a landlord should not increase the rent for improvements made by the tenant), a very widespread municipal agitation for powers to free improvements on property from local taxes ("Rates," as we say) were growing up, which the Stout and Atkinson parties opposed alike. The culmination occurred in 1889 when at a conference of County Council Chairmen in Auckland a motion demanding powers to rate only "unimproved values" was unanimously passed on the motion of Capt. Donald MacMillan, Royal Navy, who represented this County of Tauranga, and was my own immediate predecessor as Honorable Clerk of the Kati Kati Road Board, and my political Gamaliel.

The general state of the colony then was very bad. Soup kitchens were going, state relief works paid equal to 60 cents a day, tariff duties were raised, a tremendous impetus was given to Neo Malthusianism, the birthrate falling from 37 in 1879 to 29 in 1890, and the loss by emigration was over 20,000 in the last years of Tory government. Henry George made his flying tour of Australasia just when the failure to obtain benefits to labor by the old methods was fully shown by the almost civil war throughout Australasia of the great Seamen's strike; the Ballance party took new heart and won a decisive victory at the general election on December 5th, 1890. A highly composite ministry was formed, which has held office over four subsequent general elections with increasing public support. Sir Robert Stout was excluded, but MacKenzie, Minister of Lands, was a land nationalizer (now late Sir John Mac-

Kenzie); Reeves, Minister for Labor, was a Socialist (now Sir W. P. Reeves, Agent-General in London); Ward was hostile to all reforms, but a good business man, made Treasurer (now Sir Joseph Ward, Postmaster-General); Seddon, Minister of Defence, was the only colleague Ballance could really rely upon, although the hatred of the property tax kept all in line. To crown the troubles, the (upper) Legislative Council, nominated for life by the "Crown" or rather the Premier, were to a man hostile, and were backed by a sympathetic Governor, Lord Onslow. In 1891, after a lot of fighting, Ballance secured the appointment of Councillors for seven years only, and put in thirteen with a threat of as many more if needed. Lord Onslow resigned. An Act was passed levying a tax of one penny in the £1 (4 1-6 per cent.) on the value of all land in private hands, with an exemption up to £1,000 of £500, ceasing by steps at £1,500, and a graduation from £5,000 to £210,000 of at most 1*d.* more by steps of 1-8*d.* This was supposed to get at the large estates and conciliate small holders, and still stands, except that the graduation tax is now at 2*d.* extra maximum, the extra penny being added last session without opposition. A growing movement is for reduction of the exemption to £200 or £300 at most, but it is understood that Ballance promised not to increase the tax or lower the exemption as the price of getting through an Act at all, and that Seddon, now Premier, considers himself bound by this. The municipal Single Tax law was defeated four times by the Upper House, and only passed in 1896 on a compromise that one-third of the property owners on the roll must vote to carry it by a majority, and that a vote should not affect taxes for lighting, water, hospitals, poor aid, and drainage, being thus restricted to (A) "general rates" from which if desired any of the above may be met, and (B) "special rates" devoted to paying interest and redemption on specific local debts.

A lot of labor legislation of humane intention and doubtful value was also passed. With Ballance's weakness and death in May, 1893, the land nationalization people captured the Liberal party, and have since borrowed millions on millions in London to buy up large estates at wasteful figures and subdivide them for settlement at a profit. Crown lands of course have to be withheld from settlement at fair rates while the game of beggar my neighbor goes on; and the nationalizers are so indifferent to the rights of the people that in the three tenures they offer (A) sale for cash; (B) occupation at 5 per cent., with right to purchase freehold within 14 years; (C) lease in perpetuity at 4 per cent. without right of purchase, there is no provision for participation in land values by the public. By the way, the land value of the colony in private hands, some £75,000,000 is exactly the balance of the national liabilities—sales of Crown land, municipal debts, and the national debt together, and has exactly risen to balance these ever since they have been assessed. Ergo, the landowners have got all the money borrowed, and what they paid for the right to get it, back again!

To conclude with Sir Robert Stout. He was much injured at Seddon's assuming the Premiership, and after a spell as an Oppositionist accepted the position of Chief Justice, and quit politics. His penultimate seat was Buller in the southern gold fields, which was contested by a young Irish Single Taxer without success. Nevertheless Sir Robert did not again try for that seat and "Pat" O'Regan held it over two Parliaments, in which he advocated vital reforms with an eloquence and directness unequalled in our time in New Zealand, introducing Bills for Referendum and Effective Voting, and for State note issue in place of borrowing and above all for national and municipal Single Tax with splendid devotion. His seat was lost in 1899 largely by an unjustified imputation of Pro-Boerism, and in 1902 he contested Sir Robert's last seat, Wellington City, the capital; receiving 6,304 votes, a defeat by under 400.

Without doubt our leader will be restored to us next year if his life and powers are spared.

After three years trial of the municipal Single Tax law the provision that one-third must vote to make a valid poll was wiped out as intolerable, votes of 112 to 2, 122 to 20, 462 to 20 and so on being of no effect, and a straight-out vote can now be taken. Every district in which a non-effective poll was taken has now been re-pollled, over 12 in all, and only one gave a majority against us, Petone, a suburb of Wellington. Against this may be set Woolston, a suburb of Christchurch, which gave first a non-effective poll against us, and later an effective poll in our favor. One effective poll in our favor has been challenged, Normanby, a village on the west coast of the North Island, with disastrous results to the challengers, at the expiring of the statutory three-year term; while we have challenged a rejection (the first) at Picton, a suburb of Wellington, and won by a big vote. Results are as follows, tabulated to date.

There are 78 counties qualified to bring in the act: we hold 15, no rejections or challenges, several non-effective polls repeated, one being this Tauranga County. There are 103 Boroughs qualified, we hold 31, one a convert as above, none lapsed, several non-effectives reported all captured but one. "I regret to report" eight so far have gone against us. There are 34 town districts and 86 road districts (county subdivisions under an old system of local government) qualified to introduce the act, and we hold 24 of these.

In another way—we hold scattered counties all over the colony, no two being actually contiguous. Boroughs run in groups, as Wellington and *all* suburbs but one; Christchurch and *all* suburbs; Palmerston North and all boroughs and counties about for miles in a growing radius; smaller groups elsewhere of later date are promising well. In another way, one-third of the total local taxation of the colony is now raised from land exclusively, and two-thirds from land and improvements in moieties.

Auckland City went against us, the only serious blow, and due largely to the prominence of whole hog Single Taxers in Auckland, whose doctrine the colony is not yet ripe for. It is thus rather a testimonial that we raised together 800 against 1,650. Wellington gave us 1,300 to 600, Stratford 399 to 23, Waipawa 462 to 28, little Maraetai 16 to none! In reckoning Single Tax progress I must not forget the steady hewing out in 1900-3 of great blocks of tariff; kerosene, tea, fruits, and a lot of necessaries being now on the free list, while a large body of Liberal opinion demands a free breakfast table, cotton fabrics, linoleums and similar revenue taxes; the leader being Henry George Ell, who is as near a "whole hogger" as times allow, and one of our most able Parliamentarians, who has fought in some dozen rating polls with brilliant success.

A Parliamentary Land and Taxation Reform group has associated itself this last session under the chairmanship of our President Fowlds, comprising all the best of the Liberal party, and pledged to work for "reduction of taxation on the necessaries of life and securing of the unearned increment for public purposes." If he holds his position we may look for real good in this. Of course, it can only be by steady semi-secret pressure on the Ministry, and continuous platform work in the country. A Wilson Hogg, Thos. Taylor, Robt. McNab, G. Laurenson, W. W. Tanner, H. D. Bedford are perhaps the best known in the movement where all do their best besides Fowlds and Ell.

There are now several taxation polls pending, Waihi Borough and Olimemuri Co. I look for extension of the act to cover all local taxation soon, and a general increase of local taxation with reduction of State grants before long. I have tried to show a generation of breaking down of barriers in response to genuine popular demands, of slow advances with never a betrayal or setback, of desperate legislative efforts after other panaceas,

always recalled into line, and of a handful of men like yourselves, isolated, poor, unflinching, consumed with ardor, enlisted for life. With such a record in the past, who dare doubt of the future ?

ATHENREE, NEW ZEALAND.



COLORADO'S ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENTS.

BY JAMES W. BUCKLIN.

The turmoil and official lawlessness which Colorado is now exhibiting are the natural results of golden opportunities heretofore rejected. In order to understand the Colorado situation it is necessary to go back at least three years in the history of our state. At that time an eight hour law passed two years before, had been rendered void by a decision of the supreme court of the state. The legislature was now in session. It was almost solidly Democratic in both houses, with a Democratic Governor and state officials. It passed and submitted to the people six very important constitutional amendments by more than the constitutional two-thirds vote, and also revised and adopted an entirely new revenue law, containing many important conditions and omissions.

The six constitutional amendments were more or less of a compromise. Three of them were in the interest of plutocracy and were condemned by organized labor, and three of them were in the interest of Democracy and were endorsed by organized labor. One of the three plutocratic measures limited the ballot to those who had resided in the state one year and to citizens of the U. S., a residence of six months and declaration of intention being all theretofore required. By this means considerable numbers of workingmen and their wives were disfranchised. The other two plutocratic measures consolidated state, national and local elections, making such elections biennial, thus enormously increasing the power of the political machines. The three Democratic measures were 1st, the eight hour law made necessary by the adverse decision of the supreme court ; 2d, the amendment consolidating the city and county of Denver and increasing its home rule powers, and 3d, the Australasian tax amendment. As soon as the legislature adjourned a powerful and persistent attack was made upon the Australasian tax amendment, and upon the new revenue law. Thereupon a special session of the legislature was convened to repeal the constitutional amendment, and to amend the tax law. The law was amended, but the attempted repeal was defeated. Plutocracy felt that it could not successfully attack the eight hour amendment before the people, but raised an enormous corruption fund with which to defeat the Australasian tax amendment, and with which to organize the large land and mine owners, the corporations and plutocratic element generally. Such organization then made has been the most potent force behind the Peabody administration since his election, although the name of such organization was changed from that of "The Anti-Bucklin League" to "The Citizen's Alliance." This large corruption fund and powerful organization frightened and paralyzed the Democratic party, causing it to refuse to either endorse or condemn the amendment, although it was the principal issue and the only one arousing any interest in the election. None of the Democratic leaders of the state dared to raise their voices in its behalf, although a majority of them had previously endorsed it. The result of this cowardly policy was that both the amendment and the Democratic party were defeated, the Populist party which had endorsed the amendment polling a considerable vote. I am satisfied that had the Democratic party of Colorado been Democratic and endorsed it, both the amendment and the party would have been successful, and Peabody's administration and the crimes following in its

wake would never have existed. All the other five amendments were endorsed by all political parties, and all pledged themselves to adopt an eight hour law thereunder.

An effort was at first made by the state officials to make a fairly decent assessment of corporate property under the new revenue law, but such action was strenuously and successfully resisted. The revenue law as finally enforced, very largely increased the revenue of the state, without much increase of taxes on the corporations, and it continued the policy of taxing only a small per cent. of the output of the mines instead of taxing the full value of the mines themselves, thus allowing the most valuable property of the state to almost entirely escape its share of public burdens. Let it be remembered, however, that it is the owners of these untaxed or lightly taxed properties who have induced the governor to call out the state militia, and who have thus created an enormous state debt, and absorbed our largely increased revenues.

Five of the six amendments, being those which were endorsed by all political parties, were adopted. After election most strenuous efforts were begun to defeat the operation of the two Democratic amendments. The Denver amendment was juggled with, until finally a charter satisfactory to the corporations was adopted, which will prevent much if any good resulting from the adoption of the amendment. The new legislature failed to pass any eight hour law as required by the constitutional amendment, and as it was pledged to do, and the miners and smeltermen became discouraged, and resolved on a strike for the purpose of securing by force what they had been defrauded of by the political parties and plutocracy.

Governor Peabody immediately, whether with or without an ante-election understanding is not material, placed himself wholly at the service of the mine and smelter owners, and at their behest, while the civil authorities were in full control, called out the state militia for the purpose of breaking up the miners union. The union was officered and led by able men, and it was evidently their interest and intent to conduct their strike in accordance with law so far as possible. On the other hand the mine owners who had the governor and the supreme court with them, are determined not only to break the strike, but also to break up and destroy the miners organization, and to incidentally damage all labor organizations as far as possible. This is being done by the military power, and by organized mobs in several counties of the state. No such exhibition of wanton power, of total disregard of constitutional and legal enactments, and of the over-riding of all fundamental rights of the people, has ever heretofore been made in America since the time of King George the III. The only excuse offered in defense of such action is the horrible crimes committed against non-union miners, and charged by the military and mine owners to have been committed by the miners union. It was beyond question the interest of the mine owners association to have committed these crimes, but as to who is guilty there is as yet no proof. All that unbridled military and official power can do is being done to fix the guilt upon the miners union.

Let no one mistake the temper of this struggle. It is different from that heretofore aroused by strikes. There is in it the spirit of intolerance which was aroused over the slavery question in the late fifties. It is difficult to hold an even temper and to avoid taking sides. Only students of economic principles thought such conditions could arise, and as a result the great majority of the people are astounded and yet silent. Will they wake up and turn to the ballot while that weapon is still in their hands? I think so. That is what the people did in New Zealand and Australia after the great maritime strike of 1890. So far the labor organizations of the country have made the terrible mistake of petitioning President Roosevelt to interfere, the most dangerous thing to local government and to the preservation of liberty, imaginable. The

most discouraging feature of the whole situation, is the fact that workingmen seem to think that the whole trouble is merely political instead of economic, and that a mere change of governors, or perhaps of political parties, would have enabled them to win their strike, and would have averted the calamities which have befallen the state. The truth is that the now dominant element in the Democratic party of Colorado is as plutocratic as is the Republican party, and that nothing short of fundamental economic changes can preserve Democratic institutions, and prevent even more serious military and labor troubles than have yet occurred. Let us hope that rational and conservative councils will prevail, and that the way out, the open door—EQUALITY OF OPPORTUNITY—will be entered, to the end that a government of, for and by the people may not perish from the earth.



THE SINGLE TAX AS A PEACE MEASURE,

(*For the Review.*)

By JANE DEARBORN MILLS.

Many persons believe that labor never will come into its economic rights without a total upheaval of all things, with more or less of bloody strife accompanying. No doubt there are great numbers of our citizens who keep their faces turned away from all reforms, because they are convinced that nothing radical can be accomplished in any gradual and peaceful way; and they decide, perhaps unconsciously, that after us shall be the deluge, if keeping their ears stopped and their eyes blindfolded can bring about a long enough delay.

These are not necessarily ignorant, weak or wicked persons. They dread the suffering for family, self and for the country; they dread the stopping of all progress in the higher things of life while readjustment is proceeding; and they believe that nothing adequate has been found, as yet, to substitute for the present ungainly and disorder-producing system, later on, there may be—must be, some discovery of a better way. So it seems wise to them to shut their eyes and make the best of things that are.

The reason that so many of such people live unknowing of the Single Tax is no more their fault than it is our deficiency. The simple fact is that Single Taxers have not found the methods which will give to this large class of people an insight into our great truth as a peace measure. So far, it has been put forth rather as a war measure—that is, the main work has been that of tearing down established customs. Not that this has been done belligerently, but the purpose of very many of the addresses, lectures, and the written articles has been to show, first, how corrupt, inherently, the present system is, and secondly, how simple and how pure the Single Tax would be when once established. Between the two, however, a great gulf yawns, and one hearing about it for the first time immediately supposes that to pass over that gulf no path can be found except the bloody bridge of war. The question, “How get from here to there?” has always received less attention than any other phase of the whole subject.

“First get your principle established” is the natural motto of the reformer. But is it necessary in establishing a principle to let go entirely—or more truly, largely, of the connection between it and the things we live in and must live in till the other is established? That is—if it is wise to go and live on the hither border of the gulf, is not the question how to get there as vital as the knowledge that the other country is the happier abiding place?

The whole Single Tax is a Peace Measure, and the answer to “How to

get there" its Commander-in-Chief. We Single Taxers know that there is no necessity for war in order to bring about the change which would place economics on a basis just to all. We have only to convince others of this, and the thing is done. There are thousands who want to see it, and who are held back really because we do not consider the largeness of the question, "How can it be done?"

The need of a Peace Branch of Single Tax work is forcibly borne in upon one's mind when listening to a certain kind of lecture addressed to working people. On one occasion, during the last Winter, a gifted orator was using all his powerful talent in picturing how every monetary act, under our present system, from buying a loaf of bread to carrying on the large affairs of life, was necessarily an act of oppression to the wage-earner. The glowing pictures that he drew of workmen staggering under the burdens bound upon them must have aroused the heart of every hearer. How must the many in the audience who were burden bearers have felt, under the sense of personal injury added to that of general injustice? Must they not have longed to break their bonds and turn and rend their oppressors? And if, at that moment, they could have been freed, would they have stopped to reason how they might establish justice to all, with injury to none? By no means. The reasoning must come before the breaking of the bonds, if we would have the new ready in their hands to take the place of the old by peaceful measures.

Not the laborers alone, but the capitalist as well, needs to know of means which may bring a peaceful solution of the difficulty. Although he may not be convinced, as long as things go fairly well with him, that any change is best, his familiarity with a method which some believe to be the remedy would serve him and the world well, when the inevitable crisis comes. And as much effort made to spread abroad the knowledge of how the change may be brought about, as to acquaint the world with the remedy itself, might prove, when the hour comes, the greatest of blessings.

The Single Tax as a Peace Measure might be worked up into a large topic, perhaps, for every subject grows in numbers of ideas contained in it, as it is studied. The old story is applicable here of the Professor, dying, of whom a friend asked, "Do you not regret that your life has been spent on the study of Greek?" "Yes," whispered the dying man, "I wish I had spent it all upon the dative case." So any phase of truth grows larger and larger by study, and so it might prove with this phase of the Single Tax. It might prove, then, to be the key which would unlock the understandings of those many good people whom now we are always wondering about—trying to find a cause for their blindness. The cause, is, without doubt, that they see no hope but in war, and this they shrink from and determine to put off as long as possible.

Some Single Taxers are members also of Peace Societies, and doubtless, ways might open to them for getting in a word, in meetings and the periodicals of the Peace movement, as to the Single Tax as a Peace Measure. Lectures might be given on this subject, or some phase of it, it always being borne in mind how to get there peaceably is to be kept prominently in view. Peace Committees might be formed in every Single Tax Society, who should carry on a Peace Department of the work. And doubtless this, our "dative case" of Single Tax, might well engage the life-devotion of those members who have the special talent for such work.



Nut for our Socialist friends.—The expropriation of the mass of the people from the soil forms the basis of the capitalist mode of production.—*Karl Marx*.

HENRY GEORGE.*(For the Review.)*

Read on and on, oh! doubting human soul,
 If thou would'st see with clearer eyes, would'st feel
 As godlike men have felt, man's woe and weal ;
 Would'st stem the waves of misery that roll
 Increasing deep, against life's lofty goal
 Read on, and in thy spirit thou shalt kneel
 To this great master, echo his appeal
 For justice, to the rich, who pity dole.
 Be just, O man, unto thy brother-man.
 Work for humanity, then pray to God!
 Dost dare to hope, after a selfish span
 Of selfish years, to win eternal rest,
 Bringing thy least to Him who gave His best,
 And portioned all men from the common sod.

ROSALIE M. JONAS.

**THE CHILDREN IN THE MARKET PLACE.***(For the Review.)*

I stood one day amid the market throng,
 Where sharp-faced men live by the hucksterer's rule,
 Sordid and hard—when, suddenly, a song!—
 A group of singing children passed from school.

We marvel at the happiness of youth;
 Ah, marvel more why age is ever glad
 In intervals of sorrow, when, in truth,
 There is so much to make this old world sad.

Sorrows, indeed, we all might bravely meet ;
 Death were not terrible with Faith half sure;
 And pain with tender hands to soothe were sweet,
 For little matter these if Love endure.

But this brain-racking, spirit-deadening pace,
 In which to win must do our brothers wrong;
 These perils of Life's ill-conditioned race
 That leave no heart for joy, no voice for song.

The spectre of the wolf before the door,
 The legacy of trial when we are gone
 For those we love if death shall find us poor.
 The stones for little feet that further on.

Make sharp the way—the foes that they must face,
 The cruel tightening of the Laborer's cords ;
 The cares that early come to rob the grace
 Of these, our loved, pierce like a thousand swords.

Banish this fear, and all its haunting train,
 And joy shall leave of sorrow scarce a trace,
 And Age shall vie with these in livelier strain,
 These singing children in the market place.

JOSEPH DANA MILLER.



LINES TO E. A.

(For the Review.)

Dear Sir and Brother: Truly 'twas a pity that you went
 To meet the Single Taxers on the field of argument.
 It is one of the temptations that they simply can't resist
 To give that field a wiping with a rash Economist.

You're not at all without excuse for this unlucky slip;
 Since Crosby on his shoulder placed a most conspicuous chip;
 But you shouldn't let such move you from the tenor of your way.
 Remember he who fights and runs may fight another day.

Great Herbert Spencer wisely chose to take it quietly
 When Henry George confounded his reversed philosophy;
 The thirteenth Leo answered not his tender, strong appeal,
 As wishing no new chance to test the temper of his steel.

But 'twas a goodly sight to see the Duke of Argyll go
 The "San Francisco Prophet" to demolish at a blow;
 Although of lineage ancient and with every lore equipped,
 You've seldom seen a common man so thoroughly well whipped.

And Gen. F. A. Walker, who had written several books,
 Who had twice been superintendent of the school of census cooks,
 In 'ologies and 'onomies who hardly could be beat,
 Was by George's plain arithmetic quite taken off his feet.

Innumerable cases do more recent history yield
 Of reputations battered on the controversial field,
 When college men, too careless of their logic and their facts,
 Have collided with alumni from the school of Single Tax.

But though great men by these same pens have often dropped before,
 Still, that you should have thus gone down we cannot but deplore.
 As Mr. Post so truly says, we know your motive's right,
 And so in your discomfiture we cannot take delight.

A word now to Economists in general let me speak:
 When the Single Taxer smites you, better turn the other cheek.
 You cannot in great learning or great reputation trust,
 For now as ever he's thrice armed that hath his quarrel just.

JAY HAWKINS.

" A WORLD POWER."

(For the Review.)

World Influence thou wert, beloved Land!
 Proud, and serene, in throned peace secure.
 When the poor thrall of Power touched thy strand,
 Into his laggard pulses flowing pure
 The breath of life through all his being ran,
 And he looked up, and felt himself a man!

Thou stoodst, like Uriel, in the sun to shame
 The warring nations from ignoble strife.
 There was no need of trumpet to proclaim
 Thy greatness—it was witnessed in thy life.
 Thy honor was the shield—not bannered hosts;
 Justice and freedom fortified all thy coasts.

Oh! destiny sublime! Could'st thou forego?
 Fear of the strong, and refuge of the weak!
 Thy faith unsullied kept with friend and foe;
 Thy name a watch-word! Could'st descend to seek
 Place in this base arena?—to forswear
 All thy high past, and all thy future fair?

World Influence thou art, beloved Land!
 Upon thy word the Hours, trembling, wait:
 With thee, ascending still, the race shall stand
 On unimagined heights! With thee—oh fate
 Unspeakable!—lured on by power and pride,
 From darker depth to depth, the abyss shall hide.
 FRANCES M. MILNE.



A PRAYER.

(For the Review.)

Simple our plea—yet we who preach
 Small harvest see for all our seed;
 Either we lack the words to teach
 Or they who listen will not heed.
 How long, O Lord? We faint, we fall,
 And in our need on Thee we call.
 We weary of our futile speech
 That seems to have no power at all—
 Show us the daybreak, we beseech!

Grant us, O God, the flaming speech,
 The driving eloquence, the hot
 Swift words, like arrows, that shall reach
 The hearts of those by Thee forgot.
 Too long Thy mangled children bleed;
 By hell-fire hemmed, each tramples each,
 The green earth is become a spot
 Where man eats man and devils breed—
 Show us the daybreak, we beseech!

O. OWEN, LONDON, ENG.

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.

SUMMER NUMBER

PUBLISHERS NOTES.

With the Spring number of the REVIEW notices were sent to all those whose subscriptions have expired. Many have failed to renew. They are urged to give this matter their attention. The REVIEW to succeed must have the loyal support of every Single Taxer.

Will our readers also note if they are about to purchase books that these can be ordered through the REVIEW? The opportunity to secure the Anniversary Edition of the Works of Henry George is still open, and those desiring to purchase are referred to the back pages of this issue of the REVIEW for descriptive "ad" of the volumes comprising the set.

The *Liberator*, of Auckland, New Zealand, still continues its good work for the cause of economic freedom. It is one of the brightest little papers at the antipodes.

We fancy that many of our readers will hardly agree with the estimate of Martin Luther in Mr. Warren's article in this issue of the *Review*. Least of all will they be inclined to accept the comparison between the founder of Protestantism and the clearer visioned seer who pointed the way to economic freedom. The intellectual and moral, not to say the spiritual limitations of Luther furnish material more for contrast than likeness between the Monk of Erfurt and the Prophet of San Francisco.

We have received from Auckland a pamphlet entitled "Chamberlainism; A warning to the Democracy of New Zealand." It is a scathing review of Mr. Chamberlain's policy in South Africa as well as his campaign for the reimposition

of protective duties. The name of Mr. George Stevenson, one of the active Single Taxers at Auckland, appears on the cover and we assume that he is the publisher of this effective little tract.

Mr. Post's "Ethics of Democracy" is in great demand at the Pittsburg Carnegie Library.

The Manhattan Single Tax Club of this city continues its good work. The open air meetings on Madison Square on every Friday and Tuesday nights are conducted under the direction of Mr. Simon Levy. Open air meetings are also held on the corner of 125th Street and 7th Avenue. Here Chas. Rodd, Simon Levy, and Jerome O'Neil, who are up-town residents of the city, address the assembled crowd, and answer questions. These three with others who might be mentioned are the tireless missionaries of the great cause.

Bengough "Single Tax Primer" has been translated into Japanese, and Max Hirsch's "Democracy versus Socialism" is said to have been adopted as a text book in one or more of the Japanese universities.

The dinner given to Congressman Robert Baker by the Radical Democracy of Brooklyn, last month, was a pronounced success. Among the speakers were Governor Garvin, of Rhode Island and Hon. Robert Baker. About two hundred were present.

Why continues to keep its high standard. Mr. James Malcolm conducts the editorial department, and Mr. John Z. White's tour is told in an interesting way, covering the same ground as the quarterly letters to the REVIEW. In the June number of *Why* another of the REVIEW contributors, Mr. Robert Cumming, has an article on the "Fallacies of Socialism," which, like all of this writer's contributions, is a singularly thoughtful paper.

The Single Tax Association of Toronto has been compelled to change its quarters because of the demand of the landlord for increase of rent. It is now located at 75 Yonge street, corner of King, where the members will be glad to welcome any of the visiting brethren.

From *Progress*, of Melbourne, we learn that the annual meeting of the Single Tax League of Victoria was held on June 11th.

At the annual meeting of the Women's Henry George League of Manhattan for 1904, the following officers were elected: President, Mrs. Christine Ross Barker; Vice-President, Miss Amy E. Hicks; Secretary, Maud Malone; Financial Secretary, Miss Grace Isabel Colbron; Treasurer, Miss Annie M. Leitch.

THE CHAMBERLAIN COLLAPSE.

When the REVIEW some months ago prophesied the utter and complete failure of Mr. Chamberlain's proposals for preferential tariffs and the renewal in fact of all those protection fallacies laid away fifty years ago, and in Great Britain at least impossible of resurrection, we were taken to task by some of our British correspondents. The noise that Mr. Chamberlain and his followers were making in the hope of creating a diversion in the movement for the taxation of land values, sounded so loudly in the ears of our friends that they actually began to believe that there was something real in the agitation. That any large part of the voters of the United Kingdom, fallen as they seem politically, for the time at least, upon evil ways, should ever have seriously contemplated a return to protection was incredible, in spite of the noisy cackle of Joe Chamberlain and his followers.

The result amply justifies our prophecy; the movement with which the Birmingham charlatan has linked his fortunes has suffered a total collapse. There are no longer great meetings to be had in favor of a policy which sugar coated as "preferential trade," or accompanied by honeyed words addressed to the labor vote, some months ago gave heart of hope to those who fatuously dreamed of a return to a system in the greater interests of the landed few.

As if further to aggravate the situation in Mr. Chamberlain's eyes, the birthday of Richard Cobden was not allowed to pass without many and splendid tributes to the memory of the great trade emancipator. Cobden memorial meetings were held in London, Birmingham, Manchester, and elsewhere, and in all of these the leading men of the kingdom from both of the great parties participated. The total failure of Mr. Chamberlain's plans leaves him in a position of isolation that has every attribute but that of "splendid."

In this collapse of the protection movement in Great Britain there is a lesson for the American who thinks he is a protectionist. The British free trade victory partially won over fifty years ago—for the commercial free trade such as England has is but a step toward the full and complete free trade that Single Taxers would bring about—was won for all time. Under this larger freedom of commerce from the restraint of customs imposts England has prospered as no other country has, for her small area and the meagre natural resources she possesses make impossible any comparison, industrially, with the great leading nations. But her advance along the highway of economic progress was but a step, and if such a small advance may secure such advantages what may we not hope from a complete adoption of that full freedom of production and distribution which Single Taxers alone among economic thinkers and reformers contend for as the one

desirable and demonstrable thing industrially among all the warring Babel of foolish tongues?

THE COMING INDUSTRIAL DEPRESSION.

There seems to be no doubt that a general stagnation is enveloping all industry. The *World* in its issue of Sunday, June 19th, makes a general survey that is interesting as well as suggestive of what is coming. It shows that the cotton mills of New England are working on half time, that thousands of employees in the packing houses are idle, and that in Southern and Eastern centres many iron furnaces are no longer burning. Building operations halted by strikes are at the moment active, but on the completion of these contracts there is to be foreseen a long period of dullness ahead. The number of idle men in all trades is placed as high as 655,000.

The industrial outlook is full of dark portent. Yet it is best that the acute crisis should come at a period when protectionism is triumphant, and when the dominant party is boasting most loudly. Coming as it does it may teach the almost unteachable organized democracy a little economic sense, and may open the eyes of the workers to the transparent humbug of which they are the chief victims.

HON. ROBERT BAKER.

The things that Robert Baker has done during the term of his service in the House of Representatives would make the reputation of half a dozen men if the people were in the mood to honor their public servants at a true valuation. Speeches on the land question, the question of wages, the Boss Cox school of politics, ship subsidies, protests against petty bribery of Representatives by means of railroad passes, a demand that there be an investigation of the relations of the railroads to the Post Office and incidentally to Post Office officials, a short speech, genuinely Democratic and full of the old American spirit, answering the Kaiser's well intentioned gift of a statue of Frederick the so-called Great—this is but a very partial list of what Mr. Baker has done. It is a notable achievement, and probably never surpassed by a new member of Congress coming to that body unheralded by any prestige that might give him power and standing. These Mr. Baker has won for himself during his short stay in the House. Mistakes he may have committed through impulsiveness, but the time-servers and the monopoly tools who are among his associates have learned to entertain a wholesome dread of his ready wit and perfect fearlessness. In the time to come when the Democracy shall have really awakened, the services of Mr. Baker will be remembered, and such remembrance will, perhaps, assure him the suffrages of his fellows for a much higher office than the one he occupies today.

THE HENRY GEORGE LECTURE ASSOCIATION.

THE WORK OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

The lectures under the auspices of the Henry George Lecture Association began in New York city on the 1st of April, and continued in New York and vicinity until the middle of June.

About eighty addresses were made to a great variety of audiences. Among these were trades unions, churches, literary clubs, men's clubs, women's clubs, professional and charitable associations, as well as political and social societies. A few debates were included with the lectures, and frequently a lecture would become more or less of a debate as a result of energetic questioning, which latter feature was always invited if thought appropriate to the occasion.

Questions from the audience give the best results of all educational methods if the audience is in humor for further consideration of the matter, and often leads to discussion after the meeting. At one meeting, after adjournment, a clergyman asked "If your plan were put in operation would not the land owners increase rents?" The reply was another question: "Suppose the owner was using his own land, how would he increase rent?" A bystander interjected: "He would raise the price of his products." "In that case," replied Mr. White, "tenants would raise prices of products if landlords increased rents. Is that your notion?"

"Certainly," said the bystander.

The clergyman was then asked, "did you not attend college and take the course in political economy?"

He replied in the affirmative, and was then asked, "did you not learn that rent is a monopoly price?"

He again answered "yes." Then speaking slowly, as if to himself, said, "I remember, now; a tax on rent cannot be shifted."

"And, of course, if the tax cannot be shifted, neither the tenant nor the working owner can raise prices of products?" asked the speaker.

"That's true," said the clergyman. "I see more clearly now. I must look more closely into this. Where can I get literature?"

He was referred to E. B. Swinny, 720 Carroll St., Brooklyn, N. Y.

A further illustration was offered him, though really for the benefit of the aforesaid bystander and others who were listening, as follows: "Suppose I were to rob you of twenty dollars (all you have) and some one had power to take one-half of the proceeds of the robbery from me, could I then increase the robbery, or tax, or price or revenue?"

"Of course not," all agreed.

"Then, if the landowner has taken all he can (and he does), the tenant is under no compulsion to pay him more because a third party (the public) has forced him to yield a part, or even all, of the rent?"

The clergyman unqualifiedly agreed to the conclusion. He remembered the opinion of the economists whom he had studied in college. Had he been appealed to wholly on ground of reason or as matter of argument, there is but little doubt the question would have been more difficult to determine. But authority from so dignified a source as his alma mater was not to be resisted. And those who were listening? That was the curious thing. They accepted the authority of the clergyman. Now, who will say that a college education is not of highest value? It depends, of course, how it is used, as Thos. G. Shearman said of figures.

The first matter noticed by a Western man in New York is the relative absence of middle class caterers. All sorts of very fine things are easily found—the difficult matter is to find the price; and all sorts of very poor or cheap things are within easy reach. Very good restaurants are numerous and offer pleasant welcome—but they are not for the common herd. Very cheap restaurants are numerous, but they are not for dyspeptics nor for epicures. The medium grade caterer is not easily discovered. These facts show their effects in the mental attitude manifested by New York society. Middle class people are few. It very naturally follows that the ideas of middle class people are rarely encountered.

The laboring element (technically so-called) of New York is not so independent and self-assertive as is the western class of like social importance, and the upper class of New York is more affected than in its western counterpart. Snobbishness is more apparent in the East, but at the same time there are among the rich of the eastern metropolis a greater number of genuinely public spirited men. One can almost believe that classes are in process of formation in the West, while in the East the forming of an aristocracy has so far progressed that the mere building of it is not of great interest. The enjoyment of its luxuries becomes the important matter to the lightweights, but a few among the favored sons and daughters of wealth are strong by nature, and their strength of necessity must find expression. The public welfare invites the sympathy of some, and so we have at least one multi-millionaire opposing a tax on street car companies because this would be taxing patrons of street cars, and, like a Single Tax man, he wants to know why riding on a street car should subject any one to a special tax levy by the State?

The millionaire referred to said, very truly, "If the street car company can afford to pay a tax, they can afford to reduce the rate of fare instead"—again like a Single

Tax man. It would be difficult to find one among Chicago multi-millionaires who would object to taxing street car companies for that reason. They object to the tax sturdily enough, but on quite different grounds.

Just as a greater liberality seems to indicate a more settled social stratification among the rich, so a somewhat less definite appreciation of personal liberty indicates the same condition among the poor. Indeed, in some parts of the East Side of Manhattan, the American idea of a free man is apparently unknown. The social upper class and the social lower class seem to be accepted as the natural order—as an inevitable result of “business.” Is it surprising that socialism finds such soil fruitful? And while nearly all existing educational forces teach that this resulting condition is right, is it to be doubted that socialist promises will find ready acceptance?

Burn's declaration that,

“The rank is but the guinea's stamp
The man's the gowd for a' that,”

is a meaningless jingle to these. They discover as a very definite and concrete fact that the rank is the “whole thing.”

Occasionally a rift is found in the general gloom, like that caused by the remark of a young lady at one meeting, who after many questions, said, “Why, this Single Tax idea seems to answer every inquiry. Maybe it is the central thought that all reformers have been looking for. There is one right way—maybe it is this for which we search.”

That girl was really looking for something, but the general run are still dense and unbelieving—as stupid and cowardly as a Democratic National Convention. Most of our people very eloquently profess a sturdy faith in splendid fundamental social truths, but with an unyielding stubbornness resist any and every attempt to put that faith to the test of practical demonstration.

And yet the situation is vastly better than it was a few years ago. A much greater number will readily admit that something is wrong, and since the two great political parties are so nearly agreed that they might swap platforms without injury or even inconvenience to either, we may hope that before many more presidential years have come and gone there will be substantial agreement as to the nature of that wrong.

The fact of the matter is that the wrong of existing conditions cannot be revealed without bringing into view the doctrines of Henry George. That is the stumbling block to many—and it is our strength. The unrest grows, and perhaps will be even more apparent late this Fall. More evident dissatisfaction offers greater inducement for the exercise of right reason. We may now perceive more clearly the truth of the assertion of George, “The future is ours.”

It was intensely interesting at many of

our meetings to observe the close interest of the women. Hand-to-hand talks frequently followed adjournment, and as often as not women, evidently accustomed to hard labor, made up a good portion of the group. The matter of rent interested these, and when it was shown that land owners as such did nothing of a useful nature, they gave ready assent. In fact women, compared with men, have clearer perceptions, though possibly not stronger reasoning powers.

The presentation most generally pursued was to the effect that the distinguishing fact of modern civilization, indeed its chief glory, is the degree to which it has carried individual liberty. In matters of religion personal liberty is well nigh complete. No longer do we fear the midnight torch or secret assassin because of our religious faith or profession. No longer are we taxed to support religious forms in which we have no belief. Personal liberty is here secure, though an awful price was paid for it by our heroic ancestors.

In the political world each American citizen stands practically the equal of his fellow (not *her* fellow, as yet, but that is coming). Equal freedom is the essential political condition of our people. They fail to use their power with the intelligence hoped for, but that is a question of knowledge, which will be gained in time. Here, as in religious matters, personal liberty is ours.

In the economic world the situation is not so bright. Land and labor are the two natural factors of all production—the two prime factors—and one of these is free. No longer is man a serf or slave in his body. He is free. To be sure it is only the freedom to starve and freeze, if he cannot find another man who will employ his services, but still it is a fact that the ancient aristocratic control of his actions is gone—let us hope never to return. We may fairly and truthfully claim that the modern world, in its best expression, has, in matters of religion, politics, and as to the person, established personal liberty. Further, that only because of this achievement have other blessings of modern civilization been possible.

But each man and woman must consume food in order that life may continue. Freedom in religion, in politics, in the body, will not supply food. Furnishing the material needs is the office of labor, and labor cannot be done save upon land. The body is free, but it is a useless boon without the natural opportunity for its exercise. That opportunity is the earth. And this still rests under the ancient aristocratic dominion. The path to complete freedom, on the physical plane, is still barred by the earth owner.

We hold, then, that to go forward and free the earth, on equal terms to each, is but to finish the work already so far advanced by our ancestors. We claim that in

making this proposal we occupy a distinctively conservative position; that it must be done in order to justify the liberties already gained; that it must be done or liberties now possessed must be surrendered; that every argument by which we defend the modern world makes this step imperative.

How can we say to any man, you have religious freedom, political freedom, personal freedom, but if you wish for food you must find another man who will "permit" you to work? What are the glories of liberty to him?

To avoid the surrender of the fruits of many dearly bought victories over the old order we urge this advance. "Freedom will accept no half-way worship." We are the true conservatives. We are not destroyers, not revolutionists; but progressives.

One of the best evidences of solid progress of Single Tax notions is the fact that men and women holding these views are to be found in almost every community and among all conditions. Professional men, commercial men, manufacturers, mechanics and unskilled laborers evidence the universality of the truth George labored to make plain. The one thing needed is modest self-reliance. A farm laborer recently met thought himself a socialist, but after a few questions said, "That plan is pretty good, and easier." This man thought for himself. He did not need the authority of some university in order to perceive the simple truth that each man is dependent on land for the means of life. Being a farm "hand" he did not give undue weight to the importance of machinery in production. He was asked: "Suppose each was given equal access to land, how would it affect the money question?" He replied: "Well, money would not be so important as it is now." What a pity it is that farm "hand" was not sent to St. Louis in place of some great statesman.

The recent rise in rent in New York, perhaps more severely felt on the East Side, where in truth the rise is least, has made the subject, "Rent and Wages," a popular one. A simple explanation of the nature of production, to the effect that the people as a whole are cultivating the ground—are, broadly speaking, farmers—followed by a statement of the obvious truth that the product of such cultivation is divided between those who do the work and those who own the ground is generally clearly apprehended. If, now, we label one of these divisions "Wages" and the other "Rent," it is self-evident that the larger one division is, the smaller the other must be; just as, if an apple be cut in two, the smaller one portion is, the larger must be the other. Therefore, the higher wages are, the lower rent must be, and *vice versa*.

While this reasoning will usually be accepted, it will not carry conviction without illustration; so we cite a farmer working as

a tenant. It is very clear that the less of the crop he gives to the owner of the farm as rent the more he will keep for himself as wages. Most audiences will agree to this, but will not perceive that what is true of the farming occupation is also true of all other employments. It must then be emphatically urged that all products come from the ground as surely as do vegetables and grain. Further, that they are brought from the ground just as are vegetables and grain, that is, by human toil. An invitation to cite one single exception in all of the millions of articles exposed for sale in all the markets of the world, will be answered by silence. And finally, we point out that the modern woolen mill is doing the same work our grandmothers did—that is, reducing a fleece to yarn, to thread, to cloth. It is merely a wiser, because more economical, method of applying labor.

What is true of the woolen industry is true of every occupation that is productive in its nature. Always labor applied to land, with the results that by this wiser method much more wealth is produced by the same amount of labor, and with this increasing product an ever increasing share goes to the owners of land as rent, while relatively a less share goes to laborers as wages. Illustrations of this character generally force conviction, and open the way to a consideration of remedies. The Single Tax as a remedy meets all objections that arise among clear headed men who really seek the truth. It will never be accepted by a stupid people. That is one reason it formerly excited more opposition than now. The society saviors did not know how very innocent the good public is—to fully reveal this verdancy there were required Dowie and the St. Louis gathering.

The people in New York and vicinity, in common with those of the rest of the country, have been led by the public prints to believe that Henry George taught a doctrine of confiscation and revolution dangerous to peace and good order. This idea is slowly giving way to a truer conception of the noble sentiment and wise statesmanship his teachings evidence. No better service can be rendered the cause of human freedom than to tell, and tell again, the truth that Henry George came not to destroy, but to fulfil the law; not to inaugurate, but to stop confiscation; not to incite, but to avoid revolution; not to prevent, but to restore peace; not to overthrow, but to establish order.

To secure these ends, he urged a simple, honest recognition of fundamental relations, so obvious that children perceive them, and the application of a remedy so simple yet so effective as to excite wonder that it was not noted centuries since. A plan so completely meeting the require-

ments of the situation that the most capable and best trained minds of the last generation have been unable to impair its power. It is "the simple yet sovereign remedy."

In this spirit and with these and like arguments have the people of our metropolis been met, and at almost every point has an invitation been extended to return again. The seed that Henry George scattered will grow, is growing; and now, at a time when thoughts on all political questions are apparently more chaotic than at any other period in the history of our country, let us take heart of hope, and note that growing distrust of other plans is to Henry George's followers the opening opportunity.

News—Domestic.

CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES.—(Special Correspondence.—Ralph Hoyt.) The most encouraging thing for true Democrats and Single Taxers to know concerning the situation in Los Angeles at this time is the fact that we now have a daily paper here that claims to be Democratic—and is such. At least it is much more of a Democratic paper than any we have had within the past three or more years.

The oldest newspaper in the city is the *Los Angeles Herald*. For many years it was a Democratic promulgationist, and did good work towards enlightening the public on Jeffersonian principles. But a few years ago it was bought out by a man of so-called Republican principles, and until a few days ago the city was burdened with three dailies of that kind, but had not one to advance the doctrines of Jefferson, Lincoln, and other wise statesmen.

The *Herald* has now fallen into the hands of men who are doubtless Democrats of the genuine stamp. Personally I can speak for one of them, for I have known him for years as not only a radical Democrat, but a sound and active Single Taxer. Frank Finlayson is also a good lawyer and a strong speaker, always posted on public questions, though a busy man in his chosen profession. He does not control the *Herald*, but he has a powerful influence with the corporation of which he is the head. The new editor, Mr. Yost, comes from St. Louis, Mo., and is said to be one of the ablest Democratic editors west of the Mississippi. So the new owners have started off finely, and every Democrat hereabouts can have a home paper that points in the right direction. It is hoped that the *Herald* company now installed in the enterprise will "stand pat" for the principles which are dear to the hearts of all honest men who desire to see our country brought back to its former standing of a real republic instead of remaining a representative of imperialism and monopoly.

Single Taxers in this region are not as active as they should be, though many little incidents show that they are not asleep, nor apathetic to a degree that will deter them from making the most of any favorable opportunity to push our principle to the front. The Single Taxer knows what true Democracy is, and he wants no other kind. It is the embodiment of Jeffersonian principles—the principles on which rest the foundations of this government. Every Single Taxer understands this, and he is therefore allied with Democrats of the correct brand, though the two kinds of voters may not perfectly harmonize on every detail of the national platform which will emanate from the big convention.

There is no reason to presume that California will come out anything but monopolistic, when the votes are counted next November; but if the St. Louis platform is what it should be—if good, sound Jeffersonian Democracy goes with the declaration of principles—it will be reasonable to expect a much larger aggregate vote for the national ticket than has been polled here for many years. With such inducements every capable Single Taxer in the state, and every clear-headed Democrat who may not as yet quite "see the cat," will be an active factor in the great struggle.

GEORGIA, ATLANTA.—(Special Correspondence.—Wm. Riley Boyd.) Atlanta has no organized Single Tax Club but this will in due time be remedied, as there are a considerable number of true believers, and their influence is felt whenever the burden of taxation presses too heavily. It is a rule and practice in Atlanta to fine those who work instead of those who are idle; recently a tax of one hundred dollars was imposed upon "employment bureaus;" that is, persons aiding men and women to find employment were so taxed; the fine or license had been fifty dollars, but it was proposed to increase it so as to drive out competitors; but a clever young woman who was so engaged felt the unfairness of the proposed increase and asked permission to appear before the council and make a brief speech. Leave was granted and this young woman, who was a natural free trader without being aware of it, showed to the city Solons the wrong of the proposed increase, and the amount was fixed at seventy-five dollars. Every man present knew that it was an unwise exaction, having no claim to fair dealing, and it was excused only by the need for money.

ILLINOIS, CHICAGO.—(Special Correspondence.—G. J. Foyer.)—Continuing my article which appeared in the Spring number of the *REVIEW* outlining the work before the club and the Illinois Non-Partisan League for Home Rule in taxation: A circular letter carefully prepared was mailed to the cashiers of four hundred lead-

ing banks in the State of Illinois with an enclosed two cent stamped return envelope for reply, asking that they send us the name of any person who, in their estimation, was competent to represent their community as vice-president of the League and chairman of the local board. The replies from the bankers was a surprise. Many of them desired to become vice-presidents themselves, while many recommended prominent men of various callings as being proper persons for the League to honor with such appointments. A letter is now being prepared, and will be sent to the persons recommended by the bank asking that they accept the appointment. There is no doubt in our mind that these appointments will be accepted, as the letter mailed to us by the banker of his own town recommending him will be enclosed with our own letter to each appointee. When we receive the return replies a certificate of appointment will be mailed with instructions as to the duties required of him as vice-president of the League and chairman of the local board. Our object is to have the various vice-presidents appoint not more than fifteen members to his local board, and these members in return shall have the power to elect members from their community as members of Illinois Non-Partisan League for Home Rule in taxation. Thus it can be seen that a large organization covering the State of Illinois is under way. The league will furnish printing favoring local option in taxation which must be paid for by each locality and distributed by them. Each branch of the League will be asked to call upon its representative in the State Legislature asking him to vote for a bill such as will give each community the privilege of raising its own revenue in its own way. It is not our intention to stop at this point when local option is secured, but to educate the local boards in "just taxation." Our course may be altered as we progress, but not our object. It is surprising how favorably the question of Home Rule is received. Why everybody seems to be in favor of it. I would be pleased to mail the literature and the various steps taken by the League to any Single Tax club which desires to carry out the same line of work in its own state. In addition to the above the Chicago Single Tax Club co-operating with the Referendum League has induced the Referendum League to submit Home Rule in Taxation to the voters of Illinois on their "Little Ballot," and as this question is to be placed upon the official ballot by petition the Chicago Single Tax Club has pledged itself to obtain 40,000 signatures to the petition as its share. We are at present making an effort to obtain signatures and our representatives is handing petitions out all over the state. In my next news letter to the REVIEW I will endeavor to give information as to such steps that are being taken with their results. If this plan of action

gives satisfactory results every state in the Union having a Single Tax club should adopt it.

KANSAS, MOUND CITY.—(Special Correspondence.—W. H. T. Wakefield.)—Taxation is just now a live subject in the Sunflower State. The legislature before the last one appointed a commission of three incompetent politicians, with clerks, stenographers, etc., and an appropriation of about \$10,000, to revise the present chaotic system. The commission succeeded admirably in spending the appropriation, and \$3,000 more for printing and mailing their report, but the succeeding session paid no attention to the report. The only real changes they recommended were the creation of many new and high salaried offices, to be filled by appointment by the governor, and greater strictness in reaching personal property of farmers and business men.

Kansas has about ten thousand miles of railways, capitalized at an average of \$69,000 per mile and assessed by the State officers at an average of \$4,500 per mile.

Since the Republicans and railroads "redeemed" Kansas from "fusion" rule in 1900 State taxation has a little more than doubled, while the total assessed values of the State show a slight decrease; that of railways, packing houses, stockyards, street railways, telegraphs, telephones, coal mines, etc., being much reduced, and other property correspondingly raised. The result was a roar from Republican farmers and small home owners and business men that frightened the politicians into a new pledge of tax reform at the next session of the legislature, and the press is busy discussing the form the reform shall take. Most of this discussion is vague and aimless, only serving to show the editors' ignorance or insincerity. The assessment of this Spring showed a lowering of corporation and personal property values and greater increase of values for farms and small real estate owners. Aside from that belonging to farmers and country merchants, personal property seems to have disappeared, though bank deposits have largely increased for all purposes but that of taxation, the assessments being less than five per cent. of the bank statements.

More than two-fifths of the real estate values of the State are owned by foreigners and other non-residents. This is specially true of our coal, lead, zinc, salt, and other mines, city lots, packing houses and stock yards, etc., scarcely any of which are owned by residents of Kansas, and Single Taxers can do valuable work by writing to the Kansas papers and showing how an increased land tax would relieve the farmers and home owners at the expense of these wealthy non-residents.

Not much direct Single Tax work is being done here, except some circulation of literature, personal conversations and a little

letter writing to the papers. The *Kansas*, of Pittsburg, Kansas, is the only paper actively engaged in the cause.

Recently a professor of political economy in a State University that is controlled by a Republican board of regents lectured here, and in conversation with a business man noticed that he wore on his watch chain a pin that showed him to be a graduate of his institution.

"What has been your special line of study?" the professor inquired.

"Political Economy," was the reply.

"Oh! glad to hear it; that is what I teach. Presume you studied under Prof. —?"

"No, I learned it by reading Henry George's works, Thomas G. Shearman's, Louis F. Post's, and a few older writers. Have you ever studied political economy, Professor?"

"Certainly; I teach it in the university, but the Single Tax would never do—it would place all taxes on the farmers and poor men generally. What is needed is an income tax to catch oil in pipe lines, railroads, coal mines, trusts, etc."

"And a protective tariff to catch merchants and hawkers," said the business man, with a twinkle in his eyes.

"Yes, certainly, that is necessary," replied the Professor, with an air of superior wisdom.

MISSOURI, ST. LOUIS.—(Special Correspondence.—L. P. Custer.) The conference of the Women's Henry George League will probably have been held before this number of the *Quarterly* is placed in the hands of its readers, hence I will have but little to say about it. At this writing, June 26th, the prospects for the conference is not as flattering as one might wish, but we cannot always tell how successful such an affair will be until it is called into session and the crowd "sized up." I am of the opinion there will be more men in attendance than women. July is too hot for such an affair, and I do not look for a large attendance. However, where the spirit of Henry George is active there will be no lack of interest, whether the attendance is large or not. I will have more to say about the conference in the next issue of the *Quarterly*. There is considerable demand for a men's conference in the Fall. I understand Governor Garvin will be here in October, on Rhode Island day at the World's Fair. If there is anything like a general desire to attend the fair among our friends, and if those who feel like coming will write to me, I will bring the matter up and carry it forward. I invite correspondence on the subject. The expenses will be slight so far as local matters are concerned, and we will take care of that in St. Louis.

There is nothing of startling moment to write about at this time. While there are very few who will move physically to push

the work, there is abundance of that which persuadeth the faithful to go down in their pockets for the "needful" when those, who do exert themselves both physically and morally in the good work, call for it.

In conclusion, I desire to remind our friends who are coming hither unannounced, that the St. Louis Single Tax League meets every Wednesday, at the Musician's Union Headquarters, (The Aschenbroedel Club) at the northeast corner of 18th and Olive streets, and everybody is welcome. Ordinarily, if there is nothing of more than usual importance on the programme, there are but a few present, but if any one is contemplating a visit and will inform us in advance, we will endeavor to have a number of our friends out, of whom there are many in this city.

PENNSYLVANIA, PHILADELPHIA.—(Special Correspondence.—William Ryan.)—When the superficial thinker asks what progress the Single Tax is making (and the question is being constantly asked of us) he usually expects you to tell him that in such and such place they have adopted it, or that certain people are agitating for its adoption in this or that locality, or he wants you to tell him in figures the number of converts you are making each year. Failing to answer these questions to his satisfaction, he assumes that the Single Tax is not progressing.

To the readers of the *REVIEW*, it is not necessary to state that Single Taxers do not note the progress of the movement by any of these tests. They know that at the present it is purely in its educational stage, and it is in this direction that they look for its progress.

Perhaps the most notable step in Philadelphia has been the publication and general distribution of the tax assessment. Heretofore you would have to go to the tax office and wade through a mass of books to find how your neighbor was assessed, and the consequence was that few would take the trouble to do this. The effect was to make the tax assessment practically secret. This year it is published ward by ward, with each piece of property following the other in the order of location.

One of the newspapers issues a supplement with a complete list of the assessments in the wards in which they were distributed. The general effect is to interest everyone in the matter of taxation whether he is a property owner or not. It is no longer possible for the assessor to discriminate as was formerly done and the tendency is towards equal taxation. While we have not the separate assessment of land values from the value of improvements, as they have in New York, it is conceded by every one that this is a step in the right direction. This, coupled with a 100 per cent. instead of a slip shod method averaging 80 per cent. valuation, has enabled the city to reduce

the taxation this year from \$1.85 on \$100 to \$1.50 on \$100. The burden has fallen heavier in the centre of the city where land values are high and has caused a reduction on small homes which had previously been assessed at their full value.

Last October a long needed organization was formed, known as the Central Single Tax Club, with rooms at 1317 Filbert St. It is composed of about seventy-five of the active Single Taxers. It is the permanent headquarters of the movement in Philadelphia. The rooms are always open, and it is here that the propaganda work is planned.

The Henry George Club closed its series of successful meetings April 3rd. During the Winter besides having the prominent speakers of this city, we had Mrs. Belle De Revira, Messrs. John S. Crosby, Bolton Hall and James McGreggor, of New York, Miss Anita Trueman and Rev. Alexander Irvine, of New Haven, Conn.

Mr. Irvine's illustrated lecture on "Social Wreckage" was by far the most popular, and Single Taxers could not do more effective work than to send Mr. Irvine into every church in the United States with this lecture. The Henry George Club was organized five years ago for the purpose of holding propaganda meetings on Sunday during the Winter months.

Following the usual custom, the open air meetings began on May 11th on the City Hall Plaza. The meetings are held here on Wednesday and Sunday evenings with Friday evening left open for meetings in various parts of the city. The meetings are held this year under the auspices of the Central Single Tax Club whose headquarters are only 100 yards from the City Hall meetings.

The Woman's Henry George Club, of Phila., celebrated their anniversary with a banquet on May 16th. There were about eighty present, Dr. Charlotte M. Dickson presiding. The following spoke: Mr. Henry George, Jr., Mrs. John S. Crosby, Rev. J. Amies, Rev. Madison C. Peters, Prof. Lee F. Lybarger, Prof. Neff, Mr. R. F. Potwell, Mrs. J. H. Amies and Mr. Francis I. Dupont.

On August 12th a dinner will be given to John Z. White in the Colonnade Hotel, all of the reformers of the city are to be invited.

Mr. White will return and spend the month of October in and about Philadelphia, lecturing before church organizations and clubs.

RHODE ISLAND, PROVIDENCE.—(Special Correspondence.—Geo. D. Liddell.)—Rhode Island is a peculiar State. It is peculiar in many respects. It is peculiar in that it has a larger proportion of what is called the working class than any other State in the Union. It is peculiar in that a smaller percentage of those qualified to vote exer-

cise the right of franchise than in any other State north of Mason and Dixon's line. And it is most peculiarly peculiar in its government.

The government of Rhode Island was conducted until 1842 under a charter granted July 8th, 1663, by King Charles II. to "the purchasers and free inhabitants of our island called Rhode Island and the rest of the colony of Providence Plantations, in Narragansett Bay, in New England, in America."

Under this charter only landholders and their eldest sons were permitted to have a voice in the government of the colony, while it remained a colony, or of the State after it became separated from the mother country. In 1842 after an agitation for an extension of the suffrage, which had been maintained for many years, culminating in the "Dorr" rebellion so-called, the present constitution was adopted. This constitution created two classes of voters. In the one class were included all male citizens of the United States, possessed of real estate to the value of one hundred and thirty-four dollars and all male *native* citizens of the United States assessed for property to the value of one hundred and thirty-four dollars. In the other class were included all male native citizens who were registered and paid a poll tax of one dollar. All naturalized citizens, unless seized of real estate to the requisite value were excluded from the suffrage. The first class were entitled to vote on all questions arising in all legal town or ward meetings; the second class were debarred from voting for the election of the City Council of the city of Providence—which by the way was the only city in the State at the time of the adoption of the constitution, and this provision covers the other four cities at present—or upon any proposition to impose a tax or for the expenditure of money in any town or city. In 1886 the constitution was amended, giving the right to vote on all questions, on the same terms as native born citizens, to soldiers and sailors of foreign birth who had served in the Civil War, and in 1888 an amendment was adopted extending the same privilege to all naturalized citizens. These two amendments were the fruit of years of effort by the present Governor and a little band of faithful helpers, who though defeated in many battles, struggled on and finally won the campaign by accomplishing their purpose, which was to put the naturalized citizen on an equal footing with the native born.

It will be seen from the foregoing that much progress has been made from the earlier political conditions; it will also be seen that much remains to be done. We still have the two classes of voters, known as property voters and registry voters. The property voter as has been said, may vote on all questions. The registry voter may vote for presidential electors, for congressmen,

for the governor and other general officers of his State, for members of the General Assembly, for the Mayor and other general officers of his city government or for members of the council in towns, but he may not vote for members of the council or board of aldermen in cities, nor upon any measure imposing a tax, nor for the appropriation of money anywhere.

The composition of the legislature is peculiar. The legislature, or the General Assembly as it is designated in the constitution, is bi-cameral. It consists of a Senate and a House of Representatives. The Senate is composed of thirty-nine members, the same being the lieutenant-governor and one senator from each town or city. The House of Representatives consists of seventy-two members, not more than one-sixth of whom may come from any one town or city. Under this arrangement Providence has one senator and twelve representatives in the General Assembly. The population of Rhode Island is 428,556. The population of Providence is 175,597. The population of the town of West Greenwich is 606. Under the provisions of our constitution the 606 people of the town of West Greenwich have equal power in making law with the 175,597 people of Providence; or to put it in another way: One vote of a citizen of West Greenwich is equivalent to the votes of 290 citizens of Providence. There are in the State 20 small towns with a total population of less than 40,000. These 20 towns elect a majority of the Senate, and as the consent of both houses is requisite to the enactment of law, the difficulty of securing popular legislation is easily seen. The small towns are loth to give up the advantage which they enjoy under the present arrangement. It means dollars in their pockets so long as it continues, and human nature is much the same in Rhode Island as elsewhere; when you hit the pocket nerve you are sure to get a squeal.

The Governor of the State is a mere figurehead; he has neither the power of veto nor the power of appointment. Nominally he may appoint certain officers, by and with the consent of the Senate, but by simply withholding its consent for three days to the Governor's appointments, the Senate itself becomes vested with the appointing power, and may make its own choice.

In an advisory opinion the supreme court of the State has declared, that by adopting the present constitution the people have lost the power to call a constitutional convention except by amendment of the present instrument. The constitution provides for amendment as follows: "The general assembly may propose amendments to this constitution by the votes of a majority of all the members elected to each house. Such amendment when proposed must be referred to the next general assembly when, if it shall receive the vote of a majority of all the members elected to each house of

that body it shall be referred to the people. If, when submitted to the people, it shall receive three-fifths of the votes of those present and voting thereon, it shall become a part of the constitution." This would seem to be a conservative method of amending the constitution, even if political power were distributed equitably, but when we consider the very inequitable distribution of power, the prescribed method is seen to be equivalent to an injunction prohibiting the proposal of any amendment until it shall have received the approval of the dominant political machine.

Measures in amendment of the constitution have been introduced year after year, conferring upon the Governor the power of veto; removing the restrictions upon the registry voters and giving to any 5,000 electors the right to propose amendments to the constitution and have same submitted to the whole electorate for a decision without the intervention of the legislature. This is popularly known as the constitutional initiative. As regularly as these measures have been introduced in the legislature, they have been referred to a committee and have never again during the life of that general assembly been permitted to see the light of day. It has been the custom for the dominant party in the State to hold post-election sessions of the legislature. The law limits the sitting to 60 days. The General Assembly convenes in January, sits 45 days or perhaps 50 days and adjourns until after the election in the following November. It is at these adjourned sessions that some of the most notorious deals have been put through. Last year when the hold of the machine on the legislature was not very firm, the post election session was omitted; but this year their hold being firmer, the legislature was adjourned, after sitting 52 or 53 days, until after the November election.

"The best laid plans of mice and men gang aft a-glee" however, and Governor Garvin has sidetracked the machine very nicely by issuing a proclamation calling an Extraordinary Session of the General Assembly and setting forth that whereas the present General Assembly has deliberately refused to consider some of the most important questions, the Assembly shall convene on the 13th of September to consider the three measures, the constitutional initiative, equal suffrage which confers upon registry voters the right to vote in the election of city councils, and the veto power which will enable the Governor to check hasty and vicious legislation. It is pointed out in the call of the Governor that the post elective session is detrimental to public interests in that it permits a General Assembly, which has ceased to be responsible for its acts, to enact laws directly contrary to the wishes of the people.

It isn't likely that this extraordinary session will result in any affirmative legislation

on the matters embraced in the call, but it will serve to shorten the length of the post-election session if it doesn't prevent it altogether. So much at least it will accomplish. And if there is no post-election session, the boss cannot sell legislation to be enacted at that session. Two years ago, it is said, the Street Railway concern contributed \$30,000 to the campaign chest of the machine for the repeal of the ten hour law for motormen and conductors. Anyway, this law was repealed at the post-election session in November, 1902.

Political conditions here lend themselves easily to bribery and corruption. It has even been hinted that bribery and corruption actually exist. However this may be, it is certain that the opportunity exists, and men of all shades of political belief are upholding Governor Garvin in his efforts to destroy the opportunity. There is hardly a doubt that a majority of the electors would vote to change present conditions if they had the power, but it will require an overwhelming majority of the popular vote to make the change. The fight will be long and bitter, but eventually the change will come.

The registration law in Rhode Island is peculiar. In order to qualify as a voter the citizen whose name doesn't appear upon the rolls of the tax assessor for property to the amount of 184 dollars must register before the 1st of July. The election for state officers and members of the General Assembly occurs on the first Tuesday after the first Monday in November, so that the registry voter must prepare to exercise the franchise four months before the election. This law operates to shut out many because there usually being no political excitement at this season the citizen simply forgets to register until it is too late. The machine always fares the worst when the registration is largest. Two years ago the street railroad strike was on here during June and the registration climbed to figures before unheard of. In the Fall Gov. Garvin was elected by a plurality of more than 7,500. Last year the registration fell off and Gov. Garvin's plurality fell to about 1,400. This year the registration is being pushed vigorously. Cart tail meetings for the purpose of urging citizens to register are being held two or three evenings in the week.

The figures in this city to date are ahead of the phenomenal figures of the year 1902, and let us hope that they portend, as did those of that year, dire disaster to the "machine."

These days the Single Tax is always in evidence in Rhode Island. This is due mainly to the fact that we have as Governor a man who is not only a Single Taxer, but who works at it. Gov. Garvin is a Single Taxer from the ground up. He is a Single Taxer 365 days in the year, and in leap year 366. Gov. Garvin had been working at the Single Tax trade for 20

years before he was elected Governor, and since then he has been working at it harder than ever. He is a democratic Democrat; a Democrat who believes in Democracy; the Democratic maxim, "Equal rights to all and special privileges to none," is his creed. And he knows, as every one knows, that the only way in which equal rights to all can be secured is to free natural opportunities by the application of the Single Tax. Gov. Garvin is a Single Taxer because he is a Democrat, and he is a Democrat because he is a Single Taxer. The Democratic convention to be held at St. Louis on July 6th, prox., is all at sea as to the candidate whom it shall select to oppose that "incarnation of rambunctiousness, who loves a scrap better than three meals a day," and who has been chosen to lead the mercenaries of protection in the coming battle. That convention may easily go farther than Lucius Fayette Clark Garvin and fare a good deal worse. At any rate they may search where they will and they will find no purer patriot, no more upright citizen, no more democratic Democrat than the Single Tax Governor of Rhode Island. He is honest, he is capable, and he is faithful to Democratic principles. And there are others here who are fighting the battle of freedom. There is that old timer who has been in the harness as long, almost, as Governor Garvin and who, the boys say, talks Single Tax in his sleep, Dr. J. A. McLaughlin. The genial doctor with the aid of his able lieutenants, those veteran Single Tax campaigners, Granville Standish and David S. Frazer has for his motto, "Keep everlastingly at it," and he is living up to his motto literally. Seasons may come and seasons may go, but the Single Tax campaign of Dr. McLaughlin's outfit, like Tennyson's brook, goes on forever. It would be invidious to select names for special mention from among the hundreds of Single Taxers here, but there are a few of the old guard who were personal friends of Mr. George, of whom it may not be amiss to speak. And let us not forget the dead. Dr. William Barker, the first president of the first Single Tax Club in Rhode Island passed away about five years ago. Charles B. Prior, a pioneer in the movement here was gathered to his fathers about three years since, and John Francis Smith, another friend of Henry George, has just joined the "silent majority." All of these were ardent, active, loyal Single Taxers, and it will be a long day before the Single Taxers of Rhode Island will fail to honor their memory or cease to mourn their loss.

Of the living, in addition to those already mentioned, who knew and honored Henry George and accepted his philosophy because they couldn't help it are Robert Grieve, private secretary to the Governor; Hon. Joseph McDonald, of Pawtucket; Chas. J. Reagan, of Providence; Edward Barker, of Pawtucket; John Westlake, of Provi-

dence; Thomas Maguire, of Providence; Patrick H. Flanagan, of Providence; Philip A. Capelle, of Providence; George Shaw of Ashton, and others whose names do not recur at the moment, but those named are still active in the work laid out by the master, and which is to result in the emancipation of labor, the abolition of poverty and the reign of universal peace.

WEST VIRGINIA.—(Special Correspondence.—W. I. Boreman.)—There is lots doing in this State in the tax line. The Republicans are fighting a sham battle over the proposed tax on coal production. Coal lands go practically untaxed if undeveloped and far from railroad transportation. The State Tax Commission has reported favorably on a proposition to put a tax on coal, gas and oil. This has put the producing corporations on their mettle, and has set two rival factions of Republicans by the ears. In the meanwhile the Gorman Democrats who are very strong among the old slave-holding element are hoping to slip into power. The masses of the Democratic party are sincerely in sympathy with Democratic principles, but seem dumb, as usual, when the time comes to speak out. A few radicals are talking taxation on coal lands and the result of it all may be some measure of real tax reform. "The trusts" seem to be the subject of discussion, but no one is hurting himself trying to understand what that phrase means.

THE WOMEN'S WORK IN BROOKLYN.

The Brooklyn Woman's Single Tax Club has just closed its fourteenth and most successful season.

A larger number of new members were added to its roll this year than were ever added in any one year before.

The average attendance at the public meetings, especially of visitors, has been much greater than in any previous year. This is most encouraging and speaks well for the growing popularity of the Single Tax among women.

The club has seven public meetings in a season.

Heretofore the task of getting speakers has usually fallen upon a very few members.

This year the club was divided into seven committees and each committee was expected to furnish the speaker and feel responsible for one meeting. This gave every member some interest in at least one meeting.

The result was that each committee tried to get an interesting speaker and a good audience for that speaker.

In Oct. Mrs. Margaret Hughan reviewed Jacob Reisse's book "How the Other Half Live."

Being a good Single Tax woman Mrs. Hughan showed the cure for the terrible

conditions Mr. Reisse so ably describes, while he could only suggest relief. At the Nov. meeting Mr. John S. Crosby spoke on "The Single Tax" in such an interesting and lucid manner that even a child might understand.

In Dec. Miss Anna Patterson advocated the union label as one of the best methods of helping humanity.

At the Jan. meeting Mrs. Mary E. Craigie gave a very interesting paper on "The History of Taxation."

Mr. L. E. Wilmarth, in Feb., presented the objections that are most commonly made to the Single Tax and answered them in a clear and logical manner.

The March meeting was given to Miss A. V. Roome, the probationary officer of Brooklyn, who told of her experiences among the criminal classes, especially women and children. It was easy to show that most of her subjects were the product of unnatural conditions.

In April the club had the good fortune to listen to one of Mr. John J. White's able addresses on "The Single Tax."

The May meeting was devoted to business and the election of officers.

Mrs. Minnie Rogers Ryan was elected Pres.; Mrs. Margaret Hughan, Vice-Pres.; Venie B. Havens, Rec. Sec'y; Eva J. Turner, Cor. Sec'y and Jennie A. Rogers, Treas. Mrs. Corkill, Mrs. DeFriesse, Mrs. Amin and Miss Malone compose the Board of Directors.

This club is not satisfied with inviting its friends to come and hear the truths of the Single Tax, but it carries the gospel to the multitude whenever an opportunity offers.

Through the efforts of its members several engagements were made for Mr. White to speak before other clubs.

The members of the Brooklyn Woman's Single Tax Club are often seen at other meetings and never miss a chance to say a word for their cause.

The club is a member of the N. Y. State Federation of Woman's Clubs, the N. Y. City Federation and the Long Island Council of Woman's Clubs.

This brings it in touch with some of the most intelligent and progressive women in the community and at least gives them to understand that the Single Tax must be something more than a mere political or fiscal measure when women are banded together to work for its adoption.

JENNIE A. ROGERS.

The McGlynn Monument Association observed Decoration Day, May 30th, with appropriate addresses at Calvary Cemetery, by Judge Samuel Seabury and Sylvester Malone, and a Commemorative Meeting in the evening at Mott Memorial Hall, 64 Madison avenue, this city, at which Charles Frederic Adams and Richard F. George were speakers.

FAIRHOPE.

The normal and proper condition of a Single Tax town—with everybody busy—prevails at Fairhope. The "Labor Problem" here is rapidly becoming reversed. Instead of men hunting jobs, it is difficult to get men to do work desired. While we would by no means claim all the credit for this for our application of the Single Tax principle over the small territory we are able to control, there is no doubt that it is having a very great influence in that direction. The ease with which men can secure access to land and become their own employers, vastly increases their independence and the application of rental values to public works, thus increasing opportunities, is another important and related factor.

An extraordinarily dry May and June were rather discouraging to our farmers, but recent rains have revived their courage as well as their crops.

We are having a fine fruit season. Peaches, grapes and figs are in the height of their season, also the luscious water-melons—of which those of this section are famous for excellence. Several schooners have loaded melons on our shore front in the last few weeks for Mobile and New Orleans, besides many shipments made on the steamer.

May was the best season in the history of the steamer *Fairhope*, the gross receipts reaching nearly \$1,000. The receipts of the wharf, a "public service" owned and administered by the Association, were \$186.68.

We had a very pleasant visit last week from Mr. J. B. Howarth, of "What's the Use," East Aurora, N. Y. In spite of all he had heard about Fairhope, he was totally unprepared to see such a fine little city as we have. He declared that in his twenty-two years experience as a commercial traveler he had not seen in any state of the Union a town of its size, presenting the manifest evidence of public and private enterprise and prosperity that were apparent at Fairhope. This is something remarked on by all visitors, though not all see as clearly as Mr. Howarth did, that the elimination of land speculation with its attendants of tumbledown shacks, and weed-grown vacant lots, and the relieving of improvements from taxation, are the prime causes.

R. F. Powell, of the Philadelphia Vacant Lots Cultivation Association, is endeavoring to organize a "Fairhope Improvement Association," to build cottages for rent and sale on Fairhope land. He is meeting with much encouragement, and hopes to be down in November, possibly earlier, to take active direction of the work.

Our town is now full of summer people, mostly Mobile residents. It is certain that fifteen or twenty more cottages could be rented within a week, to Mobilians, if they were available. This is one of the great ad-

vantages of our location, that it is suited for both a summer and a winter resort—and not alone a summer resort for Southern people, but for Northern people as well. There are a number of such here now, who declare it is much more comfortable than in Iowa or Illinois.

The *Courier* office is now engaged in getting out a handsome illustrated booklet on Fairhope, something which has been very much needed. It will be out soon, and will be sold at ten cents a copy.

Professor Bellangee is out on a second tour in the interest of the plan to enlarge the land area of our Association, which is the one thing for which we ask and feel that we have a right to ask aid of Single Taxers. We bespeak for Prof. Bellangee the hearty cooperation of Single Taxers, everywhere he goes. His story of the results of the application of Single Tax principles at Fairhope is as effective a Single Tax speech and as interesting, as can be made.

E. B. GASTON.

News—Foreign.

TORONTO.

With the passing of Winter goes our busy season. But though the busy season may be gone we are not idle. We believe in the maxim of the poet, "In times of peace prepare for war," and just now we are "preparing" for one of the heaviest summer campaigns yet organized. Our battle cry is still the same—the exemption of all dwellings from taxation to the extent of \$700 of their assessed value.

The City Council is about to pass a by-law establishing direct legislation in this city, and we are preparing a petition by which we will compel them to ask the legislature to grant the city power to apply this exemption.

Our method of circulating the petition is to place copies of it in the hands of all our members, and to secure admission for our speakers to all clubs, trades unions and meetings possible.

Our lecture on the French Revolution by Prof. Lybarger, while a disappointment in some respects, has nevertheless proved a success. The professor addressed as many as 1,200 people when here, most of them being an entirely new audience for our speakers. We were fortunate enough to secure an opportunity for him to address the Canadian Club, one of the largest organizations in the city, which holds a dinner once a week between one and two, when an address is delivered by some prominent man. Three hundred men, mostly of the plutocratic element, listened to Prof. Lybarger.

The Young Democrats Club, an organization headed by the young men of the movement, has just closed its second season.

This year has been one of great growth and the club now numbers a goodly number of earnest young men, more or less Single Taxers, and all workers. These are to be the leaders of the movement in the next few years, and a bright future can be predicted.

Every association should have such an auxiliary debating club for its young men, where they can bring their friends, and thus introduce them gradually to the work of the movement, using it as a preparatory school.

WALTER H. ROEBUCK, Secretary.

MONTREAL.

The movement of the Montreal Railway Co. for an extension of their franchise was effectively blocked for the present by the defeat in the council of the proposal by a vote of 26 to 6. This does not show the true gravity of the crisis as it is well known that a number of the aldermen shifted over when it was felt that the motion was doomed. In the eighteen years the franchise has yet to run many more such attempts are sure to be made, necessitating constant watchfulness on the part of those interested in the public welfare.

A suggestion from an official source to support the public schools by a taxation of land values seems to have been defeated by the usual policy of inaction. It cannot be more than temporary, however, as the terribly over-crowded state of the schools is certain to keep public attention directed towards the increasing need for educational funds.

Perhaps the most promising event of the year was the election by an overwhelming majority of a pronounced anti-franchise mayor, and the defeat of several aldermen known to be favorable to the Railway Co. The French Canadian section of the city is bitterly hostile to the Railway Co., and is showing an increasing interest in civic problems. The mayor elect has stood for years in the council for honest administration and his election by an absolute majority in a three-cornered contest is good evidence of this interest. As a consequence the railway franchise extension is again set back, and public ownership of the gas plant, which had been slowly growing into public attention, came suddenly to the fore. The present gas franchise has yet about two years to run, but the agreement contains a year notification clause, if expropriation is contemplated. Otherwise the agreement extends itself automatically for five years. The subject came up immediately in the council and public ownership was resolved on. A deputation of aldermen headed by the mayor went to the Quebec Government to obtain the necessary legal power. Through what looks almost like intentional bad management on the part of the city representatives, the clause allowing public ownership was struck from the city's bill.

The usual hostility of the country members to the city's wishes as well as the invisible efforts of the gas company also contributed to this defeat. At present it looks as if the five years extension is almost assured. The hopeful sign is the strong public sentiment in favor of city ownership to break the present monopoly of the means of lighting.

Another proposition which has received scant attention is an alderman's proposal to levy a tax per foot frontage for snow removal, a very large item yearly in the city's expenditure. The Single Tax Association took steps to support the proposal, and it will probably come up again next year.

Since the people of Montreal are at present at the mercy of the monopolists of the means of lighting, public as well as private, the association memorialized the federal government at Ottawa to abolish the duty on refined coal oil. A fifty per cent. reduction was granted and crude oil was put on the free list. It since appeared from a statement of the gas company that they also were active towards these ends, crude oil being a factor in the manufacture of gas. The reduction in the tariff will thus save them \$50,000 per annum.

At the annual meeting of the Single Tax Association a decided change in the personnel of the executive was decided on, and the following officers elected: President, Henry Timmis; First Vice-President, John Anderson; Second Vice-President, Joseph Fortier; Secretary, J. R. Roebuck, 178 Mansfield Ave.; Treasurer, R. B. Capon; Financial Secretary, D. C. Barker. A board of management was appointed, composed of the following; Messrs. B. Marouse, Chas. Lingham, T. C. Allum, John Barker and E. J. Griffiths.

J. R. ROEBUCK, Secretary.

NEW ZEALAND.—AUCKLAND.

The session of the New Zealand Parliament which has just closed was remarkable for its heated debates on the land question. A few members who call themselves the representatives of the farmers were persistent in their efforts to induce the Government to cause all crown leaseholds to be merged into the freehold tenure. This proposal, which was not carried, met with strenuous opposition from the reform section of the House. Some interesting debates took place in which the whole land question was opened up, nor was the matter allowed to rest when the session closed. A number of members organized meetings in various parts of the colony to protest against the further sale of crown lands and urge the necessity of increasing the present tax on land values. The first of these meetings was held in the city of Christchurch, on January 28th, before an audience estimated at over 2,000. Some five or six members of Parliament spoke. Mr. T. E. Taylor, in a spirited speech, said: "That the land question was above all others an imperial

question. The present land policy of the Government, that of buying large estates for close settlement and at the same time selling the freehold of the remaining crown lands to speculators was the maddest land policy ever proposed." Several resolutions demanding land reform were carried unanimously.

Shortly after this a meeting was held in Dunedin at which Mr. Fowlds was the principal speaker. He pointed out that if the land monopolists insisted that crown leases should be turned into freeholds in favor of the tenant, they could not object if private tenants demanded the same right from their landlords.

The preferential trade proposals of Mr. Joseph Chamberlain have unfortunately met with a favorable response from our Premier, Mr. Seddon, but Mr. Seddon knew very well that he could not get his infamous preferential trade bill through Parliament if he allowed its proposals to be known to the people. He accordingly introduced his bill suddenly and pushed it through all its stages in a few hours. The poor apathetic taxpayer was thus saddled with a large amount of indirect taxation before he had time to even offer a protest.

Mr. Seddon is a politician of the jellyfish species, exceedingly deficient in backbone. He resembles President Roosevelt in giving glowing promises, but he generally fails to carry them into effect. However, it is generally felt that Mr. Seddon's days are numbered. He has been Premier of New Zealand 10 years and his democratic instincts have not improved lately. He has had several splendid opportunities of striking an effective blow at monopoly, but he has generally failed to avail himself of it, and reformers are now almost unanimous in condemning him as a leader who would lead us backward instead of forward.

The future of the Single Tax movement will, no doubt, be largely influenced by the success of the small independent colonies which more nearly approach the realization of the theories of Henry George. It, therefore, behoves us in this small colony, removed many thousands of miles from the hoary corruptions of Europe and America, to do our utmost to conquer the great enemy monopoly while he is yet young with us. Success will surely follow the efforts of those who fight on the side of truth.

In vain and long, enduring wrong
The weak have striven against the strong,
But the day shall come when right
With might at her back the victor shall be;
And let what may stand in the way
That day mankind *shall see*.

—GEORGE STEVENSON, Auckland.

ENGLAND.

The annual meeting of the English Land Nationalization Society was held in May of this year. Dr. Alfred Russell Wallace, who

is the president of the society, was absent, but there were a goodly number of the representatives of the movement for land nationalization, among whom was Richard Whiteing, author of "The Yellow Van," reviewed in these columns, and one of the best selling books in London. The English land nationalizers are not all or even generally Single Taxers, but they are coming to perceive that the solution of the problem is to be found through the taxing power. Among those present at this meeting in May was Mr. Jan. Stoffel, Single Taxer, of Deventer, Holland, who is known to many of us here by reason of his labors to popularize the great economic truth in his own country.

With the increase of the sentiment favoring the taxation of land values in Great Britain goes a growing perception of the impolicy of the income tax. The *Speaker*, one of the ablest journals of the United Kingdom, has this to say:

"No Liberal is satisfied with the present scheme of taxation, even when the necessary economies and reductions have taken place. Government cannot be carried on without money, and we want to see that money provided from natural, proper, and legitimate sources. A high income tax is disastrous to trade and bears with undue severity upon the middle classes. The millionaire hardly feels it. The man who earns a moderate income contributes far more than his proper share to the expenses of administration, especially when we remember the heavy rates which he frequently has to pay as occupier to the local authority. The income tax should be graduated and it should be reduced. But this is not all. In order to relieve the taxpayer and ratepayer we must see what new sources of revenue can be tapped. We naturally look round for monopoly values, and we find them in the drink traffic and in the land."

Again it says:

"There are pitfalls in the way of the reformer, and a Liberal Government will have to proceed with wariness as well as with resolution. But the principle of rating the landowner has already been applied in an Act of 1889, by which the owners of lands used for advertisements were made liable to rates. An obvious extension of the principle to which absolutely no valid objection can be offered is to rate owners of unoccupied building land on its selling value. This will not only relieve the ratepayers of many urban districts and boroughs; it will also tend to reduce rents and to solve the housing problem.

And it proposes to make the issue direct by instituting a comparison between the income tax—which excepting the tax on land values has of all taxes most to recommend it—and what we in this country have learned to call the Single Tax. It says:

"On going to war one of the first steps

taken by the Japanese was to double the land tax, just as Mr. Gladstone's first step in 1854 was to double the income tax. In the eighteenth century the land tax used to be the most important source of revenue, and Adam Smith used to say that on this account the country gentlemen were generally much less inclined to war than "the moneyed interest." But, unfortunately, at the end of the century, when war became chronic, the country gentlemen who supported Pitt insisted that the land must not be further taxed, and so, when taxes had been laid on every article of consumption and the Minister was still at his wits' end, he had to invent the income tax, instead of developing and improving the system of land taxation. But we believe that Radical financiers in the immediate future must, after retrenchment, look for national revenue to the license duties and for the local revenue to a rate upon the owners of ground values."

It ought to be said that the *Speaker* is no radical or labor paper, but a liberal journal of high character, resembling the *New York Nation* in its appearance and the high literary merit of its contributions and its editorial pages.

NORTHWESTERN TERRITORIES.

To those who are looking for the adoption of the Single Tax idea, it may be welcome news to learn that some progress is being made in the N. W. T. of Canada. The first of January of this year a new Local Improvement Ordinance came into effect organizing from three to six townships into Local Improvement Districts. A District Council is formed by electing one Councillor from each township, and this body has charge of all local improvements, with power to levy a tax of not less than $1\frac{1}{4}$, nor more than 5 cents per acre on land. There is no provision for statute labor on the roads, and all taxes are payable in cash.

Being a Councillor of the District in which I live, I am in a position to give the workings of the Ordinance. The policy of "land taxation" in vogue in the N. W. T. is not theoretically the Single Tax, but a land tax. But it will be seen that selecting the land as the best subject for taxation is in line with the Single Tax theory, and to some extent the tax falls heavier on the more valuable land; for, in practice, it is found necessary to expend more money in the more thickly settled districts in which towns and villages are situated and where travel is heaviest, than in outlying districts where settlement is sparse.

The District Council of which I am a member levied a tax of $4\frac{3}{8}$ cents per acre, or 7 dollars per quarter section of land, and the only kickers were men who are holding more land than they can use, some of whom are threatening to sell out and leave the country. Apart from a small government grant to schools, all taxes for the

maintenance of rural schools and for local improvements, are now levied upon the land exclusively. And this system applies to the whole of the N. W. Territories, and even Americans, who are coming here by thousands, and who have been accustomed to paying taxes on "all they possessed," take very kindly to the system and are writing back to their friends left behind, telling them that we don't tax everything here—only the land, and that but a small tax.

GEO. PRICE, Olds Alta, N. W. T.

REV. HERBERT S. BIGELOW.

(See *Frontispiece*.)

Herbert Seeley Bigelow was born at Elkhart, Indiana on Jan. 4, 1870. He attended the public schools of that city, also the preparatory department of Oberlin, and graduated from the Western Reserve University and from Lane Theological Seminary.

Mr. Bigelow became pastor of Vine Street church in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1886. The history of this church makes it a peculiarly fit abiding place for him. It was organized in 1831 by supporters of the abolition movement, who seceded from a Presbyterian society because that society was pro-slavery. The seceding members organized a Presbyterian church, but it subsequently became Congregational. Josiah Strong was pastor of this church at the time he wrote "Our Country." The society, more persistently perhaps than most others, has advocated the doctrines of human liberty, and for this reason, if for no other, Herbert S. Bigelow is very properly its pastor at the present time.

He came to this church without any idea of participating in a great social movement. In fact he, in common with the dominant thought of the educated class of that day and this, believed the miseries of the poor were the normal results of their own short comings. His personal experience in the "least prosperous" life of a great city opened his eyes to the fact that social injustice is a powerful factor in determining the results of individual life.

As the pastor asserted the fact of social injustice, opposition grew in the church whose history had been so interwoven with the cause of freedom. And, curiously, the matter was brought to practical issue over the admission of a negro to membership. The membership of the church was inclined to resist, but Mr. Bigelow was able to hold them to their own traditions. He even hopes that the American people may be held true to their traditions, as expressed in the Declaration of Independence.

The more heavily the burden the poor were compelled to carry weighed upon his spirit, the more earnestly did he plead for their relief. But in like degree, the opposition grew, and the resignation of Mr. Bige-

low was offered to the church officials. The resignation was refused by a vote of eighty to sixty, and the minority of Christians began a series of persecutions, in spirit very similar, to those visited upon the abolitionists who founded the church.

They attempted to try him for heresy without specific charges, maliciously assailed him in the newspapers, tried to excite fear of personal violence, and finally endeavored to starve him out by withholding his salary. Old members have left, but new ones have taken their places. After a long contest, in which a Christian spirit, in one or another sense, was exhibited on both sides, the Vine Street Church is now on a secure financial footing, and Herbert S. Bigelow is its pastor. He is there to serve God and man as his opportunities shall enable him; firmly believing that all activities of men, whether open or secret, public or private, should, and ultimately must, conform to the spirit of Him who said: "Love one another."

Mr. Bigelow has participated in political activities as the method best calculated to advance the good of mankind. But the desire, the hope, the inspiration, is to induce men to apply to social questions those methods of simple, common, honesty, that are the accepted guides of private life, viz.: perfect equity to each individual concerned. "Do unto others (all others—not just a few others) as you would they should do unto you."

MEMORABLE EXTRACTS FROM SERMONS OF REV. HERBERT BIGELOW, PASTOR OF THE VINE ST. (CINCINNATI) CONGREGATIONAL CHURCH.

THE SABBATH DAY.

The sacred thing in life is not ecclesiastical law, but human happiness. The Sabbath was made for man. As a day of rest, it is labor's greatest boon. Let us make it a day of joy and gladness.

Why should religion glower at the children that over-run the fields and parks from sweatshop and factory where the joyous little drudges grow old so young? Berry stains on the thin, pale lips are as holy as Scripture texts. The lad whose shoulders are stooped over a machine all the week may need a ball field more than a Sunday School. Hallowed be the day which places a wreath of wild flowers upon the waif of the slums and bids the children of toil make merry with the dancing daffodils.

—Sermon, Sunday, March 6, 1904.

THE RELIGION OF LINCOLN.

Once after granting a pardon which saved the life of a soldier, Lincoln turned to a friend and said: "Say of me that I plucked

a thorn and planted a flower, wherever I thought a flower would grow."

Measured by the standards of the church he was a heretic. Yet his glowing faith in humanity and the right is like a pillar of fire, still leading us, as by the hand of God, out of the house of bondage.

—Sermon, Sunday, February 14, 1904.

SENATOR HANNA.

To the hour of his death, however, Senator Hanna execrated as altogether wrong and revolutionary, the plan of Henry George to clear the way for industrial peace by the abolition of land monopoly. He did not see the relation of the land question to the labor problem. The owners of the bare land in New York City take nearly two hundred million dollars a year in ground rent. Capital and labor quarrel over what is left. Those two hundred millions represent social values which are appropriated by individuals.

Thirty years ago, in Iowa, a farm hand got \$20 a month. He will not get more to-day. But now, to become an independent farmer, he must pay from \$50 to \$75 for land worth \$10 then. Owing to the steady appreciation in land values, it is increasingly difficult for capital and labor to find profitable employment. The door of hope is being closed to those who toil, while capital that is invested in monopoly privileges yields an increasing return. There can be no statesmanship worthy the name which ignores this tremendous factor in the industrial problem. Men will come and men will go, but industrial strife will not be abated until we have statesmen who will dig through the sand-heaps of monopoly and lay the temple of industrial peace on the solid rock of justice.

—Sermon, Sunday, February 21, 1904.

The victims of monopoly have found a new champion. A Cardinal has turned agitator. In a cathedral, it is declared that economic conditions are radically wrong. The silence of the church is broken. From a high place of authority comes the plea that justice be done to the overworked and underpaid labor of America.

This is the burden of a remarkable sermon delivered by Cardinal Gibbons last Sunday in the City of Baltimore.

After a careful investigation, the Cardinal had discovered that there are people in Baltimore who toil ten or twelve hours a day for six or eight dollars a week. This pittance must suffice for rent, food, clothing, and other family expenses. This, the Cardinal calls "starving wages."

It does credit for his head and heart that he has, not apology, but condemnation for the present-day conditions under which some become suddenly rich, while "the toiler, with the utmost thrift and economy, can scarcely keep the wolf from the door."

It is most gratifying to know that the Cardinal does not commend charity, but urges that economic conditions be changed so as to enable men to earn by industry and honesty "a comfortable livelihood."

But how shall these conditions be changed? This is the most momentous question of the age. How does the Cardinal answer it?

In the first place, he says, "Agitate the question." Agitation will bring the facts to light and teach one-half the world how the other half lives. By agitation, the air is stirred, the sky is cleared, healthy discussion is provoked.

Most Worthy Cardinal, thou almost persuadest me to be a Catholic. If anything could counteract the influence of my early training, it would be to see the church hold that high ground which the Cardinal has taken and throw the weight of his mighty influence on the side of this most Christian business of improving social conditions.

I rejoice that I am able to quote the authority of one so widely respected, in favor of the divine right of agitation and healthy discussion of remedies for social ills.

—Sermon, Sunday, December 13, 1904.

THE SHIBBOLETHS OF IGNORANCE.

The fact is their gospel of free will and individual responsibility is but half the truth. Environment is one of the factors of destiny. These unfortunates have been hardest hit by a social order which would seem to us a monstrous thing if our eyes were not blinded by custom. Why is there not always work in abundance for those who wish it? My Reverend Sir, drop your phrases about the fall of Adam and the blood of Jesus and tell me, why should there be, at any time, a lack of employment for men? Have you tried to answer that question? Do you really want an answer to it? I half believe you do not. I speak the words of Henry George. Already I see a supercilious curl on your lips. What do you say? "Crank!" "Panacea!" "Patent nostrum!" Those words are the shibboleths of ignorance.

Henry George answered the question. He showed that industry is half strangled by laws which confer private monopolies upon the few, and impoverish the many by artificial restriction of the natural opportunities of employment. Put the taxes where they belong, upon land values. Stop taxing men for doing things. Make it ruinous for speculators to hold land out of use. Will that bring the Millenium? Will that secure to laziness a full stomach? No, but it will be the recognition of an economic law which is just as real as the law of gravitation. Learn the laws of Nature. That is the beginning of wisdom. Obey them, that is the will of God. The program of Henry George will do more than a thou-

sand years of preaching to make impossible this shameful spectacle of able-bodied men starving for lack of work, in a country where boundless resources could well employ the labor of the world."

—Sermon, Sunday January 10, 1904.

There has been no increase in the rate of wages corresponding to the increase in the productiveness of labor. Have we not five bridges spanning the Ohio? Mighty triumphs of civilization! Yet it was only yesterday that a father surrendered two of his four children to a charitable institution because the wage he received as a clerk in a railroad office was not sufficient to support them all. This father could not have fared worse in this country a century ago, yet those were the days of ferry boats and stage coaches and hand tools.

Neither has the capitalist absorbed a larger share of this increased production. As a matter of fact, the rate of interest has gone down, and the capitalist, as capitalist, gets less than ever before.

But not so with rent. While interest and wages have stood still, rents have gone up. On the great average, wages and interest remain on a dead level, but rents shoot skyward. When our forefathers wanted to live and work on Manhattan Island, the Indians required of them but a few strings of beads. But this generation, before it pays interest on capital or wages to labor, must pay the Astors a tribute of hundreds of millions. It is into that ever-enlarging maw of the land monopolist that the first fruits of our advancing civilization go. Ground rent is the sponge that sucks up the wealth of the nation.

—Sermon, Sunday, January 17, 1904.

ESSENCE OF SLAVERY.

The essence of slavery is this, that a man should be deprived of the fruits of his labor. The money which is taken from us in the form of ground rents, war revenues, and monopoly profits is the equivalent of our labor and the proof of our slavery. The want adds in our newspapers have taken the place of the old auction block, and the pangs of hunger do the work of the overseer's whip. Slavery remains. The landlords and the tariff barons alone have a mastery over the fruits of men's labor which is vastly more valuable to them than was the labor of the negro to the chattel slave-holder.

—Sermon, Sunday, January 24, 1904.

Bishop Potter takes the ground that wages are going up while interest is going down; that labor is annually getting a larger share of the profits of industry; that, if anyone is entitled to our sympathy, it is the capitalist; but that everything will come out all right and that matters will regulate

themselves. Trust to luck and cheer up. That is not the advice one would offer to a school boy who has a difficult problem to solve. No school boy would expect the problem to come out all right anyway. But with this problem of the distribution of wealth, the Bishop tells us not to be worried; that it will solve itself.

To illustrate his notion of the relation between capital and labor the Bishop refers to the elephants that are used in the far East to load, unload and stack lumber. Their intelligence seems wonderful and their ability beyond conception. As you look closer, however, you see a little black figure on the neck of each elephant. Watch him closely and you will see that his bare heel rests with an intermittent pressure on the neck of the huge animal he rides, and there you have the secret of the whole business. The brute obeys the man. That is how the genius of capital uses labor—by invention, construction, organization and direction.

Is that the secret of the whole business? Does that metaphor go to the root of the matter? Does it not rather ignore a factor of very great importance?

The little black figure on the neck of the elephant is not a capitalist. He is a hired man. He is just as clearly a laborer as the elephant. He works with his head, it is true, while the animal works with his trunk. He is none the less a worker. The inventors, organizers and directors of industry are, properly speaking, workingmen. The capitalist can buy one kind of labor as well as another. It often happens that laborer and capitalist are combined in one person, where a man not only owns but also superintends a factory. His share then will include his earning as a manager as well as the interest on his capital. Each man should be rewarded according to his abilities. The vital question is this: Are there any who reap rewards, not by reason of their labor or their ability, but by reason of social advantages and monopoly privileges which are conferred upon them by law, and which make them masters, not only of the elephant of labor, but also of the man on his neck?

—Sermon, Friday, February 7, 1904.

A PLEA FOR ORGANIZATION.

In our Spring issue, Mr. F. G. Anderson, one of our devoted Swedish workers in the cause, whose address is Jamestown, N. Y., made a strong plea for a national organization. We think the time has come when this matter ought thoughtfully to be considered. In a later letter to the *REVIEW* Mr. Anderson says, "If my plan is not practical let us evolve some other."

Certainly our weakness is in the absence of organization. Our work could be better systematized with organization, and whatever line of action might be adopted the work could be made far more effective—

Such an organization is needed to take up the matter of an official organ that could be made a power for good, and that could be given a wider circulation than the *REVIEW* now has. Congressional and Legislative action could be influenced perhaps to some purpose, for the power which politicians respect is that of organization.

In a letter to the *REVIEW* Walter H. Roebuck, of the *Canadian Single Taxer*, whose experience entitles his opinion to consideration, says, "We should have an international organization. The need for this has long been felt, and the sooner we get together and form one the better it will be for the cause. When Johnson was at work in Ohio there should have been an international organization behind him with speakers and literature. Let us do something along these lines that will put the movement on a strong footing. It is absolutely necessary for us to get together and know each other if we are to work with the heart that is required for success."

As a preliminary to such organization why cannot a conference be called for some date in the coming Autumn?

THE DEMOCRATIC NATIONAL CONVENTION.

The two national conventions of the great parties have met, have nominated their candidates and formulated their platforms. On the tariff question one party affirms the principle of protection, and the other without affirming it refuses to deny or question it. Both hint at revision when necessary. One, however, insists that such revision must be undertaken by the friends of the tariff, but as the other party does not say it is the enemy of the tariff, this difference is not vital. Among the supporters of Judge Parker there are many whose friendship for the tariff amounts to positive devotion. Champ Clark, in a remarkable speech in the convention, took occasion to deny that the Democratic party is a free trade party, from which it follows that it, too, is a protection party.

There is little for the Single Taxer to do in this campaign but to point out the inefficacy of proposed remedies, and to refrain from active support of either party. This is in a way fortunate, for we have been accustomed to sacrifice too much in the past for too little.

We have received from Nankin, China, copies of a free translation into Chinese of Herbert Spence's "Social Statics" with Chinese illustrations by Dr. W. E. Macklin and Mr. Li Yu Shu. Also Patrick Edward Dove's "Theory of Human Progression," the book published in 1850 and which contained the germs of the doctrines which Henry George perfected and popularized thirty years later. This work of Dove's is a "Translation of the Idea, but with Chinese Illustrations," by Dr. W. E. Macklin.

BOOK REVIEWS.

THE TRUST PROBLEM.

This is another of the many books called forth by the general interest aroused in the the trust problem, as fruitful a source of loose writing as of loose thinking. This book is not among the least valuable of current treatises on the subject, but it fails at the same time to throw real light upon it, or to guide the reader out of the tortuous paths into which current popular authorities—journalistic, political, and educational—have betrayed him.

The consideration of the trust as a phenomenon of combination rather than as a symptom of monopoly is given too large a place. We are constantly pressed with demands for the consideration of the evils of corporate combination, pooling, etc., while at the same time being assured of the inevitableness of the trend of industrial administration in this direction. When the reader is told that "The problem then is the corportion problem—but it is more, it is the great corporation," he is not being put on the right trail. For the problem is actually not one of size, nor indeed does it present itself as a corporate matter essentially. It is always a problem of monopoly, of natural monopoly. The author adopts the socialistic slogan that "competition is the mother of trusts," and from this he proceeds to a variety of loose reasoning.

The fact is, Mr. Collier talks too much; the work is full of garrulousness. We all know that specialization of labor, larger and always newer machinery, demand greater capital and larger co-operation. But the pages devoted to impressing this obvious fact upon the intelligent reader lead him to wonder what it all has to do with the real problem that the author proposes to consider. This is the defect of most of this trust literature—and of the authors who discuss remedies for trust evils.

One turns for the possibilities of promise from the indeterminate conclusions of the chapters that precede it to one entitled "Trusts and Special Privileges." Here at last, it might be thought, the author will grapple with his subject in earnest. But no. He is evidently a protectionist, and thus estopped at the very threshold of his inquiry from any sane conclusion. Note the gingerliness of the following: "The special privileges which it is generally said are the cause of trusts are railroad discrimination, certain tariff rates which happen to be excessive rather than protective, (what rare euphism!), unfair taxation, and the free granting of public franchises." For railroad discrimination our author has some words of fiery indignation, but when he comes to the tariff he says, "The Ameri-

can people have decided that their welfare is fostered by it." He says that the subject of the tariff is so important that it may be examined in a later chapter. This he does in Chapter XII.

He recoils from Mr. Havemeyer's statement that "The tariff is the mother of trusts." He says, "Coming from Mr. Havemeyer, whose efforts to secure protection when the Wilson Bill was passed caused such commotion, this assertion seems incongruous." But why incongruous if Mr. Havemeyer spoke the truth? And if he did not speak the truth why his activity when the Wilson Bill was passed?

Mr. Collier tells us with delicious *naivete* that the Republican Party in its platform denounces excessive tariffs that create monopolies. Truly, Mr. Collier is honest. But what shall be said of his penetration? This chapter which promises to be so illuminating is really a special plea for the tariff and incidentally for the Republican Party. The best things in it are the mention of the names of Lawson Purdy and Byron W. Holt. But even the value of such mention is minimized by association with that economic Cagliostro and dealer in black magic, "Prof." George Gunton.

But after all has been said there is much that is interesting and some little that is valuable in this work. The author is candid, and the book is net in the nature of a special plea. It is what it purports to be—an examination of the trust problem. It is ineffectual because its author does not know the nature and meaning of monopoly.

—J. D. M.

*SOCIAL PROGRESS.

This book based on the plan of the Statesman's Year Book, printed annually in Great Britain, may develop into a very useful publication. But grave defects will need to be remedied before it can be commended as the one thing of its kind to be desired.

The plan has been spoiled in the execution. There is an evidence of undue haste in the preparation of the work, where time and patient attention to details were needed to make it a useful book of reference. It would be interesting to know just how short a time elapsed from the inception to the completion of the work of getting together this mass of ill-assorted and undigested information. Surely a record has been broken.

No method seems to have been followed in the relation and arrangement of subjects. For example, it is a little bewildering to find a short essay on The Social Secretary—a half-parasitical excrescence on the indus-

"The Trusts." By William Miller Collier. Cloth, 12 mo. 328 pp. Price, \$1. Twentieth Century. 17 E. 16th St., N. Y. City.

*Social Progress. A Year Book and Encyclopedia of Economic, Industrial, Social and Religious Statistics. Joseph Strong, Editor. Cloth, 12mo. 275 pp. Price \$1. The Baker & Taylor Company. New York.

trial body—sandwiched in between statistics on the World's Merchant Marine and the Area, Density and Population of the United States. It may be questioned, too, if it is well in a work of this character to sprinkle quotations, not germane to the subject, at the bottom of the pages. These are doubtless of great importance in some other contest, but one wonders why they were wrenched from their own indigenous soil for such obviously inappropriate transplanting.

There are omissions, too, which one may note. Surely in a statement of the opposing theories touching the concentration of wealth there was room for a mention of Thos. G. Shearman's articles on this subject along with those of Dr. Spahr, Sir R. Giffen and the worthless excursions of Mr. W. H. Mallock into the same field. Mr. Shearman's first article which originally appeared in the *Forum* is by far the most conclusive essay on the subject.

It is especially exasperating to find under the heading, *The Causes of Poverty*, no mention of the theory that holds the chief cause to be the divorce of labor from land, but only a table of Prof. A. G. Warner in which the causes of poverty are shown to be 1st, sickness or death in the families of the poor. 2nd, lack of work, and 3rd, drink. Prof. A. G. Warner is one of the humorists of the Charities Organizations, and some ten years ago printed a book on *American Charities*, in which laborious study of tons of tables from relief statistics of cities here and abroad was entered into, with the result as given above. They call this scientific investigation. Nearly all minds that are tempted to enter this field emerge decrepit. Here for instance is this grave professor telling us that the poor are poor because they get sick and die? Why you can't even make fun of a statement like that. Its imbecility is too profound. And this is the kind of table which under the general heading "*The Causes of Poverty*," is allowed to appear in this work without intelligent and appropriate editorial comment.

There are other defects, too. Why in the name of common sense are Adams Express Company and the Mergenthaler Linotype included among "Natural Monopolies" along with traction and telephone companies?

But all these defects can be remedied in future editions. And of course there is much that is valuable in the work. The spirit in which it is conceived is the true one, for its purpose is to tell the truth regarding social conditions. Information of this kind is sorely needed, and the publishers are to be commended for the attempt to provide a Year Book of this character at a price that shall place it within easy reach of the men and women who have use for the facts and figures it presents.

J. D. M.

*A TRUE POET.

Many of our readers are familiar with the name of James Arthur Edgerton, some of whose verses have attained wide vogue among the journals of the day, especially in periodicals of social reform tendencies. Those who have read these verses must often have been struck with their homely strength, their fine sympathetic note, and the passionate hatred of injustice that animates them. They will be glad, therefore, to welcome the publication of this volume in which these poems are presented.

Mr. Edgerton's verse leaves, it is true, something to be desired. Not always is the thought articulate; we feel that it often struggles vainly for utterance, and that often, too, the utterance is disappointing. There is more of the *soul* than the garment of poetry in the work, for on the artistic side Mr. Edgerton as a verse maker is deficient. But he has a distinctive virility that marks off his work from so much of our current verse. And Mr. Edgerton at his best—and we fancy he is at his best in such poems as the now oft-quoted one in which each stanza concludes with the refrain

"For the God who reigned over Babylon
Is the God who is reigning yet!"—

is a singer of no mean quality of voice.

We quote the following lines on the great Russian prophet and Single Taxer, Tolstoy, not because it is among the best in the volume, but because of the shorter pieces it will interest our readers most.

He sought to follow God. The Church
Respectable and old,
Accustomed but to follow form
Was shocked at one so bold,
To follow God was blasphemous—
It drove him from the fold.

He sought to help Humanity
The despots in command
Had never heard of such a thing—
They could not understand
They thought it must be treason, so
They drove him from the land.

J. D. M.

† "THE MOTHER ARTIST."

This little work by Mrs. Jane Dearborn Mills, whose name is known to Single Taxers everywhere, is a book for mothers. But every lover of children might read it with profit. The spirit that animates it lends an unusual beauty to its pages, and the author's knowledge of the child heart is spiritually clairvoyant in its peculiar intimacy. Every chapter is full of suggestion; and we should like to be able to quote

**Songs of the People*. By James Arthur Edgerton. Cloth, 12mo. 230 pp. Price \$1. The Reed Publishing Co. Denver, Col.

†*The Mother Artist*. By Jane Dearborn Mills, (Mrs. James E. Mills). 12mo. 156 pp. Price \$1. The Palmer Co. Boston, Mass.

its many fruitful paragraphs, full of beauty and instinct with poetry.

Although a book of helpfulness for mothers it is really a plea for the larger life of the child. The same receptivity of mind to the philosophy of freedom that made Mrs. Mills a Single Taxer makes her an eloquent advocate of freedom for the child-soul. She is under none of the modern delusions that afflict the many writers who treat of this subject; she knows that the false economic adjustments of society make most of our social relations false and unnatural. The opening paragraph discloses this knowledge, and it is worth quoting in this connection:

"It has never occurred to human nature to take the best of its best things in earnest—Peace, Marriage, Homemaking, and Motherhood. In olden times it frankly cast them out and trod them under foot. Then it thought, one day, how fine would be the mingling of pretty talk with its real estimate of them. It tried it and liked it, and has kept on, even down to now. So the vocabulary is a queer mixture. The messenger from Mars must find it puzzling to make connection between Hosannahs for "Peace on earth" and Hurrahs for war among men, all in the self same breath. He must turn dizzy at the sight of "holy marriage" as a butt for jokes in funny papers and conversation. He must be curious to know why a mother is a queen and a slave; and all these medleys he may take back to his Martian children to show them what queer minds the folks have on the planet they call Earth."

The time comes when the mother must answer the child's question as to why papa goes to the city every day, and here for the first time our author touches upon our economic system in the same spirit and with the same philosophy that animates the rest of the work.

"Here another revelation awaited you. You had not thought before of the industrial system as more than man's contrivance for the making of the family living and a fortune. That it had anything of God's great purpose in it was a new idea. Now with those earnest child-eyes looking into yours, the question that arose in your mind was startling. Is business nothing but a universal grab bag, a street boy scramble for the pennies God has thrown? And is the normal method of its being done a jostling and a pushing and a grasping of all the fist can hold, and shoving it greedily into one's coffers?"

And with the question comes the revelation:

"Papa's business was no longer a contrivance planned by him for getting money for yourselves. It was a part of a great organism which, from its very nature and in spite of the deformity into which man's greed had twisted it, was inherently a service of every man to all and all to each. It

was worthy to be scanned by the innocence of the child, and to be entered into by the manliness of man."

There are many passages of equal significance in this little volume, but the chief charm of the work is its originality, its suggestiveness and the calm serenity of its philosophy. A thoughtful introduction by Mrs. Hannah Kent Schoff, President of the National Congress of Mothers, fittingly precedes these illuminating chapters.

J. D. M.

*A STORY OF A "LAND BOOM."

Most of our readers know of J. Herbert Quick, once mayor of Sioux City, Iowa, and known as an active worker for the Single Tax cause. They will be glad to welcome a novel by ex-Mayor Quick, that is of sterling value as a story, and tells, unobtrusively, its own moral. It differs from most reform novels in that its author lets the story itself convey the lesson. It is therefore distinctively not of the class of didactic fiction that makes as a rule such dismal reading.

This is not a Single Tax story in the sense that the Single Tax is even mentioned. The author is too excellent a literary artist for that. A more blundering craftsman would have wound up his story with a dissertation on economics, and thus have spoilt all its force. Yet few will read it without having their minds irresistably impelled to the conclusion that the author has lanced to the quick the sore of civilization, that the forces that make for the destruction of society and the brutalizing and dwarfing of every finer instinct are indicated with a strong and sure touch.

The history of this land boom ends in a tragedy, the darker features of which are merely hinted at. Through it all runs the thread of a love story that will heighten its interest to many readers. The characters stand out with some distinctness—General Lattimore, Captain Tulliver, and Elkins, the last the hero of the romance.

There are many quotable passages. General Lattimore, the Union soldier, who was at no time deceived by the fictitious prosperity of this boom town, and Captain Tulliver, whose opinions are a survival of the traditions of a pro-slavery South, and who is none too acute a reasoner on any subject indulge in this interesting colloquy.

"In the midst of forests, suh," went on the Captain, "we had our mansions not inferior to this—each a little kingdom with its complete wo'ld of amusements, its cote, and its happy populace, goin' singin' to the work which supported the estate."

"Yes," said the General, "I thought when we were striking down that state of things that we were doing a great thing for that populace. But now I see that I was

*Aladdin & Co., A Romance of Yankee Magic. By Herbert Quick. Price, \$1.50. Henry Holt & Co., N. Y. City.

only helping the black into a new slavery, the fruits of which we see here, around us, to-night."

"I habdly get youah meaning, suh."

"Well," said the General, looking about at the little audience. "Well, take my case. I have got some pretty valuable grounds down there where I live. When I got them they were worthless. I could build as good a mansion as this or any of your ante-bellum Alabama houses for what I can get out of that little tract. What is that value? Merely the expression in terms of money of the power of excluding the rest of mankind from that little piece of ground. I make people give me the fruits of their labor, myself doing nothing. That's what builds this house and all these great houses, and breeds the luxury we are beginning to see around us; and the consciousness that this slavery exists, and is increasing, and bids fair to grow greatly, is what is making men crazy over these little spots of ground out here in the West. It is this slavery——"

"Suh," exclaimed the Captain, rising and grasping the General's hand, "you have done me the favo' of making me wisah. I nevah saw so clearly the divine deeree which has fo'eo'dained us to this opulence. Nothing so satisfactory, suh, as a basis and reason foh investment has been advanced in my hearing since I have been in the real-estate business."

This is real humor, but how many men are of like mind with this unteachable Captain of the late Confederacy? J. D. M.

L. S. Dickey & Co., of 79 Dearborn Street, Chicago, have published in neat pamphlet form, Mr. Louis F. Post's essay, "The Prophet of San Francisco." This is a brief and admirable summary of the principal events in the life of the "prophet," which epithet "flung in derision by the Duke of Argyle has clung with honor" to Henry George. It is a brief history of the man and the movement with which that name is associated. It is admirably calculated to create in the mind of the reader a desire to know more of both. The last few pages are occupied with some of the more notable press opinions which greeted the appearance of "Progress and Poverty" twenty years ago. Copies may be had at 20 cents each with discounts for larger quantities.

That indefatigable worker in the cause, Sylvester Malone, publishes a pamphlet containing Dr. McGlynn's great speech "The Cross of the New Crusade," delivered in 1887. This is one of the classic addresses of the movement, and the pamphlet is appropriately printed and bound. A speaking half-tone portrait of the great priest occupies the frontispiece. Copies will be sold at fifteen cents each—the proceeds to be devoted to the McGlynn Monument Fund. Address Sylvester Malone, 220 Broadway, N. Y. City.

Among the bibliography of the movement for the quarter is a notable little brochure—a beautiful specimen of the art preservative of arts—"Justice the Object; Taxation the Means," the address delivered by Henry George in Metropolitan Hall, San Francisco, Feb. 4th, 1890, while on his way to Australia. It is printed for private circulation by Robert Brooke Blakemore, Fargo, North Dakota, and prefaced with a few words from the publisher. Mr. Blakemore has passed—to slightly paraphrase his own words—from a conviction of the visionary, impractical and untenable character of Mr. George's propositions to an acceptance of the Single Tax and the dedication of his life to its advancement.

"Hide and Seek with the Customs" is an interesting article in the *May Century*. It is an account of the many methods adopted by people of various stations in life to defraud the customs. It ought to make interesting reading for a protectionist. The writer is unsparring:

"As one of the big ocean liners was working into her dock not long ago, a lady stepped up to a friend and said:

"Do you see anything green about me?"

"No, replied her friend," why?

"Oh, nothing; only I have a silver tea set hanging under my skirt."

"That woman had no intention of smuggling. That is a vile infraction of the law which only the distinctly criminal commit. She was merely intending to evade the customs. She was in much the same frame of mind about it as the civilian who went with the allied troops on their famous and profitable march through the forbidden city of Peking. As he drew near the guard on his way out, he said to his companion:

"I wish I didn't have to go so near the sentry."

"Why?" asked the other.

"Because, unless I move with such caution as to give me away I positively clank."

"Many persons hate and despise the customs. It is a relic of barbarism, a creature of inquisition, a blood-curdling iniquity, and all that" says the author, and then he adds this delicate thrust:

"The wide range of anathema and vituperation is all insufficient to fit the case, and only a man who has voted for protection all his life, and finally finds out by this experience one of its ways of working, can rise to proper heights in its description."

In the June number of the *Atlantic Monthly* appears an article entitled "The Ethics of Taxation," by Winthrop Daniels. He gives an admirable characterization of present methods in the opening paragraph, part of which we quote: "Despite its historical identity with early taxation, we may no longer designate as taxation the habit of

the Orient, where taxes are indistinguishable from blackmail, and where the rich disguise themselves in rags to escape the exaction of the publican. Nor may we longer account as taxation the archaic methods in vogue in the land of the Grand Llama, where the tax collector, happening upon the wayfarer, accosts him with complaints of the cruel rigor of the winter, and after a minatory flourish of his matchlock, remarks 'Thy cloak, venerable brother.' Process like this is rendered unnecessary in civilized lands by the proper extension of indirect taxes."

This is so very good that we must regret the more our author's failure to summarize the ethical principles of taxation. This should have been easy if what he says were true, that there is "no absence of enlightened enquiry into the nature of fiscal problems," and that "the diagnosis of the financial status of the body politic has been made with great thoroughness." This is a pleasant word for that part of economic literature which deals with the taxation problem. But Mr. Daniels should have known that it is the grossest flattery.

PERSONALS.

The children's playground in Battery Park, N. Y. City, owes its existence to a good Single Taxer, long a member of the Manhattan Single Tax Club, Mr. Thomas F. Lewis. Mr. Lewis was employed until recently in the public baths at Rivington Street, this city, but has lately been transferred to Brooklyn.

Mr. Lewis was sitting with his sick child on one of the Battery Park benches when the little one wandered inside the iron chain and began to play on the grass. Mr. Lewis was informed by the policeman that children were not allowed on the grass. The child on being removed by its father began to cry. This simple incident, and the child's bitter disappointment impelled Mr. Lewis to start the movement that resulted in the children's playground.

Mr. E. O. Bailey, of Central City, Colorado, writes us that Henry George, Jr. recently called upon the Single Taxers of Denver. He has been engaged in writing up the plans of the Colorado situation for the *New York Journal*. He has been accorded much attention by the papers of the State.

Mr. W. R. Whitelaw, of Coburg, Ontario, Canada, advocates that we call our movement the Birthright Restoration League, and ourselves the Birthrighters.

A prominent business man of this city, who is a Single Taxer, has designed a blank check on which appears in prominent type the following: "Capital and Labor clash because both fail to recognize that they are robbed alike by their common enemy, Monopoly, which the Single Tax will destroy." The friend who sends us this check

calls attention to it as a cheap and effective means of advocating the cause to business men. Any similar striking and conservative inscription is a certain means of arousing comment and discussion.

In a letter received from Mr. Joseph Leggett, of San Francisco, that able and life long advocate of economic righteousness has this to say: "I think the cause is making satisfactory progress throughout the world. Of course it is not moving fast enough to suit men of my age who naturally long to see tangible results before we are called hence. But there is nothing to discourage even us."

Judson Grennell, of Detroit, Mich., is now in Europe. "Industrial Europe as Seen through American Eyes," is the title of a series of letters from his pen now being syndicated in a number of papers. His last letter was a study of Battersea, an English municipality conducted by trades union members. We hope in the Autumn number of the Review to have a communication from Mr. Grennell in which he will treat of matters in which Single Taxers have a more immediate interest.

Michael Flürscheim, whose contribution to the "Echoes of the Interest Symposium" appears on another page, will become a resident of the United States in the coming Spring. Mr. Flürscheim has been called "the Henry George of Germany," but in not a few points he differs with Single Taxers. On the tariff question, for example, Mr. Flürscheim without being a protectionist, holds views which but few Single Taxers will endorse. But he has done great service in his own way, and American Single Taxers will welcome, we are sure, the German thinker to an honored place among them.

Fred Skirrow, of Yorkshire, England, has printed a designed pictorial postal card, on one side of which is the space for address and communication and on the reversed side this extract from the speech delivered by Henry George a few hours before his death: "I have never claimed to be a special friend of labor. Let us have done with this call for special privileges for labor. Labor does not want special privileges. I have never claimed for nor asked for special rights or special sympathy for workmen. What I stand for is the equal rights of all men."

It was the well known Single Tax advocate, Rev. Father Cox, assistant pastor of the Roman Catholic Cathedral in Chicago, who was the chaplain of the day at the second day's session of the Republican National Convention on June 22nd.

Among those who have recently evinced a profound interest in the Single Tax is Dr. Alexander Graham Bell, inventor of the telephone. He is devoting his leisure hours to a study of the literature of the movement.

John Harrington, of Oshkosh, Wis., whose interesting news letters to the REVIEW have been a feature of this periodical from the commencement, has been appointed by Gov. La Follette a member of the State Board of Normal School Regents. Mr. Harrington is a practising lawyer in Oshkosh, and one of the prominent Single Taxers of the State.

There died in Kansas City a few weeks ago a faithful worker in the Single Tax cause whose name, George Breck, will be familiar to but few of our readers, so quietly and unobtrusively were his services rendered. Mr. Breck was a resident of Plattsburgh, Nebraska, and was sixty-nine years of age. It was his expressed wish that one who believed in the Single Tax should conduct his funeral services, and this was accordingly done by Judge J. C. Point, of Omaha. Thus passes another of the great army of those who have wrought worthily for their fellows, and whose work, little as it seems to count in our world of myriad activities, yet moves to a splendid culmination.

Wellesley Bourke, of Kingston, Jamaica, in the Kingston *Daily Telegraph* thus expresses his satisfaction with a recent Act:

"It was gratifying to me to observe a few days ago that our Legislature passed a law to encourage the building and equipping of hotels to meet the needs of a tourist trade, by which it was declared that furniture for hotels and materials for hotel construction, under certain restrictions, may be imported free of import duty; and also that the value of any land for the purposes of the property tax and the parish rates, used for hotels, shall not for 10 years be increased by reason of the nature of the building upon it.

"My satisfaction arises from the fact that this is a direct condemnation by the Legislature itself of our system of taxation, against which, as you know, I have been for years contending."

The *Leader*, which is a weekly journal of Jamaica, thus comments:

"Mr. W. Bourke and Capt. Taylor of Moy Hall may be looked upon as representatives of modern, 'modified' followers of Henry George. They recognize that the value of land can be increased in two ways: first, by the improvements made on it by the owners; and second, by the operation of forces outside the control or influence of the owners altogether. And the position they take on the direct taxation question is this, that the Government should take the value of land as land, *i.e.*, land with whatever 'unearned increment' it may have acquired, as the basis of the land tax, and leave the owners to enjoy the fruits of their own enterprise and industry without diminution."

The *Leader* concludes with the remark that the movement is making "steady progress even in conservative England."

Frederick Upham Adams has contributed a valuable series of papers to the Brooklyn *Eagle* on the municipal ownership experiments in Great Britain. These papers are written on the spot, and the data is interesting and illuminative.

Dr. Hampartzoom der Garabedian, who is an Armenian exile, in a contribution in the Detroit *News Tribune*, of recent date says two things in the United States astonished him: "the hard struggle for existence among the poorer classes, and what seemed to me a peculiar land system."

"After ten years of wide observation in the United States, I can say that the average Armenian artisan and peasant flock-tender has less anxiety as to the means of livelihood than has the average small shop-keeper in this country, to say nothing of the 2,000,000 tenant farmers and the clerks and laborers. There are no tenants in Armenia. Our people own their homes. If a poor man fails to work one day, it is no cause of anxiety about the future. In this rich country of the United States there seems to be a struggle among thousands to keep out of the poorhouse.

Justin McCarthy speaks in high terms of Richard Whiteing's "Yellow Van," the land reform novel reviewed in these columns last Autumn. If Mr. Whiteing is not a Single Taxer it is because no one has yet convincingly brought this sovereign reform for the evils he sees to his notice. But he is with us to all intents and purposes. He is a land nationalizer, but no form of land nationalization is so practical as the Single Tax. If we must buy let us first tax and buy—the buying will then be all the more cheaply done. But when we tax we will find it no longer necessary to buy.

It will interest our readers to know that the "Yellow Van" is one of the popular London successes.

J. J. Pastoriza, whose labors for the Single Tax have made him known wherever the cause is known, has at last seen his efforts crowned with success in Houston, Texas, where by a vote of nearly four to one the voters of that city have declared for the referendum on all questions of public franchises.

As we go to press we learn of the death of Mrs. Henry George at Merriewood on the night of July 20th. Mrs. George suffered from heart disease, and for several years has been in ill health. We regret not being able in this issue to give an account of the self-sacrificing labors of the wife and mother to whose devotion Henry George and the cause for which he stood owe so much. Ere this number reaches our readers all that is mortal of one of the most remarkable women of her time will rest in the family plot at Greenwood.

THE WOMEN'S NATIONAL SINGLE TAX CONFERENCE.

The Women's National Single Tax League met at St. Louis, Mo., on the 11th and 12th of July, Mrs. John S. Crosby of New York, presiding. Delegations were present from New York, New Jersey, Washington, D. C., Massachusetts, Missouri, Illinois, and Iowa. Written reports were read from several absent delegates, and visiting Single Taxers from Pennsylvania, Missouri, Illinois, Alabama and Colorado took part in the discussions. A delegate from Toronto, Canada, unavoidably detained, reported too late for business session.

Mrs. Louisa L. Werth, of St. Louis, made the address of welcome. At the Monday evening mass meeting, Mr. F. M. Crunden of St. Louis spoke hopefully of reformers' work—in the long run—citing the work of the abolitionists from small beginnings. Mrs. Lona I. Robinson, of Des Moines, Iowa, held that just now, while nearly every principle of economic justice is submerged below the line of projection into politics, is the time for Single Tax reformers to do educational work. Mrs. Margaret L. Coope, LL.B., of Washington, D. C., reported for a large and active Single Tax League in that city, and incidentally the development such work was bringing the women themselves.

James Bellangee, of Fairhope, Alabama, explained this working model of the Single Tax idea and its obvious benefits. Hon. Robert Baker, member of Congress from Brooklyn, spoke earnestly of the remarkable object lesson daily being presented by the increased rents resulting from the crowds attending the World's Fair; an increase by which the landlords, not the city, profit. He referred with much warmth to the breakdown of law and order in Colorado, by civil and military authorities, before any alleged law-breaking by strikers took place, and the cause—monopoly of mining land.

Among resolutions adopted at next day's session was one setting forth the belief that the far-reaching method of the Single Tax was the only peaceful solution of the labor question including its most distressing and disgraceful feature, child labor. Woman suffrage was heartily endorsed.

Mrs. John S. Crosby was elected president; Dr. Lund of Chicago, vice-president; Dr. Mary D. Hussey, East Orange, New Jersey, recording secretary; Mrs. Kate E. Freeman, Brooklyn, N. Y., corresponding secretary; Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe, Washington, D. C., treasurer. Plans of wider organization and propaganda were adopted. The next conference will probably be held in Philadelphia next June.

LONA I. ROBINSON, Reporter.

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.

MOODY PUBLISHING CO.

.....Publishers.....

NEW YORK, 35 Nassau St.

CHICAGO, 1601 Unity Building