



*The*  
**SINGLE TAX REVIEW**

**A RECORD OF THE PROGRESS OF SINGLE TAX  
AND TAX REFORM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD**

Editorial Contributors to This Number

- |                        |                   |
|------------------------|-------------------|
| WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON |                   |
| LAWSON PURDY           | LOUIS F. POST     |
| FRANK C. WELLS         | ERNEST H. CROSBY  |
| HENRY GEORGE, Jr.      | Hon. ROBERT BAKER |

Special Articles by

- |                  |                    |
|------------------|--------------------|
| O. R. TROWBRIDGE | CHAS. H. INGERSOLL |
| W. A. DOUGLASS   | and Others         |

**W I N T E R     N U M B E R**

**JANUARY 15, 1906    x    VOLUME 5, NUMBER 3**

*Yearly Subscription, \$1.00    x    x    Single Copies, 25 Cents*

PUBLISHED AT 11 FRANKFORT ST.  
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.



# SINGLE TAX REVIEW,

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor and Publisher.



---

---

## TABLE OF CONTENTS.

---

---

WHAT SHALL WE DO TO BE SAVED? . . . . .	<i>O. R. Trowbridge</i>	1
PROPAGANDA METHODS . . . . .	<i>Geo. L. Rusby</i>	6
PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND— <i>Communications from C. B. Fillebrown and Mrs. Eliza Stowe Twitchell</i>		8-12
TAX REFORM OR LAND REFORM . . . . .	<i>Wm. J. Ogden</i>	13
REPLY BY A. C. PLEYDELL . . . . .		16
A HERITAGE WORTHILY UPHELD . . . . .	<i>Grace Isabel Colbron</i>	17
THE PEOPLE VS. LANDLORDISM . . . . .	<i>Ralph Hoyt</i>	20
MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP—THEORY AND PRACTICE . . . . .	<i>Chas. H. Ingersoll</i>	22
THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS . . . . .	<i>W. A. Douglass</i>	25
DIRECT LEGISLATION AND THE SINGLE TAX . . . . .	<i>James P. Cadman</i>	29
POEM BY T. SPENCE, 1783 . . . . .		32
THE REVIEW FOR 1906 . . . . .		33
DEATHS OF D. D. PATERSON AND WALTER ROEBUCK . . . . .		34
EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT— <i>Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Lawson Purdy, Frank C. Wells, Henry George, Jr., Louis F. Post, Ernest Crosby, Hon. Robert Baker</i>		35-40
NEWS—DOMESTIC . . . . .		49
NEWS—FOREIGN . . . . .		41 44
TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE . . . . .		45-47
JAPANESE INTEREST IN THE SINGLE TAX . . . . .		48
“PROPUTTY” . . . . .	<i>J. W. Bengough</i>	49
DEATH OF FREDERICK SHEFFIELD . . . . .		50
COMMUNICATIONS . . . . .		51
BOOK REVIEWS . . . . .		53

---

---











**THE LATE WALTER ROEBUCK**

Who, at an age when most youths have hardly begun to think of the serious business of life, had, by his services in a great movement, made his name known upon two continents.

*(See page 31)*



# THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

---

---

## WHAT SHALL WE DO TO BE SAVED?

(For the Review.)

By OLIVER R. TROWBRIDGE.\*

Within the last few months there has been considerable discussion among Single Taxers as to the present status of the movement. All admit that outwardly there has been a falling off of the old time spirit of the propaganda. Some of those who are closely identified with the movement maintain, however, that the change is rather in form than in substance. They think that on the whole the movement is progressive, and that to-day more persons than ever before are identified with this reform, or at least are familiar with its doctrines. For many years I have been a student, not only of Single Tax doctrines, but of the Single Tax movement itself; and much as I dislike to say it, I am constrained to agree with the opinion expressed by Mr. Ernest Crosby in the last REVIEW that Tolstoy is very nearly right in saying that the teachings of Henry George have fallen into great neglect. I would not express it in just this way (nor would Mr. Crosby, I think), but would say rather that the teachings of Mr. George have nowhere and at no time received that measure of acceptance to which they are so clearly entitled; and that relatively the last few years have marked a decline rather than an advance. As suggested by Mr. Crosby, we have only to compare for a moment the Single Tax progress with that of socialism to see what is meant by Tolstoy.

In this connection I wish to call attention to the fact, as furnishing the keynote of this article, that the present Single Tax propaganda is confined almost entirely to individualistic lines; that its chief adherents (myself included, if I may claim the honor,) have come to it from the individualistic school, and that in the United States its converts nearly all come from one of the great political parties. In my opinion these facts disclose the weakness, not of the essential Single Tax doctrines, but of the Single Tax movement. To my mind these doctrines are worthy of universal acceptance upon their merits. If they are truly to prevail, they must ultimately receive an acceptance that is well-nigh universal. This they can not do unless they are propagated upon broad and liberal lines.

For eight years prior to 1896 I resided and practiced my profession (law) in the city of Chicago. It was during these years that the old Chicago Single Tax Club was in its prime and met with largest growth. In connection with its work and my own efforts to spread the doctrines of Mr. George, I became impressed with certain matters which gradually changed my point of view as to propaganda methods. In the hope that my experiences and the conclusions

---

\* Author of *Bisocialism*; *The Reign of the Man at the Margin*. Public Publishing Company, Chicago. See adv.



based thereon may be of benefit to other workers and to the movement as a whole, I shall outline them as well as I can within the limits of this article.

#### MY OWN EXPERIENCE.

First, in connection with my own work. I had read *Progress and Poverty* critically five times and always with pleasure. To me it was easy reading. I regarded it not only as easily the greatest book of the nineteenth century, but also as the greatest book that had ever come from the hand and pen of one man. But I met the experience of all those who have urged others to read *Progress and Poverty*. Many read it, but all these did not accept its teachings. Some feared to accept its conclusions because of the very charm of its literary style; others declared they could get nothing out of it; still others that its doctrines are unjust, and not a few failed or refused to read more than a part of the book because it presented too long an argument. Some readers I tried to rescue with Mr. George's Open Letter to the Pope On the Condition of Labor, as I regarded this as the classic of economic ethics. This book appealed to some to whom the more complete masterpiece did not, and this suggested to me that the literature, together with the spirit and method of the movement must be enlarged until they shall present the essential doctrines in ways that appeal to persons of all the more common bents of mind.

At that time my work, like that of the Club, was along individualistic lines. I felt, however, that if the Single Tax doctrines were presented differently, we might reach many who were more or less inclined toward socialism. I began to see that the individualistic arguments presented but one side, and this the more remote, though none the less true, side of the Single Tax doctrine. For the truth is that it is only the end, the final goal of the Single Tax movement that is distinctively a matter of individualism. The immediate means, the working plan of the movement is distinctively socialistic. This must necessarily be true of the working plan of a movement whose immediate object is to make the land common property and whose ultimate object is to attain economic freedom for the individual by this means. It seems to me that many Single Taxers entirely ignore the force of what Mr. George must have regarded as one of the most significant passages in *Progress and Poverty* since he gave it a separate paragraph in italics in a chapter of exceptional brevity: *We must make land common property.*

This statement of the immediate step to be taken is followed by an elaboration by Mr. George of the working plan of the movement by means of which common property in land is to be attained by the appropriation by the State of ground rents under the forms of taxation for the purposes of revenue. There is nothing individualistic about this working plan, although it makes true individualism for the first time possible. The working plan itself cannot in any way be translated into an individualistic formula; but it lends itself readily to the formula of limited socialism: *We must socialize the land by socializing all ground values*; or, we can make the Single Tax working plan include the complementary step of public ownership and operation of all public utilities under this formula: *We must socialize all natural opportunities by socializing all ground values and franchise values.* Result: The complete individualization of all other forms of property and all other business activities.

#### SINGLE TAX IS SOCIALISM LIMITED.

From a consideration of these matters I concluded that the first two steps of our reform (the public appropriation of ground rent and the public owner-



ship and operation of public utilities) are socialistic, and that instead of concealing or denying this fact, we should avow it openly and at all times. As a corollary to this it follows, of course, that when we come in contact with people who are already tinctured with socialism (and many such people there are in all walks of life), we should neither dismiss them as mollusks who are incapable of thought, nor undertake to club the socialism out of them in order to club some individualism into them. By judicious treatment they may often be made into thorough-going Single-Taxers.

Consider for a moment: A friend asks you about the Single Tax, and his questions indicate that he has associated it in his mind with socialism. You assure him that nothing could be farther from the truth—that Single-Taxers are strict individualists. "What, then," he asks, "do they propose?" You explain that the first great step to be taken is the appropriation by the community of ground rent in taxation and its expenditure for the common good. Suppose he then says: "Well, now, if I understand you, you propose to socialize ground rents instead of socializing the land itself." Will you then do violence to his sense of logic (to say nothing of your own) by assuring him that what you have proposed is individualism, simply because you can demonstrate to him beyond question that it will finally result in the economic freedom of the individual by securing and maintaining equality of opportunity? Do you not see that the steps by which you may mount to a plateau are very different from the plateau itself?

And then as to the second step—you are asked about that. You explain that Single-Taxers also favor public ownership of public utilities. "Then," says your inquirer, "if I understand you now, you are in favor of socializing all public utilities." Can you consistently deny this? If not, will not your friend say, "Where, then, is your individualism? I thought you said you were not a socialist!" The fact is that at this point, for the first time, you are in a position to disclose your individualism. Individualism is not the beginning, it is not the working plan of your philosophy. It is the end, the final goal, the plateau to which your socialistic steps have led. Is it not true?

My good friend Mr. John Z. White is perhaps the champion *par excellence* of the individualistic school (and this school has about all the pupils at present) among Single-Taxers. Yet in the old days of knock-down-and-drag-out argument he was wont to say that he did not seriously object to socialism, provided it had a safety valve; that is, provided it furnished equality of opportunity to all. But for socialism without a safety valve, or with a safety valve weighted down with governmental monopoly or bureaucracy he had no use. Nor have I.

Could a happier expression be found for the Single Tax movement in its purity and its fullness than this: The Single Tax is socialism—with a safety valve! Individualism furnishes the safety valve; but the safety valve is not the whole engine—neither is it the motive power. It furnishes a check, a limitation upon the steam, not the steam itself. And a safety valve weighted down, overworking its function, is dangerous. So it seems to me that in our movement the element of individualism is given too much weight; that it is overworking its function and so interferes unnecessarily with the efficiency of the machinery.

While considering the above matters I had also in mind the fact that, aside from those socialistically inclined, the members of one of the great political parties are practically unaffected by our propaganda. This is greatly to be regretted, and unless a radical change can be effected in this regard, the growth of the movement must be very slow. I became impressed also with the fact that the more modern, or so-called Austrian theory of value, when fully worked out, could be made the basis of a scientific treatment of Single Tax principles.

#### AN EXPERIMENT.

In 1896 I removed to Bloomington, a city of 25,000 inhabitants, located in



the midst of the rich farming lands of central Illinois. Here my environment was greatly changed. There was no Single Tax sentiment discernable, although Mr. E. H. Bailey, now of the *Johnstown Democrat*, had sown some good seed (in pretty thorny places, however,) some years before. Few people knew anything of the doctrine and the most of them seemed to care not at all. The values of farm land began to increase rapidly soon after this time and practically all these lands have since doubled in value. The prevailing sentiment was conservative to a degree, except that socialism was beginning to make some headway, largely among railway-shop employees. The county was strongly republican; so much so that the sun could scarcely rise on a democrat before eleven o'clock; and on election day the sun set on democratic hopes shortly after dinner. It is somewhat different now, but in such an economic atmosphere I completed the investigations begun in democratic Chicago. By 1902 I had arrived at the principal conclusions published in *Bisocialism* a year later.

Before publishing these conclusions I desired to test their effectiveness with reference to people of different minds and predilections, and an opportunity to do this occurred in 1902-3. I was asked by a young attorney to discuss economic matters from my points of view with himself and a few friends, and I consented to do this on condition that those who attended the discussions should be taken equally from the republican and democratic parties and that party politics should be completely barred. Weekly meetings were begun, the first evening with six young attorneys. The attendance grew rapidly, however, until the number reached twenty-four—evenly divided politically. The additional members or attendants (there was no organization whatever) included the editor and the business manager of a leading partisan daily paper, the manager having represented the district in the State legislature; merchants; retail salesmen; traveling men; a teacher; more lawyers (eleven in all), and a real estate speculator. At one of the early meetings the proprietor of a jewelry store who had been a republican until converted to socialism by Eugene V. Debs asked leave to attend and was given welcome.

At these meetings I took the same position regarding the socialistic and individualistic phases of the Single Tax doctrine outlined above and practically as given more in detail in *Bisocialism*. I also discussed the new theory of value, the entire land question, the tariff, the money question, the wages question, labor unions, monopolies and franchises, compensation to present owners, and all other questions afterward included in my book, and in the same manner. These meetings began October 1; the next summer I suggested a vacation for July and August at least, but the members preferred to continue the meetings despite the season. Accordingly we met each week, practically, for twenty months. It was not a rare thing for a member to forego the pleasures of some social event in order to attend one of these meetings.

#### THE RESULT.

I shall not attempt to give results in detail except in one instance. Suffice it to say that they were highly satisfactory to me in every way. Of two things I may speak especially: I am sure that this method of presenting the Single Tax working plan as a phase of socialism is easily apprehended, and does not, in the most conservative environment, tend to keep either republicans or democrats from accepting the doctrine fully; and I have never been able to see that it made a particle of difference whether a member had been a republican or a democrat; or scarcely that it made any difference whether he had been or was even then actively engaged in the work of one of the old parties. Within our first year a local campaign along party lines came on. Some of our young

lawyers took active parts on their respective sides but they absorbed the Single Tax doctrine just the same and apparently equally well. One of these came to me to explain his absence from one of our meetings. He said he was booked by his party for a speech a few evenings later, and that he had absorbed so much bisocialism (Single Tax + public ownership) that he was afraid he might mix things in his campaign speech; so he had stayed away from our meeting in order to attend one of his party in order to get his bearings and the proper inspiration for his speech later on. This was said not merely in jest, but seriously. He was a republican, too.

But what of our socialist member? Well, he was treated just like the rest; no especial effort was made either to please or to offend him. Neither sops nor bricks were thrown at him, and he attended regularly. At first he defended socialism; then he conceded that if we are to have socialism, the Single Tax is the way to get it. He talked in this way at the meetings of his socialist local, also. Finally, the leader of the local, after expostulating with him in vain, preferred charges of economic heresy against him, and moved his expulsion. He was not expelled, but soon tendered his resignation to the local and it was accepted. He is now an outspoken Single-Taxer and prints a Single Tax line on his envelopes. In spreading Single Tax literature he has no equal in this community.

#### WHAT SHALL WE DO?

What, then, do I recommend? That we right-about-face, drop individualism, and talk about nothing but the socialism involved in the Single Tax? By no means. Then shall we keep on talking only individualism, seek for converts in only one of the great parties, and have a club or a brick ready for every socialist as soon as he shows his head? By no means. I do not go upon the theory that every man who does not accept either individualism or socialism as a fetich is a mollusk, but upon the theory that "some people are not all alike." And I hold this: The first steps—the steps constituting the affirmative program of the Single Tax—are socialistic; and further, that it is easier to teach a man to take the first steps first than it is to teach him to take the last step first. Many people will not take the last step at all unless they have taken all the other steps in their order. Therefore, unless a man is already an individualist, I maintain that he can best be brought to see the Single Tax from the socialistic point of view. After he has done this, there will be no trouble about the individualistic side—this will follow as of course. The reasons for socializing natural opportunities contain in themselves the reasons for individualizing all other forms of property and kinds of business; but the reverse of this is not true.

However, let those to whom individualism appeals, make their appeal to others through individualism, if in this way they can secure the best results. If failure comes in certain cases, let not prejudice prevent a trial of argument from the other (not opposite) point of view. It may succeed. For true individualism and true socialism are not opposites but complements. They are the two halves of a consistent whole.

Let those who can attain the best results by working in and through one of the old parties continue to work in this field. But at best this is only half the field. Shall we not as a movement occupy the other half also? For mayhap it will prove the more prolific. And above all, will not those who choose to remain in the exclusively individualistic field be kind enough to drop the clubs and the bricks, and in this way leave the other field clear to those whose predilection, ability or judgment shall lead them to work therein?



Let us have no friction, no handicaps of prejudice, and a wider field. It is only in this way that our movement can attain its own. It is only in this way that the dispiriting view of Tolstoy concerning the doctrines of Henry George can be changed into a vision of progress undoubted and untold.

Bloomington, Illinois.

---

## PROPAGANDA METHODS.

(*For the Review.*)

By GEORGE L. RUSBY.

There are two chief factors necessary to the effective equipment of a propagandist: one of these, devotion to the cause at stake, is well recognized; the other, though equally important, is often over-looked. This is definite, clear-cut knowledge as to method to be followed in applying this spirit of devotion toward the accomplishment of the end sought.

The Croasdaler is ever watchful for the most effective methods of advancing the Single Tax. It is the writer's belief, based upon careful observation and varied experience, that there is no way in which greater results can be secured, proportionate to effort and expense involved, than in using bank checks bearing a Single Tax text. This method of propaganda is naturally limited to those who have bank accounts, either for private or business purposes. Bank checks pass from hand to hand and the inscription should be chosen with a view to appealing to as many classes as possible. There are many texts that would be appropriate. The following has appeared on all of the writer's checks for the past four years and may be appropriated by anybody else to whom it may appeal:

"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."

A rubber stamp could be used, but a printed check is better, and better still is a handsome, lithographed check that appeals to business men, suggesting to them among other things that the maker of the check has a snug bank account. After the first expense of engraving, etc., the cost is but a trifle and one can thereafter feel that these checks are quietly doing their work without outlay of energy, time or money. It is an automatic method of propaganda, running itself, however busy the business man may be; indeed the busier the man, the more checks drawn, and the greater the propaganda opportunity.

A carefully chosen text thus circulated will antagonize nobody, and the writer contends that any business man thus expressing his convictions will not invite trouble for himself, but will to the contrary gain the increased respect of those whose attention may be attracted. Whatever danger there might be in antagonizing the interests of customers is largely absent, from the fact that checks are usually given out for goods purchased, not for goods sold. Tradesmen and merchants are always glad to receive checks, and the better the customer the more attention will be paid to his opinion if circulated in the way suggested.

While discussing the question of propaganda ways and means, it seems appropriate to refer to another and a very important phase of the same. In addition to the question of choice of method, the problem is constantly presenting

itself how far we may dare indulge our desire to help at all, knowing that every move means expenditure of time, energy or money, that could be used in fortifying one's self or one's family against the danger of present or future poverty. This is a serious and an important consideration.

Our present spirit of liberality is stifled by the thought that one of this topsy-turvy world's accidents may some day reduce us to dependence. We reason that we can in the long run do more for the cause we would serve, by doing less just now, fortifying our position and thus making it possible to be very liberal at some future time. There is much to commend this line of reasoning, but it involves much danger also; we may become so careful that we do little or nothing now and through lack of exercise, the desire to give will gradually die, the cause thus remaining unserved.

There is a way to obviate this latter danger, while at the same time recognizing every demand for providing for the material future. The method of securing this double purpose is in so writing one's will that the same funds that serve one's family obligations will likewise serve the cause which it is desired to advance.

Entirely aside from the feature of sentiment, it is from a practical point of view usually far more desirable to leave to the family the continued income from one's estate, safely invested, than to leave the principal at the disposition of legatees often unqualified to conserve it. How often the beneficiary, demoralized by the possession of a lump sum of money, will squander it! How often the inexperienced legatee will by poor investment lose the principal and thus be left without income! The parent's chief purpose should lie in providing that the child shall be secured in a continued income, even though very modest.

Single Taxers whose family obligations demand consideration in the disposition of property, can instruct their executors to safely invest the same, pay the annual income to the beneficiaries nominated in the will as long as the latter shall live, or for a shorter period, and then turn the principal over to duly named trustees, to be used for propaganda purposes. The principal could remain invested as an endowment fund, if desired, thus insuring for the propaganda the same permanence of income as previously for the family.

It cramps us to feel that material necessities compel the "saving" of the dollar which we would like to devote to spreading the truth; the saving becomes a habit which we may carry farther and farther beyond the limits of necessity; we gradually become dishonest with ourselves. The danger of this unfortunate condition is obviated by taking the precaution herein outlined; we may then feel that the money laid by to-day for the material necessities of the future is truly "saved"; for it will do its greatest work after serving these material interests. To business and work there is thus contributed a new and elevating interest, which relieves the depressing monotony or shattering strain to which the average man is to-day subject in making a living.

Is it not well to urge upon Single Taxers the importance of this question? Those who have no family obligations could find no better way of serving the Single Tax Reform, while those who do have such obligations can at the same time remain loyal to these and advance the greatest, because the most fundamental of all reforms.

Although it has been frequently referred to before, it may interest some of the readers of THE REVIEW to hear a word regarding the vacant-lot-sign method of propaganda. For the past six years I have maintained a board sign, fifty feet long and ten feet high, reading as follows:

**"NEIGHBORS ARE PAYING INCREASED TAXES FOR THE PRIVILEGE OF BUILDING HOUSES AND RAISING THE VALUE OF THIS VACANT LOT. WHY NOT TAX EQUALLY ALL LOTS ON**



THIS BLOCK, WHETHER IMPROVED OR VACANT, AS WE NOW TAX FOR SEWERS AND FLAG SIDEWALKS? WHY FINE PEOPLE FOR MAKING IMPROVEMENTS? FOR INFORMATION REGARDING CORRECT TAXATION METHODS APPLY TO  
 "THE NUTLEY SINGLE TAX CLUB."

The original cost of this sign was \$66.00. It stands on a vacant lot in the center of my native town, Nutley, New Jersey. It has caused much discussion and has brought inquiries from many directions.

---

## PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

MR. FILLEBROWN STATES HIS POSITION,

*EDITOR Single Tax Review:*

I gladly avail myself of the opportunity to contribute a few thoughts upon an issue which, in the dissemination of Single Tax ideas, is admitted to be a source of embarrassment inversely proportioned in most instances to people's understanding of the subject.

Few people know of the distinctions made by Henry George and political economy and the law between private property in land and private property in the things produced by labor, or between the private ownership of land, and the private possession of land; therefore, if you say that private property in land is unjust, or that private ownership of land is unjust, the tendency is to close many minds to further consideration of a statement which they are not qualified to understand. One may attack with vigor the private appropriation of ground rent (what land is worth for use), and be easily understood, while an attack upon private ownership in land is very apt to be misunderstood. Able men sometimes assert that the end in view of the single tax movement is the complete subversion and overthrow of the institution of private property in land. Five minutes of such talk from one such man will do more damage than can be repaired in a long time, and all on account of a confusion of ideas which seems unnecessary. This confusion arises partly from a lack of clear understanding as to the meaning of terms, but largely from applying to land the theory of ownership which in law applies only to personal property.

Coming to an analysis of the different terms, possession, ownership and property, used in describing the tenure of land, we find that while not synonymous, these definitions have much in common, and the terms are often used interchangeably. The "possession" of the dictionaries does not always imply ownership; but possession does imply that same physical dominion which belongs of right to ownership, which right the legal ownership grants and conveys. Henry George's proposition was to leave owners in possession of land, and to accord to that possession this legal right of physical dominion by means of a broad definition of the word, made to include the right, quoting Mr. George's own words, "to buy and sell, bequeath and devise," or, in the usual form of the real estate deed, "to give, grant, bargain, sell and convey,"—a right universally granted to ownership and property.

A land title is a title to the rights and privileges which constitute its value, and which, largely at least, are the creation of labor. Title to the land itself, whether its value is one dollar or a million dollars, is necessary to security of improvements. Title to the annual value of land, (ground rent) is not neces-

sary to the security of improvements, which would be equally secure whether one-quarter or three-quarters of ground rent be taken in taxation. The dictionaries do not include land value in their definition of land. Land itself, deprived of the rights and privileges pertaining thereto (that is, land with the ninety-nine years' restriction of a tight and high board fence around it) has no market value. The value of land is in large part created by the tributary surroundings which are provided through taxation, and hence such value is largely the product of the labor of the community as represented in its public and quasi-public outlays. A man who owns land owns the soil, which of itself has little or no value, and he owns every right and privilege, fee, title, etc., pertaining to the land from zenith to earth's centre exclusive and absolute as against any other individual, but qualified and conditional as against the community.

Private ownership of land may be defined as that proprietorship of the rights and privileges pertaining to the situation which extends to the exclusion of all other persons (person being limited in law to "an individual, or a body corporate, other than the State"), but subject always to the claims of the community to its share in the value of those rights and privileges, so far as that value is a social product, the same to be asserted and maintained by means of the sovereign power of taxation.

Property in land, ownership of land, in law, means tenure, holding, right of possession (subject to the sovereign right of taxation) and no more. The owner can have no more enjoyment of these rights than can the possessor, as defined by Henry George. Either must have an exclusive enjoyment (proprietorship) in the benefits of which no one else can share except through the agency of taxation. The rights of the public are the same under either definition.

If, under the Single Tax landowners should be allowed to retain a small percentage of rent, there is no moral difference whether such privilege attach to their ownership or to their possession, for in either case there is no recognition of the right of the private appropriation of ground rent, no compromise with any wrong attendant upon ownership that does not attend alike upon possession.

It is not individual proprietorship of land, but the private appropriation of ground rent, which is charged with maintaining industrial slavery. True it is that under present conditions "when land value is made private property the law of equal freedom is denied", but under the Single Tax this would not be true. Any degree of justice or injustice, with the Single Tax or without, would be exactly the same whether the tenure be called property, ownership or possession. What practical difference then does it make, whether the tenure be called by one name or the other? The private property in land of which Herbert Spencer and Henry George treated was the untaxed ownership of our day and generation with its private appropriation of ground rent. It is confidently asserted, as shown by the context, that when Henry George said "private property in land was unjust," he must have meant private property in land values.

It is sometimes said that if landowners can rightfully claim ownership they are entitled to all the ground rent; that the common right to land, and the common right to rent, go together. How can this be true, when, under the land tenure of to-day, which is that of ownership, no one claims that the landowners of Boston are entitled to all the ground rent, but only to that part which is not taken in taxation. Their own claim falls short of "all" by the \$8,500,000 now yielded up in taxation. In case the demands of taxation should be twice as great, would they be any more than now entitled to all? It is not easy to see how ownership can rightfully carry with it the private appropriation of ground rent, because there has never been a denial, but there always has been a recognition, of the sovereign power and right to tax the land. Private ownership of



land is no injustice to anybody to-day, nor has it been at any time. The un-taxed private ownership of land value as it exists to-day is unjust. This does not mean that the ownership is unjust, but that not to tax it is unjust. An absolute ownership in land, such as is theoretically recognized in the products of labor, would be unjust, but no such "absolute ownership of land is recognized in the law books." Its tenure is always subject to taxation, and to the superior right of eminent domain. Feudal tenure would seem to have been a rude recognition of the principle that the beneficiaries of a Government should pay the expenses of government.

Henry George said himself, *Progress & Poverty*, Book VIII, Chap. II, "I do not propose \* \* \* to confiscate private property in land" \* \* \* but "to appropriate rent by taxation." "It is not necessary," he says, "to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent." And again, "people are led into confusion by assuming that we propose to take land from its owners." What people need to see in order to incline them to the Single Tax is not so much "the wrong of private ownership," a phrase which often both violates and confuses their moral sense; but "the wrong of the private appropriation of ground rent," a phrase which does neither.

Inasmuch, therefore, as the operation and efficiency of the Single Tax would be the same under either of these three names or forms of land tenure, cannot Single Taxers well afford to disregard this point upon which they themselves, as well as others are disagreed, and unite upon a declaration of purpose in which all may be agreed?

Boston, Jan. 1, 1906.

C. B. FILLEBROWN.

[We print Mr. Fillebrown's communication because it is a statement of his position, in which some of the members of the Massachusetts Single Tax League share. It is by no means the view of any large percentage of Single Taxers anywhere, but it is interesting as furnishing a viewpoint from which we doubt not certain conservative minds may survey the approaches to our ultimate end with less inclination to hesitate. We say the "approaches" only, since "the ultimate end" is the same in any case. When a reasonable percentage of land values is taken—and what is reasonable will be determined by how much it is practicable to take, limited only by the present needs of government and such extension of its functions as may be called for—the purely abstract question of ownership will have ceased to interest anybody.

The metaphysics of the controversy are tempting, but we refrain from combatting Mr. Fillebrown's position so forcibly, and, on the whole, so clearly stated. Those who venture to take exception should bear in mind that Mr. Fillebrown is to-day the most successful protagonist of the measure to shift taxation from improvements to land values in the whole length and breadth of the land. We know of no one—not even the Hon. Tom L. Johnson—who has so impressed the influential elements of a great community with the ethical quality and practical value of the Single Tax, as well as his own "sweet reasonableness."

Mr. Fillebrown, on page 51 of the REVIEW, returns again to the subject in an endeavor to show that Tolstoy's recent pronouncement, entitled "A Great Iniquity," is in perfect accord with his own views on land ownership.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.]

Tom Watson criticises Tolstoy's land ideas in a long indictment. This is natural, and very human, when it is understood that Tom "owns half the county" in which he lives. Of course he can see no evil in land monopoly, but thinks the whole lies in finance and transportation. Tom is a reformer, limited. Watson is from Georgia and Tolstoy from Russia, and this one outclasses that, in mental breadth, about as far as Russia outclasses Georgia in her physical dimensions.—Ellis County (Texas) *Mirror*.

## PRIVATE PROPERTY IN LAND.

### FROM MRS. TWITCHELL.

#### "UNCONSCIOUS DECEPTION."

##### EDITOR *Single Tax Review*:

I am glad the question of private property in land has reached **THE REVIEW**, where I hope to see it discussed in a broad, tolerant spirit, and I beg for space to answer two points, made by our able Editor, since these two cover concisely nearly the whole contention.

First, he claims that Brother Martin, and all who agree with him, are practicing "unconscious deception, unworthy of our cause ;" yet he desires Mr. Fillebrown to continue in this "deception," since it has produced such good results. This statement does not sound "nice" when put in plain speech. Why? Because deep, down in the editor's heart, he knows that those who are advocating private property in land are doing it honestly, that they are not trimming down a principle in order to make converts.

It would, indeed, be deceptive, and cowardly for one who did not believe in private property in land, to dodge that question for the sake of making converts ; but to assert that it is deception for others to do so, is not argument but bold assertion. Indeed, it is more than this, it is assuming to know the thoughts and *motives* of others, better than they know them themselves.

I once had the good fortune to listen to one of the editors of *The New Earth*,—one of the rarest, sweetest spirits our noble cause has produced. He was teaching a class in Single Tax, and this, in brief, was the way he explained this vexed question :

"Theoretically we do not believe in private property in land ; but practically, legally we do."

Both sides contend that each side is injuring our cause, for it is as false to say that we believe in private property in land, *as it now exists*, as it is to say, unqualifiedly, that the Single Tax would abolish all private property in land. Both are false, but to my mind, the latter contains the most "unconscious deception, unworthy of our cause."

Not long ago, one of our worthy apostles, who has a zeal so pronounced as to make him, in spirit, twin brother to Saint Paul himself, spoke before a Boston audience on the Single Tax. No doubt his address was an excellent one, but the next morning the Press reported only one line of his speech, and it was this : "We Single Taxers do not believe in private property in land." There it stood in cold type for all to read. I am not over emotional, but I could have shed tears when I saw it ; for I knew that that statement, standing alone, would turn thousands of farm and home-owners away from a desire to know anything more of our doctrines. That would be all they cared to know. For them, that would settle the question. Now, I do not accuse our good brother of "unconscious deception." He is too brave for that. He believes what he says, and believes it so thoroughly that he half thinks no one can think otherwise and be honest. To question the motives of all who do not agree with us has long been one of the cheap and common arguments of reformers. But, pray tell us, which requires the most courage,—to advocate the abolition of private property in land before an audience of strangers and take the consequence—indifference ; or to assert one's conviction that the Single Tax will not destroy titles to land, in opposition to the cherished belief of some of your most beloved friends and time-honored leaders of the cause? Is it not just as well to believe in the honesty, the bravery and loyalty of all who advocate the teachings of Henry George?

Secondly—and I will be brief—the editor asserts that "our justification for demanding the full *value* of land, is our denial of the right to private property

in *it*." Evidently the word "*it*," here refers to land; but if for "*it*" you substitute the term "land values" I think all can agree with him.

Land, to-day, bears a tax of one and one-half per cent. on its value; yet this tax does not affect its title. If this tax were doubled to-morrow would titles to *land* be any less secure? The truth is that land has two values,—a selling value, the title to which the Single Tax would destroy. We do not believe in private property in those values which are caused by the general progress of civilization; even Mr. Carnegie now agrees to that.

But land has also another value—a value that it had before it possessed a selling value—a value of utility. This value it still has—as a farm, or as a foundation for buildings. This value should be owned in order to secure ownership in the improvements, and I doubt if you could convince Mr. Carnegie to the contrary, or any other practical, business man.

Theoretically no one can own land, because it cannot be moved from place to place, but legally it can be owned by contract. The Single Tax would destroy no title-deeds to land, but it would destroy private ownership in public values.

Look at the wonderful progress made in England, where hardly a word is said regarding private property in land. Read the Traveyan tract, on "Land Taxation and the Use of Land," and you will discover one of the causes of the rapid advancement of our doctrines under such wise and statesmanlike leaders.

ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL.

[We are glad to print Mrs. Twitchell's letter. We have only one comment to make, and that is that we did not accuse anyone of practicing "unconscious deception." In order to make this clear let us quote what we did say. After stating Mr. Fillebrown's position (see autumn number of THE REVIEW) we said: "With this view Mr. William Lloyd Garrison, Mr. Lothrop and others take issue. The aim and purpose of the Single Tax is to destroy private property in land, which is the curse of civilization. Its purpose is to secure equal rights to land, the common heritage. Mr. Garrison holds that to conduct the agitation in terms that fail to deny the iniquity of private property in land is to minimize the strength of the forces that can ultimately be aligned in our support, and that it involves in its counsel of caution an unconscious deception unworthy of our cause." In this we were stating not our own views, but those of Mr. Garrison—which we think we have fairly stated.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.]

---

It is still true that all men have equal rights to the use of land. It is no longer true that men all require to use land in equal portions, or that equal portions of land are even approximately of equal value. We can now assert our equal rights in land by having the rent of land paid into a common fund, and either divided equally or spent for the common benefit. The modern method of removing our neighbor's landmark is to put the rental value of land into private pockets instead of into the public exchequer, and the first step, in modern times, towards reasserting the ancient and eternal principles which underlay Mosaic land laws is the taxation of land values. —The London *Echo*.

---

Nothing pays better than good roads, but some people are powerful slow about finding it out. Tennessee, as a matter of fact, ought to have a State Highway Commission, headed by a first-class road-making engineer. The expense of such a commission would be more than offset by the benefits accruing from the construction of good roads in the several counties. Good roads mean enhanced land values and enhanced land values mean more money for the State and counties and land-owners.—Nashville (Tenn.) *American*.



## TAX REFORM, OR LAND REFORM—WHICH?

MR. OGDEN RE-STATES HIS POSITION.

EDITOR *Single Tax Review*:

The controversy among Single Tax men, as to the justice or injustice of private property in land, began when it was first discovered that the annual rent of land was about double the expense of government, and that a single tax on the rental value of land would therefore take only half of that value.

The fact that the rental value was at least equal to the tax needed to support government, was seriously questioned by some authorities, and Mr. Thomas G. Shearman gathered such information as he could obtain, and made a careful, and very satisfactory approximate estimate of the amount of rental value in New York City, and found that a tax of about fifty per cent. would yield the full revenue for State and City taxes.

This discovery was of great practical value. It settled the doubt that Professor William T. Harris, U. S. Commissioner of Education, had raised as to the sufficiency of ground rent to meet the needs of government. But it did more,—it raised the question among Single Taxers—What shall be done with the remaining fifty per cent.?

Mr. Shearman stood for what was then called the Single Tax “limited,” that is, for taking in taxes only so much of rent as would meet the needs of government. As Mr. George declared for what he regarded as the broader question of common ownership of land, he did not agree with Mr. Shearman, except in so far, that for the present it was expedient to limit our demand as suggested by Mr. Shearman.

But the logic of the fact that the landowner would still enjoy one-half of the rental value of his land, would not let the alleged moral issue in Mr. George’s great work remain quiet. Their belief in the justice of taking the full rental value stirred the souls of the earnest followers of Henry George, and a breach occurred between the “Unlimited” and the “Limited” Single Taxers.

Many were not satisfied with the position taken by Mr. George, but some of these did not blindly follow Mr. Shearman, who opposed no other argument to Single Tax “Unlimited” than that of mere expediency. The “Limited” Single Taxers were referred to as subordinating the great moral issue of the injustice of private ownership in land, to the mere material issue of a great fiscal reform.

At that time, about 1890, I made another, and a critical examination of *Progress and Poverty* and then found the error of Mr. George revealed in Book III., Chap. I., where occurs the only vague, and incomplete statement in a work marvelous for purity of style, and the rare analytical power of its great author. Following an inquiry into the laws of distribution and their necessary relation, he makes this remarkable statement: “It is, further, a matter of fact, that in every community which has passed the most primitive stage, some portion of the produce is taken in taxation and consumed by government. But it is not necessary, in seeking the laws of distribution, to take this into consideration. We may consider taxation either as not existing, or as by so much reducing the produce. \* \* \* After we have discovered the laws of distribution we can then see what bearing, if any, taxation has upon them.”

Certainly, if the first sentence in the above quotation states a fact, taxation is as truly a law of distribution as that association is a law of the human species. Taxes, rent, wages, and interest are the four grand divisions of the distribution of wealth, and the importance of the first is seen in its adoption by Henry

George as the efficient remedy for the alleged evil of land ownership, which he has found by leaving out of his analysis of the distribution of wealth all consideration of the factor of taxation.

Of course the error was fundamental, and fatal to a proper solution of the great problem, which was to find the cause of poverty, and a remedy; and it was only after he had thus erroneously found that private property in land is unjust, that he adopted the expediency of taking rent through the medium of the tax office. As Mr. Pleydell says: "The term 'Single Tax' applied to his philosophy was not of his coining or seeking."

He did not see that the cause of the unfair distribution of wealth was owing to the interference of a false system of taxation; and this is the more remarkable because he found the single tax *per se* to be the only just tax, agreeing in perfect harmony with the accepted canons of taxation. He afterwards referred to it as a natural tax, and sought to know why Adam Smith did not adopt the views of the Physiocrats. On page 167, in *The Science of Political Economy*, Mr. George says: "Even if Adam Smith had seen the place of the Single Tax in the natural order, as the natural means to supply the natural needs of civilized society, &c." Yet even in this last of his writings, after the clear statement quoted, he, in a subsequent chapter, again declines to consider taxation as a proper subject for political economy, and in language as vague and incomplete as he had used in the above quotation from *Progress and Poverty*, he dismisses the subject as not germane to his inquiry. On page 426, he says: "Taxation is a matter of human law, while the proper subject of science is natural law."

Now where is the truth? If, as nearly all men believe, landownership is just, and as many believe, the Single Tax "Limited" is just, how is it to be proved? Perhaps I can help you to understand my views of this proposition by attempting to tell in my way the story of the first settler, in *Progress and Poverty*, Book IV., Chap. II.

Let us imagine the first settler in a wild country taking up a piece of land. Now suppose another settler locating by the first; then the difference between the wealth the first settler will be able to produce by associated effort with his neighbor, and what he before produced by himself, is the profit in association, and this is rental value. If more settlers come along they will naturally locate near these two, and the difference that each of them will produce in association with the others, over what he could produce if he went farther on and settled by himself, is his profit in the association; and he would not rent his place to another for less than this annual profit. But if this were all, every new settler would simply take land near by, and no one would pay rent for land when there was abundance of free land in the immediate neighborhood. Rent of land would simply be the profit in association enjoyed by the user, but it would have no exchangeable value, if this were all. But this is not all. The association of settlers would form a society, and government would appear, and with it security of tenure. The settlers could only associate by means of roads, and these would be opened and extended as the society grew, and the land bordering on the roads would of course have a greater value than outlying land of equal fertility, and, as the extent of the road itself would limit the amount of land so benefited, the profit in association to a land owner enjoying the road would be the wealth he could produce, over what he could produce on land without the use of a road, less his share of the cost of the road. And this rule would apply to every other function of government. The administration of justice, and the school, would benefit only those within the area supplied; the value of the land would reflect the appreciation of other men for the advantages of government; the profit in association would be the annual rent of the land less the cost of government, and this profit would have an exchangeable value, for the reason that every service of government is limited to a certain area, and only those

within the area can enjoy the benefits. And men would pay rent to live within the area.

Let this primitive settlement grow into a large city, and still the services of government will be limited to a certain area. The streets, the railways, and gas, electricity, schools, water supply, sewers, police, and the administration of law and justice, will all be found to be limited to a certain area. And the owners of land within that area will enjoy all the profit of association, which profit is the rental value of the land less the taxes paid for the support of government.

Mr. George noticed that when the first settler chose his place, the broad Savannah offered unlimited opportunities alike desirable; but Mr. George did not notice that the land occupied by the settlers was afterwards changed materially from the surrounding country, changed by the laying out of roads, causing a permanent and exclusive advantage to the blocks or sections of land formed by the roads.

There is nothing in ancient philosophy, Mr. Pleydell, so dark and impenetrable, as the conclusion that Mr. George arrived at when he said: "\* \* \* the same land, in nothing changed, which when our first settler came upon it had no value at all."

Mr. Pleydell says: "To say that each block is a product of labor and capital, is misleading. \* \* \* Labor and capital have worked to the boundaries, but that site within the bounds is "in nothing changed," &c. And yet Mr. Pleydell will contend with equal positiveness, and more reasonableness, that labor applied to the exterior or "boundaries" of a block of marble, changes the whole stone "within the bounds," from a piece of land to a product of labor. Now suppose the stone to be three hundred feet long by two hundred feet wide, and labor be applied to its boundaries so as to form a city block, as many blocks of stone in Manhattan have been formed, would it be any less a product of labor?"

Of course, as soon as you admit that the society of persons composing a government do change the form of the land surface by constructing roads and streets, and that city blocks and county farm sections are products of labor paid for with taxes, then you will see that property in land is not only necessary, but that the profit of association to the said society of persons should be enjoyed by each member according to his individual participation in the work of all, or, in other words, that every owner of land shall pay, we will say, fifty per cent. of his rental value to the tax collector, and keep the balance as his squarely earned share of the said profit of association.

Mr. Pleydell looks forward to the time when rental value will decrease so that the entire profit of association will be taken to maintain it! A very gloomy future, indeed, from which I would rescue him, with the assurance that under the Single Tax the profit of association will tremendously increase, and the proportion enjoyed by individual landowners (and there will be few tenants), will likewise greatly increase. Of course every Single Taxer knows that economic rent, or as I name it, the profit in association, does not require landlords and tenants to determine its existence.

Mr. George promised that the Single Tax "in its turn would lead to an increase in the value of land—a new surplus which society might take for general purposes." (Book IX., Chap. I., P. and P.) It was because he failed to notice that the effect of governmental expenditure is to make double the amount in rental value of the land served by it, that he suggested that the surplus could be used up by spending it on free libraries, free street cars, etc. You can't overtake it, and it would be a crime to waste it. It belongs to those who under the Single Tax will pay for it. It is the legitimate profit in association.

WM J. OGDEN.



## REPLY BY A. C. PLEYDELL.

Some of the questions raised by Mr. Ogden were discussed in the October REVIEW in an article by him and a reply by me, to which Mr. Ogden now rejoins.

In my reply to Mr. Ogden, from which he quotes in part, I said: "When Mr. George refers 'throughout all his work to land as an unchangeable thing' he is always using the word land, as he explains many times, in the sense of opportunity, location, site, and site being a dimension does not change in quality; only the use made of it changes." Mr. Ogden does not disprove these statements.

While labor applied to the exterior of a block of marble changes the stone from a piece of land to a product of labor, it in no wise changes the site, as opportunity for location, from which the marble was taken or upon which it may be left (except as it may leave a hole to fill in). If labor were applied to the boundaries of a huge block of stone so as to form a city block of dwellings, that block would have two distinct values. It would have improvement value and land value, and for a time "rent" paid for that block would be partly a rent for improvement and partly a rent for land, and the amount of the latter could be determined readily by comparisons with other sites that do not have similar improvement. Philadelphia is largely built of bricks made from clay dug on its own site. But the value for building purposes of an abandoned brick yard does not depend at all on the labor that was spent on making bricks there.

Mr. Ogden alleges another error in "Progress and Poverty," because Mr. George says in effect that it is not necessary in seeking the laws of distribution to take taxation into consideration. Mr. Ogden then says "taxes, rent, wages and interest are the four grand divisions of the distribution of wealth." While he was about it he might have included railroad charges, the extortions of lighting monopolies, and any other imposition upon the producers and consumers of wealth.

Taxation is not a primary distribution, but a secondary one. It may and does come out of rent and wages in varying degree, and sometimes does not come out of rent at all. Landlord and tenant agree upon the rent of land without regard to taxation. What they consider are the productivity of a certain site and its relation to the available supply of land.

While it is in a sense true that in nearly every community some portion of the produce is taken by the government and that this is generally called taxation, this does not prove taxation to be a law of distribution. For there have been organized communities with no government; and there have been and are plenty of "governments" that are solely spoilers and that render no economic service whatever for the tribute they levy.

Assuredly in a social organization where the government took everything that it could lay its hands on, the question of landownership would not be fundamental. But among the western nations where taxes are intended to bear some relation even though remote to service, the "robber that takes all that is left" is private ownership of land.

The separate assessment of land in New York supplies data for computations unavailable to Mr. Shearman. Leaving out the franchises of public service corporations, the land values of New York City (as taxed) are about three billion dollars, and the rent based on this would be about \$200,000,000, including what is now taken in taxes. The total tax bill of the city under direct taxation for federal, state and local purposes would be about \$150,000,000 or 75% of the rental value. As a large part of the land is unused the actual rent paid annually is probably no more than the tax bill would be. The increase in pro-

duction under Single Tax and the decrease in rents due to the forcing of more land into use, would likely offset each other. However, these matters are largely guesswork and are not essential.

Mr. Ogden does not explain how 50% (or any other per cent.) of the rental value of land is the measure of a share in the profit of association that accords with the owner's individual participation in the work of all. This might or might not be true if everyone were a land owner, but when half the people are landless it certainly is not true.

But Mr. Ogden's main argument is based upon a fallacy. He assumes that rent is the measure of the entire "profit of association," when it is no such thing. His error is indeed fundamental and invalidates all his conclusions.

Whatever increase in productive power is equally advantageous upon every sort of land in use will not increase rent. When Mr. Ogden speaks of rent under certain conditions having no exchangeable value he is mixing his terms. When there is so much free land that no one need pay any rent then there is no rent, and the increased production of wealth due to association is increased wages. It is true that economic rent can exist without there being landlords and tenants. It is also true that economic rent and the "profit of association" are not interchangeable terms.

Until Mr. Ogden refutes these assertions and demonstrates the correctness of his own contention, it would be superfluous to discuss the minor questions raised of the relation of taxes to profit from governmental functions.

I do look forward to a decrease in rental value, but this outlook is not gloomy, for I expect it to coincide with an increase in the profit of association, and that the net result will be a great increase in wages. I would rather have the Single Tax result in more equal land value, lower rents and higher wages, than in higher land values, even though these went to the community. But whichever effect it has, no one should be allowed to retain rent on the fallacious plea that it is a measure of his service to the community.

A. C. PLEYDELL.

---

## A HERITAGE WORTHILY UPHELD.

(For the Review.)

By GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

It is not an easy task to live up to a great name. It is harder, in fact, than to make a name, as the latter task is a self-chosen one, the choice for which comes with the power to accomplish. To live up to an inherited name is something imposed upon some of us whether we have the power to accomplish it or not. Henry George, Jr., is proving, in his published work, as well as in his political life, that he is capable of living up to his heritage. His second book, "The Menace of Privilege" (New York, Macmillan and Company) takes its place with its predecessor, "The Life of Henry George," as a worthy and necessary addition to the economic library given the world by his father.

Mr. George's book bears the sub-title "A Study of the Dangers to the Republic from the Existence of a Favored Class;" it might with full right call itself "American History Up to Date." For it gives a true and exact history of developments in our social life within the last fifty years, or more properly,

---

\* The Menace of Privilege. By Henry George, Jr. See adv. among back pages.

within the last century, developments far more important as historical evolution than the fact that we sent men out to kill other men in various places. This last being what is called in our schools and newspapers, "Making history."

Mr. George does not attempt to comment upon, or even to elucidate, except in terms of popular exposition, the economic philosophy which made his father famous. He wishes merely to show us how true the prophecies that were uttered by the author of *Progress and Poverty*, and how surely social life is taking the turn he predicted it would take, unless the great truth he had laid bare to us is heeded. There is a great deal in this book of the younger Henry George that might win for it the popular success which would lend far-reaching power to its teachings. There is an enormous public that loves to read of the luxury and the looseness of the private lives of our multi-millionaires, and Mr. George has a good deal to say on the subject. But the connection in which he says it, and the moral he draws from such conditions, are not of a nature to strike the fancy of a sensation-loving public. The public that revels in the stories of laxness of morals prevailing in moneyed circles and the absurd luxury that has become a disease there, likes to be told that this is because of personal depravity on the part of these rich ones. \* \* \* A sort of consolation for those not so rich, and a sign, in their eyes, of the benevolence of God in distributing his gifts of morals and riches in inverse ratio. Mr. George says nothing of the kind, however. And furthermore, he plainly tells the less rich that not the moral laxness of the very rich is at fault, but that the civic laxness of the middle strata is responsible for the conditions they appear to think so abhorrent. This is a fearlessness which may cost the book some readers, but which gives it its greatest value.

The book comes at the right moment. There is a spirit of unease abroad in the air, a feeling of awakening consciousness that things in the body public are not as they should be \* \* \* and a still more dangerous feeling that they *can* be changed somehow. At such a moment a book that puts the blame calmly and sanely where it belongs, that does not point at persons, but at systems; and that does this in an easily comprehensible popular manner, backed by an array of easily proven facts, such a book can be of tremendous value.

Mr. George has made his book a study of what Privilege,—those vested rights made sacred by man-made laws antagonistic to God's laws; *i. e.*, natural laws, has done in bringing about a false distribution of wealth, and therefore an unhinging of all social conditions. He has not attempted to do it in the large philosophic manner in which his father treated the subject, but has shown us, by examples taken from our life here and now, that his father's doctrines were not merely academic theories, but were truths as important to the welfare of the body public as the laws of sanitation are for the physical body. He has done something worth while therefore, and has done it well.

The volume is subdivided into nine Books in which various phases of the subject are treated. Privilege itself is explained in the first book; then the types of those who profit by Privilege and the types of those who suffer under it are given two large and important divisions. Under the title of Resistance to Privilege, two chapters on Labor Unionism contain the sanest material that has been written about this important subject yet. The Weapons of Privilege come next, the perverting of justice through corrupted courts, and that hideous crime of modern time, the use of the bayonet in civil affairs. Then the influence of Privilege in the corrupting of politics and the perverting of the official guides of public opinion,—the press, the university and the church, is described. An interesting division warns against the dangers of centralization of government and foreign aggression, two evils that must follow Privilege grown powerful; and the last book, *The Remedy*, gives a short, popular exposition of the Single Tax, and of the methods and results of public ownership of natural monopolies.



The tone of the book is most hopeful in spite of an unflinching fidelity in the portrayal of apparently hopeless conditions.

It is difficult to single out the most important points in a book which treats of so many important things. The matter of the influence on the social life of a nation of the piling up of enormous fortunes in a few hands, with resulting widespread dire poverty for the many, is certainly a vital matter. It is also a vital matter that Privilege should thus corrupt our politics, and hold out its threat over what should be freest, the education of the growing mind. All these Mr. George treats of, and treats of them well. There are two other matters, however, which are so pressing and actual for the moment, and which he writes of in a manner so fearlessly true, that it is from these chapters I would like to quote a few of the many good things he says.

The problem of labor unions is a most difficult one for the modern radical, particularly for the Single Taxer, to solve. Our radical sympathies naturally lie with the workingman seeking his honest share of the wealth he produces, and we realize that, under present economic conditions, organization is the only means by which the great body of the workers can be helped. But the many vital mistakes made by the unions, their distorted point of view in a fostering of class hatred \* \* \* and a hatred turned toward the minor evil instead of the greater \* \* \* their false conception of the problem presented to them, and their apparent lack of understanding of fundamental truths; all these make it hard for us to be on their side in their fight for that justice for which we ourselves are fighting. But while Mr. George is quite frank in pointing out the mistakes of the unions, particularly in regard to the tariff, and in regard to the benevolent slavery in which they keep their members \* \* \* though he recognizes that while such slavery is not compatible with free conditions \* \* \* still he says: "Conditions are not free. Privilege controls the avenues of employment and in that sense tends to enslave laborers. If labor unions are against the free exercise of personal liberty, censure should not be bestowed upon the unions without first condemning Privilege, which drives laborers to this course." The two chapters on trades unions are illuminating and instructive in their calm, impartial sanity.

Then there is another question which calls for consideration from every right-thinking man and woman in our country. This is the growing tendency to use the bayonet in civil affairs, to make of the army, federal or state militia, a sort of police force for internal troubles, but a police force that is dangerous and hostile to every principle of liberty in that it is above and outside civil law, and responsible only to its own courts and code of ethics for whatever it does. The presence of a body of men systematically trained to hold in scorn and contempt the laws and moral codes that regulate the lives of other citizens, is always a terrible menace in a nation that calls itself civilized. This is what the armies of to-day are to the nations of to-day,—not a protection, but a direct menace to every principle of liberty. And Privilege has been quick to recognize the power of this weapon standing outside the law. Mr. George shows how recent events have proven what use Privilege can and does make of this deadly anachronism we still foolishly foster in our body public. Among other instances he describes the Colorado strike, put down by troops, and adds a warning which is only too terribly true.

"Now, as has been said, a strike is not according to the natural order of things. It is only a temporary expedient of combined laborers. But if, under cloak of protecting life and property against strikers, a military despotism is for a season to be erected, what is to become of the sacred principles of liberty? If this can be done in one State, why should it not be done in others? If miners in one part of the United States, because they are labor unionists, can be thrown into prison or deported, why cannot miners in other places be similarly treated?

If the owners of Colorado can substitute bayonet for ballot rule, why should not the coal, steel, and transportation lords of Pennsylvania take it as a precedent? Why should not the railroad masters of California, Nevada, Oregon and Washington hail it and follow it? Why bother with popular suffrage in New York, Ohio, Connecticut, Illinois or Massachusetts? If a Governor of Colorado can, on pretext of protecting life and property, set aside civil government and establish in its stead arbitrary military rule by which citizens are cast into prison or deported without charge, and by which regularly elected public officials are deposed to give place to appointees of Privilege, why should this not some day be done by a President over the country at large?

"Nor can the fulfillment of these possibilities appear so remote when we realize that what has been done in Colorado has really only been in the free exercise of principles clearly established by a President of the United States, who sent Federal troops to Chicago at the behest of railroad powers there and despite the protests of the Governor of Illinois."

And one word more of much that might be quoted on this vital subject.

"Privilege uses the soldiers of the Republic as it uses the courts—for itself and in violation, in abrogation, of the rights of the body of the people."

---

## THE PEOPLE VS. LANDLORDISM.

(For the Review).

By RALPH HOYT.

I have sometimes thought that if Landlordism, the great criminal of the age, were placed on trial before a Judge and jury, the case would be intensely interesting. I have also contemplated the probable charge of the Judge to the jury, after the evidence had been heard, and presuming His Honor to be a fair-minded, clear-headed man, with a desire to administer exact justice, without fear or favor.

I can easily imagine that his instructions to the jury would be couched in substantially the following language:

"Never before in the history of American jurisprudence was a jury called upon to decide a case of such grave importance as the case now and here under consideration. It involves the question of human rights in a broader and more far-reaching sense than any case mentioned in any of the reports. You, the jury, have listened attentively to the evidence and to the arguments of learned counsel. You are a jury of exceptional intelligence, selected by counsel not because you knew nothing about the case, had never read the newspapers, had no opinions of your own, and were incapable of forming any; but because of other and better qualifications. In this particular the learned counsel have wisely ignored the usual practice in jury trials and this Court heartily commends them for so doing. The case which you are called upon to decide involves not only the natural rights of the present residents of this city, county and State, but the rights of all the people now living on this earth, and all who may hereafter be born. The question for the jury to determine is whether all human beings born into this world have an inalienable right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness—as proclaimed by our forefathers as long ago as 1776. Though that declaration has in recent years fallen into the shades of forgetfulness, it may be well for the jury in this case to recall it to mind and give it due weight.

"On behalf of the people I give you these instructions:

"If the jury believes from the evidence that land is man's inheritance; that no person can exist on earth without using it; that all are equally entitled to its use; that those who appropriate particular pieces of land for private use should pay the community for the enjoyment of that special privilege, because the community by its growth and enterprise gives to such special privilege a value which it would not otherwise have—then the jury should find for the claimants.

"On behalf of the defense, I give you these instructions: If you believe that the right to life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness does not carry with it the right of access to those natural resources essential to human life and without the use of which none can exist, that conclusion should have great weight on the side of the defendant. And if you believe that use of land and everything implied by the term is not essential to men's physical existence; that land ownership, and not labor applied to land, produces wealth; that land monopoly and plenty of it is what makes cities, States, and Nations prosperous; that the earth was made for a few persons to own in order that they may thus own the landless millions of their fellow beings and exact toll from them for the privilege of existing on the landlord's earth; that immense tracts of unused, but valuable, land, and unimproved but valuable city lots, held for speculation, are more conducive to the general welfare than are properly improved farms and city lots covered with beautiful, convenient buildings; that taxing monopoly is wrong and taxing labor and the fruits thereof is wise and just; that checking the production of needful things adds to the sum of human happiness; that a man has no natural right to that which he produces by his own efforts, but has a natural right to land values, which were not created by him, but by the community as a whole; that it is proper and just for the people of the United States to pour billions of dollars of their earnings annually into the coffers of Land Monopoly, as a donation—if you believe these things, then you should return a verdict for the defense, with costs of suit assessed against the people—who, the Court would incidentally remark—are so accustomed to being bled that they will not complain.

"Contrary to the usual custom in Courts of record I will not require the jury to be locked up by a bailiff in an unventilated room till you reach a verdict either by agreement or by a game of cards; but I will permit you to go at large, meet and converse with your fellow citizens, discuss economic questions, attend meetings of Economic Clubs, and do such other things as may seem to you lawful and proper. You will be expected, however, to record your verdict at the polls whenever an opportunity is offered you to help decide the great case of the People versus Landlordism."

---

As one reads the current periodicals the thought is impressed that it seems a great pity Henry George could not have lived to this day. During his life he was generally reviled as a dangerous socialist. But no feature of economic thought has made more progress in recent years than the denial of the right of private ownership in land. His belief that no man is entitled to hold more land than he can make use of and that every man is entitled to all the land he can use is coming to be adopted in unexpected quarters. Those who condemn it are perhaps not aware that it has behind it the great authority of Adam Smith, and those who call it unpractical do not know that it is the law on which nearly all the land in India is held. The coal famine in 1902-3 made a multitude of converts to this theory, and the belief is growing that of God's great gifts, water, earth and air, no one should be allowed to set apart for himself more than he can make good use of.—*Louisville Courier-Journal*.



## MUNICIPAL OWNERSHIP—THEORY AND PRACTICE,

(For the Review).

By CHARLES H. INGERSOLL.

The futility of government control of enterprises it does not own is every day demonstrated, and follows the general principle that control is inalienable from ownership; to permit ownership and deny control of property is a negation of rights involving utter impracticability.

It is but a capitulation and compromise—a wavering from the plain indication of correct theory.

Management would be handicapped and efficiency reduced through interference, with no corresponding gain to the public.

I therefore address myself to the proposition of Municipal Ownership, which to my mind presents itself in two phases, theoretical and practical, and as every practical matter must have a good theory behind it, a thorough questioning of the basic principles of public ownership is essential.

The purely practical side may be under various circumstances seriously questioned, and Municipal Ownership would in many cases seem quite impracticable unless approached from the standpoint of a correct theory.

Theoretically, *private* ownership of *public* utilities, is a sheer impossibility, and its toleration in this age is a commentary on our advancement. It seems to me that this is one of those self-evident things that people have persistently refused to see; it is one of the paradoxes—fully realized and demonstrated—and a saving feature is that we now have our eyes opened to the fruits of this policy, in corrupted municipal councils, imposition, and extortion from the corporations, inadequate or dishonest service, monstrosities in our public streets and works, future generations mortgaged, and stock watered and sold and resold to widows and orphans to satisfy the greed of frenzied financiers.

The question of Municipal Ownership attaches to what are known as public utilities, or services; going beyond this certainly takes us towards Socialism, and to the average mind going this far is dangerously near to that awe-inspiring scheme, which, of course, accounts for much of the popular bias against it.

That it is socialistic except in a most general sense, is readily disproven by pointing to existing public utilities, the right of municipal ownership of which no one questions; for example, schools, sewers, highways, police and fire protection, poor houses, jails, and a long list of public services.

So the indications are that whether socialistic or not, the term Public Utilities is a variable one which must be currently defined in the light of circumstances and conditions.

A usual and economically correct definition of Public Utilities is based upon whether the service is monopolistic or competitive, and if the former, it should be considered public, and therefore publicly operated, and if competitive it should remain in private hands.

This theory of public ownership is based on broad grounds of justice to all—the greatest good to the greatest number—by which is meant that to the people collectively is reserved that which they create and own, without to any degree affecting the rights of the humblest individual in what is private property.

This theory is so obviously correct, that so far as I can conceive, the only debatable questions are as to its application, or we may say, the selection of services for public ownership.

Continuing from the theoretical viewpoint, and accepting the monopolistic

test for assigning certain functions to public ownership, we have already adopted, generally, roads, sidewalks, sewers, water supply, and to quite an extent in this country, gas, electricity, heat, power, transportation, and some miscellaneous services; and discarding the monopoly test, there are numerous functions that are fixed public institutions, such as schools, parks, baths, poor houses and jails, libraries, museums and hospitals, cemeteries, etc., etc., some of which relatively are remote from universal public use.

All of which shows the extent to which we are actually committed by precedent and practice to municipal ownership.

We may, therefore, consider the theoretical side of the question disposed of, by summing up that Municipal Ownership is founded on right ethics of government; is applicable to all business of a public character, especially with reference to its monopolistic nature; has been in practice for ages, coincident with various other functions of government.

As to the practical side—and there may be more or less theory also in this—there can be no doubt that we are in the midst of a saturnalia of exploitation, because of our failure to recognize the correct relation of the public to its utilities—allowing them to be the basis of every imaginable scheme of finance and speculation.

Largely by reason of private ownership of public utilities our Municipal Governments have degenerated into political machines or adjuncts to the larger state and national machines, fully justifying some radical's opinion that "the government must own the railroads or the railroads will own the government."

In fact this whole question might well be boiled down to this proposition, that the public service corporations do in all practical matters relating to the services, substantially control our Municipal Governments.

Such a condition is easily accounted for—a City Council is the trustee of public property of enormous value; with hazy views both as to its being a public asset, and of its value as well, its members are, especially if of low average character, easy marks for the shrewd efforts of the corporations whose business it is to get such public franchises and sell or juggle with them in Wall Street.

The fault is ours in permitting this temptation, and in refusing to accept for our representatives the full responsibility for public business, and then compelling them to handle it properly.

We elect men to handle public affairs and then by implication or directly, instruct them to farm them out.

The argument that cites present political corruption, as a reason why we should not consider public ownership, is, I think, refuted by what I have just said—remove service corporation temptation and give your Council this important work to do (instead of the dickering with corporations) and then turn them out if they do not do it.

At least this may be said: if your public officials are corrupt they cannot sell you, your children, and your children's children out *perpetually*, as they are now doing daily; they can only do it piecemeal under Municipal Ownership by way of petty graft, such as padded pay rolls, commissions on purchases, etc., and this is easy to detect, and is an unpopular form of stealing.

The danger of placing increased voting influence in political hands is the most common argument against extension of Municipal Ownership, and while there is considerable force to this argument it seems to me much exaggerated.

Civil Service is giving us progressively less to fear from this source, and we are rapidly learning not to consider as inevitable the success of the machines backed by municipal employees.

And on their part, employees are enfranchising themselves by declaring their independence.

Ballot reforms assist in minimizing this defect.

But conceding it in its fullest measure, I would still say that the balance under the head of "Corruption" is largely in favor of public ownership; the influence on voters exists under present conditions almost as strongly as if the employees were public employees, through various forms of coercion and threats applied by the corporations.

Frequent change of administration and consequent disruption of management is also an oft heard objection, theoretically strong but actually weak, for I do not think sufficient parallels can be cited in support of it; present functions of our government do not suffer from this cause; changes are almost as infrequent in the executive management of our post office, fire and police departments as in private businesses, and the effects are no worse; a report made by the U. S. Superintendent of Water Works Plants will confirm these statements.

It is sometimes said that private enterprise is essential to the financing of the large undertakings involved in public services. Passing over the intricate, persistent and serious disorders due to current methods of financing, including the piling of watered stock on top of bonds, and the failures resulting, the "economies" practiced in the service, in order to pay dividends on water, etc., etc., it cannot be seriously contended that any combination of individuals have facilities for borrowing money equal to a Municipality having behind its bonds the whole assessable property of the town.

I think we all feel that the rank and file of service corporation employees are overworked and underpaid—particularly those with whom we come most in contact, the street car men.

While better treatment and increased pay might imply less economy, it would not be keenly felt by a service asked to pay interest only on actual investment. We all believe labor worthy of its hire, and want no "blood money" in our public administration.

The dangerous situation that has been produced by street railway strikes, traceable to private ownership, is in itself a sufficient argument for Municipal Ownership of street railways.

My idea is that the legal right of corporations in perpetual franchises, and in fact all franchises, are merely technical; they are based on no equity, justice or morality. The granting of perpetual franchises has been without warrant, and if the highest courts do not finally declare them invalid, an aroused public sentiment will in due course produce other laws and other courts that will do so.

Beyond this it is a matter of computation to ascertain the basis of acquisition of tangible property of the corporations, naturally without a dollar of allowance for capitalized future earnings, or for foresight in the securing of these valuable franchises from misguided or dishonest Councils.

The question of confiscation receives its own answer. I would only remark that the waiver of any restitution on the part of corporations of past profits, should be a complete offset, if any is needed; and the same argument applies to presumed innocent present owners of stock. People who buy stock should know the formula on which it was issued, and be at all times prepared for a wringing process if they find themselves confronted with the interest of the whole people.

One of the most forcible reasons for Municipal Ownership of water, lights, telephone, telegraph, and railway services, is the anomaly presented in our streets by the various installations of these plants.

They would logically be laid out and administered together; this is shown by the consolidation in many cases of service companies, and when it is carried to its logical conclusion, these plants will all be constructed and administered compositively along proper engineering lines, and by local governments.

Conduits now maintained separately by telephone, telegraph and lighting companies, at infinitely greater expense and less efficiency, and to the constant



destruction of our streets, will be consolidated, and, under proper plans and rules, operated together.

This physical condition is but a reflection of the chaos that prevails in our Council Chambers, and furnishes an interesting setting for numberless star-chamber hearings and patch-work ordinances.

A full, consistent and economical administration of these services would tend rapidly to universality of use; electric light, for example, would be generally used at six or eight cents a kilowatt, at which it could be easily supplied, whereas few care to indulge at fifteen or twenty cents, the prevailing price.

Public opinion is at last crying out against corporate greed, and beginning to see how it has been the victim of it; this is gratifying, and I give due credit to the limited franchise agitation for arousing public spirit; but the work will not be complete and the question will not be settled until it is settled right.

There is no logic in permitting fifty-year franchises in place of ninety-nine; and nowhere in the descending scale do they become logical. Only when we get to the point where the people receive every dollar that is their due, which is *all* of the profit of their own utilities, will the question be finally settled.

---

## THE CHURCH AND SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS.

(For the Review.)

By W. A. DOUGLASS, B. A.

What gravitation is to the universe, that religion is to humanity. As gravitation binds the universe in a cosmos, so moral law will some day bind humanity in the harmony of brotherhood.

Religion is the supremest of sciences, the loftiest of human considerations, the bond of universal harmony, the source of the highest inspiration, the crowning of goodness, the enthronement of love, and the harbinger of universal peace.

The correct method, therefore, of developing the religious spirit and of securing the triumph of its influences must ever be a question of the highest importance.

There is a twofold application of religious truth: First, it appeals to the individual to consecrate himself to the highest ideals; second, it lays down the principles for the government of the organization of society. What the brick is to the building, what the soldier is to the army, what the wheel is to the machine, that the individual is to society.

In our evangelistic efforts this dual application of religion is almost, if not wholly, ignored. All the efforts of evangelistic organizations are almost wholly concentrated on the individual. Again and again is proclaimed the doctrine, that, if every individual were right, then the whole of society would necessarily be right. The assumption is that the goodness of the parts insures the goodness of the whole. If, however, we ask a few questions respecting this assumption, we see at once its fallacious character.

What would we think of an architect who would assure us that the soundness of a building depended altogether on the soundness of the parts, and that the arrangement of these parts is a matter of no importance? What would we think of the general who would assert that the success of the army depended wholly on the valor of the individual soldiers, and that organization, strategy

or adaptation, were of no possible importance? What would we think of the mechanic who would teach that the success of a machine depended wholly on the perfection of the parts and in no way on their adaptation, relationship or adjustment?

Can we think of teaching more irrational? A building is a great deal more than a pile of bricks; an army is a great deal more than a mass of soldiers; a machine is a great deal more than a mere aggregation of parts; and in the same way society is a great deal more than a mere assemblage of individuals.

As bad adjustment will ruin any building no matter how good the materials; as lack of organization will insure the defeat of any army no matter how good the soldiers; as bad arrangement will wreck any machine, no matter how perfect the parts; even so will bad relationship vitiate humanity, no matter how pure and how correct the religion we try to proclaim. Injustice cannot bring forth the fruits of righteousness.

We are here in charge of the architecture of society, compared with which, that of all the temples or palaces in the world, sinks into utter insignificance; we are engaged in a campaign, whose aim is the triumph of the kingdom of God; we have to determine the adjustment of a mechanism as grand and wondrous in its adaptations as anything in the heavens above or the earth beneath. And how are we grappling with this, one of the highest of all problems? We are attempting to solve it according to an assumption, which, if applied to architecture, to generalship, to machinery or to any business organization, would be the sheerest madness.

In our evangelistic efforts the servant is exhorted to be faithful to his master and the master to be considerate to his servant, but no enquiry is made, why there is such a relationship as a servant and a master, and why they are not fellow-helpers, brethren beloved. The master is regarded as satisfying the claims of honesty, when he pays the wages of the sweat shop; but he is not exhorted to investigate why it is, that, in this world of teeming abundance, such a monstrosity of iniquity as a sweat shop can have an existence.

Could there be anything more sublime than the teachings of Christianity? Further than sweep of sun or star, wider than the expanse of the heavens, loftier than the reach of human ken, there must exist a supreme dominating intelligence. In the transcendent glories of the universe there comes the overwhelming conviction "Thou art, O God, thou art." The mission of Christ was to teach us to call this being "Our Father." In the testimony of the rocks, in the wondrous mechanism of the heavens, in the sublimities and the harmonies of the universe, in the marvellous adaptations of the physical forces, in the ineffable potencies of thought and vitality, we catch glimpses of His power and we see with what ample abundance He has fitted this earth to be the habitation of man. Therefore, in humble reverence do we bow before Him, and repeat the Credo, "I believe in God the father, maker of heaven and earth." Through what ages did men grope before they reached the sublime grandeur of this summary of truth, and how many times do we repeat that declamation before we begin to possess anything like an adequate conception of its full import?

Having once accepted this creed, we are bound by the inexorable laws of thought to accept other truths necessarily sequent thereto. As a part implies a whole, as an upper implies an under, so a father implies a child, children imply a family and a family implies a brotherhood. The moment, therefore, we acknowledge the doctrine of the fatherhood, by that act we acknowledge the doctrine of the brotherhood. In addition to this we also acknowledge the doctrine of God the Creator, the provider of the earth with all its potentialities. We are brought, therefore, face to face with this important inquiry: For whom did God the Creator furnish these bounties? To declare that he furnishd them for

the special benefit of a class and not for the equal enjoyment of all, would at once negative the doctrine of fatherhood and brotherhood. Every instinct of the soul rises up in protest against such teaching. Equal brotherhood and equal heirship to the gifts of the Creator are indissolubly united, they stand or fall together. For one part of humanity to claim the right to charge the rest of humanity for the occupation of the face of the earth or for access to its bounties, is the negation of the doctrine of brotherhood and the asseveration of the doctrine of master and slave.

Between the raw material as furnished by the Creator and that material as transformed or transported by labor, there is an essential difference. By that act of transformation the laborer establishes an inalienable right of property in the value he adds thereto. Let a man demand that commodity from the producer without offering some fair equivalent for his labor, and, by an unerring instinct, by a divinely planted instinct, this producer feels that the demand is unjust. The universal consensus is, that the toiler who has produced a commodity, is entitled to a reward. He has not created material, but he has created value and by that service has established an indefeasible right of property therein. When, therefore, two men produce different commodities and then exchange them, the moral instincts recognize at once the justice of the transaction, just as unerringly as the intellectual faculties recognize the truth that the equals of any one thing are themselves equal. The justice of service for service is unerringly and unanimously conceded; but that men should be allowed to charge for that which the Creator furnished, that some men should be allowed to charge the others for the privilege of living and moving and having their being on the face of the earth, that is a doctrine the injustice of which has been demonstrated by the universal experience of the ages. That the millions, who, by their industry, produce the abundance of food, clothing and other products, should enjoy that abundance, is a doctrine that should be unhesitatingly accepted. That the man who puts in one bushel, and by his fostering care reaps twenty bushels, should own these twenty bushels, would seem to need no demonstration. But when a man acquires possession of a piece of land and makes nothing abundant, when he raises no crop of any kind from that land, by what principle of justice should he be allowed to claim a share of the crops that other hands have raised? Let population, however, gather on that land till the area for each occupant becomes very small, then, according to our present arrangements, the land owner is allowed to claim the abundance that the industry of other men has begotten. By this arrangement, therefore, the men who produce abundance, secure only scarcity, while the men who raise nothing, often secure the abundance, simply because land has become scarce, and the greater this scarcity of land, the greater is the abundance we allow the landowner to claim. In this arrangement is there not a terrible travesty of justice?

It needs but the most casual attention to notice, that between the value caused by energy of the individual and the value caused to the land by the community, there is an essential difference. By every productive act the laborer is trying to multiply the abundance of commodities, and in this way he multiplies the value. At the same time let the population of any town increase from nothing to hundreds of thousands, and to the land of that location there will come an enormous value. The first value indicates that the industry of individuals has increased the abundance of the commodities, the second value indicates that population has increased the scarcity of land. To treat these two values alike is as irrational as to confound an asset and a liability or a multiplication and a division.

And yet in our regulations respecting the rights of property and in the imposition of taxation, this essential distinction between these two values is



utterly ignored. The evil results of this failure are to be witnessed in the development of all our cities, the larger the city the greater the evidence of the injustice. With every addition to the population the landowner can claim from industry a greater tribute. Thus do we elevate non-production to a palace and crush industry down to the humble surroundings of the crowded tenement or to the pestiferous slum. Thus do we make a cleavage in society, till at one extreme we have the Millionaires' Row and at the other we have the Beggars' Alley.

By ignoring the difference between the gifts of the Creator and the products of industry, by ignoring the equal right of every one to the former and the exclusive right of the individual to the latter, by ignoring the difference between the value caused to commodities by the energy of the individual and the value caused to the land by the conjoint presence of the community, we trample on the claims of honesty and the rights of property. We destroy the possibility of brotherhood; we establish mastery and servitude; we make injustice inevitable and by so much do we make Christianity impossible. In this way we dethrone Christianity and exalt the God of Mammon.

In our churches we try to lift the attention of our hearers to the higher duties of life, to elevate their thoughts from the material to the spiritual. We renew our vows, we acknowledge our belief in the fatherhood and the brotherhood; but when we have once stepped outside the sanctuary, could the contrast between our acknowledgments and our practices be more terrible? We proclaim God the Creator, then we treat the earth as a manufactured article; we acknowledge the brotherhood, and then we nullify that acknowledgment by lifting one to the palace and driving another to the slum; we exhort to honesty, and then we punish the honest methods of acquiring wealth by increasing taxes on industry and thus encouraging and rewarding speculation.

What a contrast between the religion taught and the religion practiced! On the one hand we proclaim a goodness of heavenly beauty, and then on the other we beget a social gehenna. We repeat the hosanna, "Peace on earth, good will to men," and then we range the classes in hostile array to the masses. Is it any wonder that so many are losing faith in the churches? Sowing the seeds of injustice and then praying God to send us a harvest of righteousness; is not that a spectacle to make angels weep?

Let us, however, once succeed in bringing the adjustments of society into harmony with the eternal equities; let us learn how to recognize everyone born into the world as the child of God, as a member of a brotherhood with certain inalienable rights, by which he is entitled equally with all others to the gifts of the common Father; let us thus secure to him the opportunity to procure a livelihood with the assurance that what he sows, that shall he also reap; let us make his environment such that the path of goodness will be easy and the surroundings tend to develop all that is best in him and not the worst, as the present circumstances in many ways do; let men be placed in such relationships that each will try to confer his greatest benefit on all the rest. Then with the opportunities that will thus come for the development of the higher intelligence, with the removal of the terrible pressure of temptation that we now place in the pathway of honesty and virtue, with human law in harmony with the divine law, with the principles of righteousness enthroned in the institutions of the people, may we not look with confidence for the coming of that time by prophets and bards foretold, when the reign of evil shall forever cease and man shall attain to triumphs of goodness, compared with which, the attainments of to-day are but as the glimmering dawn to the brightness of the noon-tide glory.

Toronto, Canada.

## DIRECT LEGISLATION AND SINGLE TAX.

(For the Review.)

By JAMES P. CADMAN

Treas. Referendum League of Illinois.

It is generally agreed that throughout our nation bad laws and ordinances are constantly being passed and much needed laws and ordinances as constantly fail of enactment.

Illustrations of undesirable legislation are found in most of our large cities and at many of our State capitals.

Most of these instances are in connection with public utilities, such as water, gas, street cars, &c. Franchises of almost incalculable value are often given away for a mere song by venal legislators.

When needed legislation is not enacted it is upon subjects such as child labor, taxation, temperance, &c., designed for the protection of the weak and the exploited poor, or for the suppression of vice. In nearly all these cases it is greed for money that is the main hindrance. The few are preying upon the many; the house of Have upon the house of Want; the privileged classes upon those who are less privileged.

This injustice and inequality are not new in the world, but have for centuries characterized, with varying intensity, most of the nations of Europe and Asia, and only as intelligence and democracy make progress on those continents is any material improvement in the conditions of those peoples to be seen or expected.

In America, where the people are sovereign, there has been a good degree of justice and equality for the white man until the time shortly after our great Civil War. Since that time our people have increased so rapidly in numbers and wealth that many evils have been developed, among which are the ones previously referred to—injustice and inequality.

While our population was sparse and our legislative and business methods simple, giving opportunity for everyone and ample publicity, essential justice was obtainable by all. In local matters the town meeting—that ideal of Democracy—prevailed in many states.

When the population grew too great for convenient assembling for law-making purposes, the town-meeting gave way to the present representative system. This system has developed many evils, most of which are due to the irresponsible power of the lawmakers. The evils will be largely removed by giving the people an optional veto upon all legislation. The optional referendum, together with a possible initiative, will purify legislation and secure complete majority rule.

We have in Illinois what is known as a public policy law which is very valuable indeed, but which is generally claimed to be only advisory; and is not what the states of South Dakota and Oregon now have, viz., the Initiative and Referendum, which is exercised at the option of the voters, but which when enacted is mandatory, and binding upon all.

Last fall by means of our public policy law the people of Illinois (by a vote of 476,780 for and 140,896 against) declared in favor of an amendment to our state constitution to "enable the voters of any county, city, village or township of the State of Illinois to adopt such system of assessing and levying taxes as the voters of any such county, city, village, or township may determine."

No action by the legislature has yet been taken in regard to the matter.

In theory we to-day have majority rule through our representatives; but in practice we are largely governed by aggressive minorities representing various business interests which co-operate closely with party bosses.

Under our present system it is almost impossible to secure any desired legislation without the consent of the party leaders, and they in turn usually are mainly influenced by these business interests or by an aroused public opinion.

On subjects of ordinary concern like methods of taxation or temperance, it requires great effort and consequent expense to arouse such an expression of public opinion as will move our legislatures to action.

Last year in Illinois the temperance people of the state expended a vast amount of labor and over \$40,000 in an attempt to arouse public opinion strongly enough to cause the legislature to pass a local option law. The bill however failed of final passage by one vote.

There are good grounds for belief that had one-half of this effort and money been expended in the fall of 1902 in the attempt then made to secure an Initiative and Referendum amendment to our state constitution it would have been successful, and the people themselves, if they saw fit, could then have done what the voters of Oregon did, pass the desired law themselves without waiting for the action of a reluctant legislature.

Whenever the citizens of either South Dakota or Oregon become convinced that Single Tax should prevail, and their legislatures neglect or refuse to give the desired legislation, the Initiative can be invoked and the popular wish secured.

Thus while the Initiative and Referendum is not a reform in itself, it is a key to all reforms which depend upon legislation. The Initiative and Referendum is "the conservation of energy" for all who desire to secure important sociological improvement.

Leaders in the Single Tax movement have generally for years recognized the value of the Initiative and Referendum as an aid to the advance of their ideas, and it is the purpose of this modest communication to extend the recognition of this value as far as possible to all Single Taxers.

A public policy law such as Illinois now has and which is peculiar to this state, may be advocated as an entering wedge for the stronger enactment; or where conditions are more favorable, a mandatory direct legislation act may at once be sought.

The state of Delaware, which has the distinction (hardly the honor) of being the only state in the union which has no compulsory referendum in constitution making, has a few months ago passed a law allowing the people to vote upon a proposition to have a public policy law similar to ours in Illinois.

Mr. F. I. Du Pont, of Wilmington, in a recent article in *The Public*, of Chicago (Louis F. Post, editor), gives an interesting and instructive account of how the campaign for the law was conducted.

The question which is to be submitted to the voters is "Shall the General Assembly institute a system of advisory initiative and advisory referendum?"

The motive which prompted the agitation which secured this referendum is shown in the following quotation from Mr. Du Pont's article:

"As far as I can tell it was begun by the farmers in Kent County. But a little over a year ago a number of men, nearly all of whom were Single Tax men, met and advised that on account of experiences in endeavoring to promote the Single Tax cause in the state of Delaware in the past, we needed direct legislation."

It is indeed a very hopeful sign of the times that such an important movement as the above should have had its origin among the farmers.

Farmers are now more heavily taxed than any other class, paying more

than they should. Under Single Tax the farmers' taxes would be materially lessened; and the tax upon site values, which are largest in the cities, would be greatly increased.

---

In New Zealand the total number of local bodies which levies rates on land values exclusively is 71. No district having once adopted this system of rating has returned to the old system, although they have the power to do so by a bare majority of the votes of the ratepayers. It is also rumored that a Single Tax settlement, on the lines of the American Fairhope, is to be started. The daily papers of Auckland are unanimous in condemning the Single Tax as a scheme to rob the "poor man" of his allotment, and let the wealthy merchant and the rich bank manager go free. Evidently this transparent bluff is not taken so seriously in New Zealand as in Australia.—*Taration*, Perth, W. Australia.

---

A tax on land values is unique among fiscal expedients in that it frees industry instead of restricting it. It attacks the corner in land, which, after all, is the most pernicious and far-reaching corner that has ever been held. For one comparatively lucid moment Mr. Chamberlain called his campaign a fiscal campaign. There could be but one result of an honest fiscal inquiry, and that would be to tax land values. By freeing land it would promote industry and lessen unemployment. Such a tax could not, as the tariffs which Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Balfour advocate must, dislocate trade or destroy industries. But the day of conjecture is past. The tax has been imposed with every success in New Zealand and the Australian colonies. In New York separate assessment has been made with ease of improved and unimproved values. The tax is cheaper to collect than income tax, and infinitely cheaper than a tax on imports. It is impossible that the day of its coming to this country can be longer delayed.—London (England) *Daily News*.

---

Leo Tolstoy, greatest of living Russians, has just aroused Europe by a trumpet blast in which he adopts the land theories of George, wholly, completely and enthusiastically, and declares them especially adaptable to the needs of Russia in her present crisis. \* \* \* No wonder, therefore, that European publicists are ransacking libraries and exploring second-hand book stores in search of the all but forgotten works of Henry George. For George has in this day won his greatest disciple, and a disciple may, under more suitable conditions, accomplish more than the master. But how still more eloquent this is of the fertility of ideas. By dint of thinking, a poor San Francisco printer lifts himself into world-wide prominence by a startling conception as to the cause of poverty. He dies, and apparently his ideas are buried with him, when, behold! they flame up again on the other side of the world, where, possibly, conditions are more adapted for the experiment which George advocated.—Cincinnati *Post*.

---

There is but one remedy. The root-evil is private ownership of the rent. That rent should, according to all the laws known to equity, be paid to the State for the benefit of the people, and not given to private individuals, who have no moral claim whatever to it. The rent paid for the earth, for agricultural and building purposes, should, according to all the known principles of justice, be a *State asset*. The laws of God declare it, but the laws of selfish men deny it, and until the land laws of God, in all their beneficence, in all their beauty, in all their purity and high sense of justice, are established, there must be fabulous wealth and monopolizing "trusts" on the one side, with maddening, grinding poverty on the other.—*Cork County Eagle and Munster Advertiser*.



## THE RIGHTS OF MAN.

O! there is a land, as I hear say  
 Where landlords none there be!  
 O! Heaven! might I that happy land  
 Before I die but see.

The rents throughout that happy state,  
 Each parish deals so fair,  
 That every householder therein  
 Does get *an equal share*.

Of equal shares of land or goods,  
 They never once do dream;  
 But in each parish, part the rents  
 Which better far they deem.

As all the world belongs to all  
 So does a land to those  
 That dwell therein, the likeness then,  
 Down to a parish goes.

So by this simple *rule of right*.  
 All things in order move,  
 In church and state, 'mongst rich and poor  
 All's harmony and love.

For as the poor their natural rights,  
 And lordships thus enjoy,  
 The rich unenvy'd live in peace,  
 None wish them to annoy.

Then Lord have mercy on all lands,  
 This happy change soon bring,  
 That brethern-like, men may divide  
 Their rents and gladly sing.

So if by sickness or mischance  
 To poverty some wane  
 Their dividend of rents will come  
 To set them up again.

Ye priests and lawyers, who men's *rights*  
 Gloss o'er deceitfully,  
 Our common claim to rents will stand,  
 'Gainst all your sophistry.

T. SPENCE, 1783.



**THE LATE FREDERICK SHEFFIELD**

**Who worked in quiet ways for the advance of the  
movement, and died this month in  
the City of Brooklyn.**

*(See page 50)*



# 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.

WINTER NUMBER, 1906.

## PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

If this paragraph is marked in blue pencil it is a notification that your subscription has expired. Help the REVIEW by sending at once your renewal with arrears if any are due.

It is your duty as a Single Taxer to support the organ of the movement. Even if you have little or no leisure for reading, or "know the story," send it to some one who doesn't know it. Put it in the Public Library in your city, if it is not already there.

Ten subscriptions to the REVIEW for the year can be sent to ten different addresses for \$5.00. Are there no libraries in your city, nor public reading rooms, nor newspaper offices where the REVIEW could profitably be sent?

Note that with every two new subscriptions, or with every renewal accompanied by one new subscription a cloth bound copy of Progress and Poverty will be sent, or Social Problems if preferred—the Double-day-Page \$1.00 Household Edition.

Read our BOOK ADVERTISEMENTS. Those of the Anniversary Edition of the Works of Henry George, and the single volumes of George's works, Bi-Socialism, and Henry George, Jr.'s Menace of Privilege. IF YOU WANT ANY BOOK SEND TO THE REVIEW FOR IT.

And this notice to all of our readers: SEND A COMPLETE LIST OF SINGLE TAXERS IN YOUR CITY OR TOWNSHIP, and send it as quickly as possible. Within the next year there will be developments that make a universal enrollment desirable.

## THE REVIEW FOR 1906.

For the present at least we are obliged to relinquish the endeavor to increase the size of the REVIEW. A number of the good friends of the movement think such an attempt would be ill-advised. We differ with them; we think that if the REVIEW had 128 pages in place of the 64 that it now contains it would enable us to cover a wider field, and to include those reforms which are allied to the Single Tax, and some of which are desirable as facilitating the earlier adoption of our principles into legislation. We refer to reforms in the machinery of elections and representation, and to all such measures as will tend to a freer expression of democratic sentiment.

We shall, however, do the best with what means we have to keep the REVIEW to its present policy, and to increase, if possible, its influence. There are in active operation a number of useful activities for advancing the cause: the Monroe and Stern Lecture Bureaus; the E. B. Swinney and Rossing Information Bureaus; Fairhope; the agitation of the St. Louis and Massachusetts Single Tax Leagues, and the independent work of helpful individual effort here and there.

Yet there is a work that transcends in importance any of these, which is practically neglected—that is, ORGANIZATION. With organization would come an ORGAN—a periodical which even if supported at some loss by such organization would appear on every news stand in the country, meet the wayfarer at every railroad crossing, and go into every newspaper office to enlighten its editor on the progress being made in every quarter of the globe.

Mr. Post is wrong as Mr. George was, who argued that the necessity of an organ ceased with the greater hospitality of the newspapers to Single Tax communications and Single Tax news. But such greater hospitality has been helped by Single Tax organs. The exchange list of the REVIEW has for such reason been purposely increased, when it was felt that its influence could be made useful. Greater, too, in this connection has been the usefulness of the *Public*, which though not a Single Tax organ, has faithfully chronicled the more important steps of our progress.

The need of an organ is not less, but more. It yet remains to be seen how largely minimized will be the rising land movement in Great Britain in the communications from British correspondents that filter through the Associated Press into the columns of the American daily papers. It is a safe prediction that every radical manifestation will be softened so as to be more palatable to the friends of privilege on this side of the water. Little will be learned by the great American public of the progress of our cause in the United Kingdom.

The Socialists understand these things better. Organization is made to support



their organs, and far and wide are their periodicals circulated. Are these not potent factors in the growth of socialism?—are they not in some measure an explanation of such growth?

#### DEATH OF D. D. PATERSON.

The death of Duncan D. Paterson, of Brooklyn, N. Y., on December 4th, was as untimely as sudden. It came with a sudden shock not only to personal friends, but to all of those who through a knowledge of his useful influence, may form some estimate of the loss which his death means to the community.

Mr. Paterson came to this country in 1889, from his native city, Glasgow, Scotland, and at once connected himself with the wholesale grocery house of Francis H. Leggett & Co., New York. He retained this connection until the time of his death, well merited promotion having advanced him to chief position in the imported goods department.

In this position all the responsibility of purchasing foreign groceries from all parts of the world devolved upon him. Although but 84 years old at the time of his death, his mastery of the necessary knowledge fitted him as few men occupying similar positions are fitted, to conduct this department of the wholesale grocery business profitably and successfully. A master of details and ever watchful of opportunities to extend the scope and business of his department, diligent and faithful, he can not but be sorely missed by his business associates.

Though thus attentive to business, his own estimate of success was, however, something above and beyond the possible limits of a mercantile life. In 1897 his attention was called to the writings of Henry George and his active, open mind at once grasped the philosophy therein expounded. At that time Mr. Paterson was an enthusiastic worker in the Baptist Church; believing that the regeneration of society depended upon the religious conversion of its individuals, he devoted his energies accordingly. He now became convinced, however, that present unhappy social conditions are continued not through designs of the masses who might change them, but through ignorance as to how the change might be accomplished, and his life, aside from business activities, was thereafter largely devoted to enlightening the public as to the ease with which social reformation may be secured by application of the Single Tax.

Although an idealist, bent upon the propagation of mighty principles, he was, however, too practical to ignore opportunities for advancing reform into which those principles entered only partially, and which are, therefore, too often neglected by propagandists. At the time of his death he was

Treasurer of the Brooklyn Single Tax League, and also of the Radical Democracy; he was active in the Brooklyn Municipal League, which contributed effectively to the campaign work of Mr. Coler as President of Brooklyn Borough and Mr. Hearst as Mayor of New York at the recent election.

At the time of his death Mr. Paterson regarded the church institution as an impediment to intellectual and social progress. In recognition of this conviction his friends arranged a quiet, informal funeral service, the speakers being chosen from among those friends who had been associated with him in his Single Tax work.

#### DEATH OF WALTER ROEBUCK.

The cause of liberty and true reform suffered a loss on October 23rd in the death of Walter H. Roebuck, editor of the *Temiskaming Herald* of New Liskland and formerly secretary of the Toronto Single Tax Association. At the early age of twenty-two years he closed a series of battles for freedom that justly won him an unusual prominence and which give him now a conspicuous place among those who have struggled and fallen for the cause.

Walter Roebuck was a young man whose bright and happy ways and whose forceful progressiveness and breadth of character made a remarkable impression upon those with whom he worked. He was as popular as a man should be. He had innumerable friends, and a few warm enemies. For with all his pleasant, free and jolly ways he was a born fighter, a descendent of a family of fighters, from the celebrated inventor of the sulphuric acid process to the still more famous English Radical of Gladstone's time.

Walter Roebuck's personality first came into notice when he accepted the secretaryship of the Toronto Single Tax Association, succeeding his brother to that office in March of 1903. During the months that he led the forces for land reform much progress was made in the cause of liberty. It was while he was at the tiller that the plans were laid for the present powerful movement in Toronto for the exemption of houses from taxation. It was during his term of office that *The Canadian Single Taxer*, the Single Tax organ of Canada, was first published, and that the young Single Taxers of the city formed the so-called "fighting wing" of the association. When the Police Commissioners issued their high-handed order to the police to forcibly prevent the Single Taxers, socialists and labor men speaking on the streets, it was his courage that won a signal victory for free speech, as mounted on his "soap-box" platform he hurled defiance at the authorities to arrest him if they dared.

But it is seldom that the more enterprising of young men are content with the

progress to be made in their native cities. Walter Roebuck resigned the secretaryship to strike into the northern Temiskaming District ahead of a prospective Government railway. His first job was driving a construction team on the railroad. He hoed potatoes and sawed wood. From this he stepped into clerking in a general store. But his chance came, as chances usually come in new countries to those who make opportunities.

The proprietor of the local newspaper in New Liskland needed a man, and in this case he wisely hired a boy. The paper was a "dead-alive" affair under the old management and in three months' time the young fellow bought out the entire plant, giving therefor his own guarantee and a deposit of \$100.

With Walter H. Roebuck as editor and proprietor the publication became a power for good in the new country. It attacked "graft" with unsparing vigor and it advocated freedom to the extent of all that word can mean. In less than a year the paper trebled its circulation, and under the management of the boy just past his teens, was fast becoming financially as well as editorially powerful.

Then came the blow. New countries claim many victims. "I have typhoid," read a telegram to his brother Arthur, "you must take my place," and on October 23rd he died in Toronto, at his mother's residence, thus closing a life at the age of 22 that had been as full of experience in well doing as many well intentioned lives of twice the duration.

#### FOR GARRISON AND GEORGE TABLETS.

It so happens that William Lloyd Garrison, the great leader in the abolition of chattel slavery, and Henry George, the great leader in the abolition of land slavery, died within a few doors of each other on Union Square in New York City. Steps have been taken to place suitable bronze tablets upon the houses in which they died, and a single committee has charge of both memorials. Upon this committee some of the leading men of the country have already agreed to act, and the owners of the two buildings have given their consent to the plan. Preparations have not yet gone far enough for the REVIEW to publish the details, but in our Spring number we hope to be able to announce the time of the unveiling of these testimonials to the fame of two men whose life-work was, in the last analysis, along the same lines.

The record price for land in lower New York was reached in a recent sale of a small plot in William Street, opposite the Cotton Exchange building, which changed hands at \$650 per square foot.

#### EDITORIAL DEPARTMENT.

##### MORAL CONSIDERATIONS PARAMOUNT.

It is not strange that reformers who expose popular wrongs should be out of vogue. The social fabric is adjusted to present conditions and disturbance brings discomfort to the prosperous. It is things of "good report" that are demanded. Optimism is essential to subserve a system based on foundations consciously unsound. The pickets of convention are watchful and alarm is sounded when unwelcome truth is declared.

Popular esteem is the bribe for subservience. The favorites of the day can be named by the dozen, satisfied and smiling, defenders of things as they are, welcome in lecture courses, of excellent repute in the press, preachers of the doctrine that principles change with circumstances. Magazines compete for their smooth essays and official honors fall easily into their laps. "Success" displays their smug pictures in its pages as object lessons to aspiring youth, and popularity in colleges brings rewards denied to scholarship.

Although worthless as contributors to current thought, these time-servers are powerful to hinder progress, discourage zeal, and obstruct earnest reforms. Gifted with the skill of ambiguous speech, shunning definiteness, they pervade humanitarian conventions, in which their platitudes often receive the loudest applause. Their vagueness has a charm for certain minds. They abhor plain speech, praise gradualism and are ever counselling effort on the line of "least resistance." Their association weakens movements that need fronts of granite and uncompromising purpose. They are more to be feared than unmasked opponents.

The anti-slavery cause furnishes many examples. Had the resolute leaders listened to these siren voices, modified their demands or diluted their stern language, the movement would have been wrecked. They never ceased to see the suffering victims of the slave power or to hear their beseeching cry for aid. They scorned expediences and reiterated the broad principles of human freedom which are scoffed at as academic, knowing, like Emerson, that "only the great generalizations survive." Until the infamy ceased no words could be too harsh, no demand too immediate, no action too vigorous. By this sign they conquered.

The Single Taxers have a cause similar in nature but covering the wide earth. American slavery was a concrete institution and its supporters were unconcealed. But the liberation of the land from monopoly encounters the organized privilege of the world. No greater incentive to holy knighthood ever appealed to mankind. The advocates of the Single Tax need to be on fire, for, like

the abolitionists, they have mountains of ice around them to melt. But the tendency to shift the burden of the conflict from the impregnable moral ground to political effort is everywhere apparent.

That parties must spring out of moral movements is inevitable, yet their success depends upon the public sentiment generated by moral agitation. Henry George might have written a dozen masterpieces on fiscal and practical lines and failed utterly to kindle the conflagration which his impassioned utterances for truth, justice and mercy have produced. How marvellously his bugle-call to high and generous souls was answered! We miss it in these days of economic argument and wrangle over definitions; of attempts to sugar-coat the pill of truth and induce the patients to swallow it unwittingly. Details and clever devices tend to crowd out the all important and insistent work of changing conscience and conviction and forgetting consequences.

It would be a great service to make a selection of Henry George's writings, eliminating every practical suggestion, leaving only those inspirational passages that have the weight of the old Hebrew prophets. They will never be out of date, and are potential as long as one man seeks to thrive at the expense of his fellow-man. We need the courage to denounce and expose evils and evil doers, regardless of election prospects or the fear of repelling from our ranks material which will add weakness instead of strength. We need

"A hate of tyranny intense,  
And hearty in its vehemence,

As if our brother's pain and sorrow were  
our own."

WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENTS.

The constitutions of at least twenty-four states contain limitations upon the power of the legislature which render impossible the adoption of any sensible system of taxation. The constitution of Ohio is as bad as the worst, and contains a typical restriction: "Taxes must be equal and uniform and imposed on all property, both real and personal." The taxation provisions of the constitution of Minnesota were copied from the constitution of Ohio. In 1902 the Minnesota legislature proposed an amendment providing at great length that the legislature might impose an income tax and might do various other things. The people very properly rejected it. The legislature of 1905 adopted an amendment and if the people ratify it at the election in 1906 the material part of the constitution of Minnesota relating to taxation will be as follows: "The power of taxation shall never be surrendered, suspended or contracted away. Taxes shall be uniform upon the same class

of subjects, and shall be levied and collected for public purposes."

At the election in last November the people of Ohio ratified an amendment to the Ohio constitution providing for the exemption of state and municipal bonds. This amendment is entirely inadequate, and it seems probable that at the coming session an amendment similar to that recommended by the Ohio State Board of Commerce will be adopted. That amendment as adopted in 1908 by the legislature was as follows: "The General Assembly shall provide for the raising of revenue for all state and local purposes in such manner as it shall deem proper. The subjects of taxation for state and local purposes shall be classified, and the taxation shall be uniform on all subjects of the same class, and shall be just to the subject taxed."

Unfortunately it failed of ratification by the people, receiving more than ten times as many votes for it as against it, but not receiving a majority of all the votes cast at the election as is necessary under the constitution of Ohio.

The general movement for constitutional amendment is gaining headway in many of the western states, and it may well be that before the close of 1906 the Minnesota constitution will be amended and amendments adopted by the legislatures of Ohio and Kentucky.

LAWSON PURDY.

#### THE GEORGE PHILOSOPHY.

Fatuous indeed must be the optimism of the man who can walk through the slums, or read the newspapers, or keep his eyes open as he goes about his daily business, and still hold with Pangloss that everything is for the best in the best of possible worlds. Nor can he who thinks give entire adherence to the dictum of Dr. Johnson:

"How small of all that human hearts endure,  
That part which laws or kings can cause or  
cure!"

Government, through its tax laws, has a vast deal to do with the existence side by side of individual luxury and individual poverty in contrast so enormous that the apologist for things that are who seeks an analogy in the differing mental and physical powers of mankind invites reflection upon either his sincerity or the length of his ears.

Government and taxation are almost interchangeable terms, and not only unearned wealth and undeserved poverty, but also the oppression of some men by others spring alike in the main from bad taxation and depend upon it. What the world needs, to rid it of this fruitful source of misery, at least, is a system of taxation that would be, in the language of the moralist, just; in the language of the scientist, natural. It is the glory of Henry George that he conceived such a system. Whether it would do all to

ameliorate the world's evils that its advocates fondly hope cannot be proven in advance of its establishment. But its justice has never been assailed save from the standpoint of vested interests, and its simplicity, its logic and its coherence are clear to every one who will look at it. Not all the attacks of the college professors, muddle-brained or sycophantic, have availed to shake it.

The George philosophy, too, affords a meeting place—the only one—for the individualist and the socialist. In times past the reformers and the radicals have been sturdy champions of individualism. "Equal political and legal rights to all men, and then let alone," has been their shibboleth. To-day in the democracies of the world these rights have been attained, and the individualist who looks about him finds his faith shaken. Yet he is reluctant to admit that his inspiring creed is a mistaken one, and that he must look to the colossal system of State socialism if his object is to be attained. He does not wish to dethrone the plutocracy that has entrenched itself on the ruins of overthrown systems merely to set up in its place a new kind of bureaucracy. Nor does he need to. Henry George has incorporated in his philosophy all that is true in the dogmas of socialism and has added to the individualism of the past the one thing that it lacked. On the broad and unshaken platform that he erected these opposing forces will some day unite, and from it privilege will receive its death blow without the surrender of a single hard won individual right.

FRANK C. WELLS.

#### THE NEW SOCIALISM OF AN EMINENT JURIST.

Declaiming against socialism, United States Circuit Judge Peter S. Grosscup in a much advertised article in the December *American Illustrated Magazine* on "Who Shall Own America?" like many of the controlling legal minds to-day advocates what in effect is the embodiment of that principle in an effort to solve the great economic problems of our time.

Urging his readers to "see through appearances to the thing behind appearances," this eminent jurist himself fails to do this. He assumes that there is comparatively equal distribution of wealth, but that the trouble lies in its concentrated corporate control through bad State corporation laws. He sees no help but through the suspension of such laws by a national incorporation law, carrying with it a "constant watch" by the government to see that "the trust" involved in such incorporation "is executed." Also "provision should be made for a government exchange, or a private exchange under government supervision, through which the securities of national incorporations could be bought and sold." Moreover, the learned jurist thinks that "provision

should be made to interest labor in ownership" of the securities of such national incorporations, by "dividing equitably between the capital invested and the labor put in" all securities "issued on account of increased value." He would do this in order to give labor an interest in what the Socialists call "the tools of production," since, as the judge says, "with few exceptions, the man who works with his hands [to-day] does not even own the tool that is in his hands. On top of all this he would have "the corporation of the future deal fairly with the people in the matter of prices," although whether he means the prices of corporate securities or the prices of such corporations' productions is not clear.

All told, Judge Grosscup professes to solve the great social problems of our time by substituting a national for a state incorporation law, have the national government regulate the construction and operation of all national corporations, and have the stock artificially distributed, to the end that labor should possess some ownership in the tools of production; while he would also possibly have the government regulate prices in production.

This is what he calls the *peopleization* of corporations, the *peopleization* of trusts. It would, in effect, be nothing less than the using of the national government by the few to exploit to still greater degrees than they do to-day various forms of privilege around which incorporation now occurs.

For the main evil about corporations to-day is not in the nature of the corporations themselves, but in the privileges they are organized to use. The vital part of the coal trust is not the incorporation but the ownership of coal-bearing lands and railroad franchises; of the steel trust, not that its charter was drawn under the New Jersey corporation act, but that it has a monopoly of the Connellsville coking-coal fields, that it possesses great advantages in ore and natural gas fields and transportation advantages through ownership of roads or possession of secret rebate contracts. Bereft of such privileges, these trusts would go to pieces despite the supposed privileges of their corporation laws.

The fact is that Judge Grosscup, whether consciously or unconsciously, does not heed his own words and "see through appearances to the thing behind appearances." "Appearances" are that the trouble lies with corporation laws, whereas the real evil "lies behind appearances"—the monopoly of natural opportunities, the ownership of public franchises and the unjust advantages arising from the taxation of production and its fruits. There are other forms of privileges, but these are the chief ones. With the whole taxation burden shifted from production to land monopoly, and with public franchises in public hands, the great demand for vast incorporation powers would be gone. Corporations then would operate for the most part not in fields of exclusive-



ness, of monopoly, but in fields of competition; in which case any suspicion of corporate manipulation would operate against a particular corporation precisely as would suspicion of honesty in any of its head officials.

Judge Grosscup's proposal does not lessen, it conserves, privilege. But perhaps it is because he has been one of the chief molders of the deadly injunction principles used by Privilege against labor unions, that he is blind to this, and that he uses his large abilities and commanding position to advocate not what will simplify, but what will complicate, social problems, and make more desperate the struggle to restore the Republic to its natal principle of equal rights.

HENRY GEORGE, Jr.

#### IS THE SINGLE TAX MOVEMENT MAKING PROGRESS?

Many of its good friends share the not uncommon notion that the Single Tax movement is decadent. But those who have been active in it from the beginning know that this notion is erroneous.

Since the inspiring days of the Henry George campaign, out of which the *Standard* and Anti-Poverty Society came, the Single Tax movement has grown immensely; and at the present moment it is larger and more influential than the socialist movement, with which its progress is sometimes disparagingly contrasted.

This statement depends, of course, upon one's standards. If the present state of the particular form the movement took in 1886-87 is the test, then the Single Tax movement is indeed decadent. So, also, if the test is the number and condition of its distinctive organs and organizations. For the fine ebullitions of those early days have passed away, and outside of the *REVIEW* in America, *Land Values* in Great Britain, and the *Volkstimme* in Germany, there is hardly a distinctive organ of the movement anywhere.

But the question is not whether those forms of the movement are decadent; it is whether such is the condition of the movement itself.

As to that question the reasons for believing in substantial progress are abundant. Though there is no longer a Single Tax party, and all efforts to organize one are futile, the movement in politics is more influential than ever, even if less exhilarating than when it was in its infancy. One of the two great parties is honeycombed with Single Tax principles, and in the other the same principles are not uncommonly discussed with favor. What is true in this respect of the United States is true in greater degree of Great Britain, where the parliamentary electioneering over free trade and land values taxation is now surging about the Single Tax idea; and in Australasia, before

the same rising wave of free trade and land values taxation, socialism is receding. These are but indications of the progress that may be observed on all hands, if one look for substantial growth instead of looking for spectacular demonstrations.

Who is there that would surrender the advances of the Single Tax movement as indicated by these conditions, for the Single Tax movement as it was in the '80's? If those who were thoughtfully active in the movement then, could have foreseen the movement as it is now—a vital force unobtrusively but steadily influencing the trend of affairs—they would have thought of the seed of their sewing well planted then—and well grown now.

If we have few organs, the accession of papers of the general press has reduced the necessity for organs. Probably no other movement of our time is so well represented by papers of the general press. Many daily and weekly papers, both in Great Britain and the United States, are under Single Tax control, and many more are responsive to Single Tax influences. They preach Single Tax doctrines, not only academically, but, better yet, in practical connection with the municipal, national and world movements, and as part of them.

These things mean progress such as no degree of party success, no extent of distinctive organization, and no possible number of organs could mean. They imply progress in the minds and hearts of the masses of the people; not so deep nor so clear as to apprehension of principles as in the isolated Single Tax groups of the earlier days, to be sure, but deep enough and clear enough for practical purposes, and vastly more extensive than ever.

Working among ourselves in the ebullient times of George and McGlynn, we favorably affected only the few outsiders who touched the edges of our groups, and astounded the masses by what they mistook for insanity. To-day our movement has so far progressed that its influence permeates public opinion and gives hopeful and wholesome direction to municipal reforms and national politics.

LOUIS F. POST.

#### THE SHORT-CUT OF THE SINGLE TAX.

It is a sign of the times that the *Denver Republican* should devote an editorial to the "Growth of Socialism" and state its conviction that a socialist tidal wave is among the possibilities of politics. Incidentally it declares that Socialists and Single Taxers are at one on the land question. This is a common error, for clearly the management of the land from a central office as the common property of the people (as Socialists propose), and the mere raising of the tax on land to its full annual value, after deducting all improvements, are very

different things. The just aim of doing away with the private absorption of land values would be common to both systems, but the first would call for a complicated arrangement for administering a great national estate, while the second would require much less machinery than we have now for collecting taxes. The land value tax would simply be increased in amount under the Single Tax, and this would call for no increase in the number of collectors, while the whole cumbersome mechanism of custom houses and personal and indirect taxation would be swept away.

And this difference in form involves a difference in principle. Socialists and Single Taxers unite in criticising unfavorably present economic conditions. Both desire to secure a just distribution of the product of labor. But the socialist believes that the present unsatisfactory state of industry proves that the natural laws of labor and exchange are defective, while the Single Taxer asserts that natural laws have never had a fair chance to operate. After his house has burned down, it is natural for a man to find fault with the laws of combustion, and, in a moment of resentment, he might wish to do away with them. Just after a bad fall we are inclined to curse the law of gravitation. But to do away with these laws would leave us in a worse plight than ever, and the wise thing is to study them and adjust ourselves to them, and to make them our useful servants and not our tyrannical masters. The socialists would throw the natural laws of trade overboard and provide a special Providence at the center which should take the place of these laws. The Single Taxer pronounces such an attempt unnatural and impossible of execution. He has faith in the laws of nature, and would only ask to let them have free play, as they never have had up to the present time. He claims that it is unnatural that the mere possession of valuable land should give the power to individuals to exact tribute from the community. Abolish this injustice and all other monopolies, and the much-decried law of supply and demand, and the other beautiful laws of natural human intercourse, would begin to operate as benignly as do the laws of gravity and combustion when man makes proper use of them.

It is a beautiful sight in a laboratory to watch gases and liquids and solids obey the laws of their being—to see water rise to its own level, however indirect the connection between its various surfaces—and to note how vacuums are always filled if the pressure of the air is given a fair opportunity. And just so it would be a delightful thing to open our eyes to the world around us, if the beneficent laws of social life were not interfered with at every turn. By laws of the same character the product would seek the consumer, the laborer would seek his work, the reward would adapt itself to the service. Where there was a tendency to pro-

duce too much of a given article, the demand would diminish, the price would drop and the manufacture of it be discouraged, and at the same time the producing class, receiving the full value of its product (for there would exist no monopolistic method of depriving them of it), would be able to consume all that they produced, after making such provision for the repairing and extension of plants as their savings might justify. Socialism means a lack of faith in natural laws. It believes in an artificial, machine-made justice. The Single Tax, on the other hand, is based on faith in natural law and would secure justice by removing the artificial obstacles to it which man has created.

The *Denver Republican* is right in dwelling upon the growing unrest of the public. Some great crisis will arise before long when the people will have to decide what form of change they prefer to enter upon. Will they select a vast and impracticable system of universal interference with individual activity, or will they take the wiser course of putting an end to the unjust privileges which are operating before their eyes to their injury? The former course would lead to disastrous experiments, bring in again the Man-on-Horseback and postpone for a century or two the final triumph of justice and freedom. But even then the Single Taxer can afford to abide his time in patience, for eventually his simple plan of preventing all sorts of graft will have to be adopted. By our present campaign of education, however, we hope to persuade our fellow-countrymen, when the time comes, to take the short-cut to the Promised Land and not waste golden years in wandering through the Wilderness.

ERNEST CROSBY.

#### SINGLE TAX PROGRESS IN GREAT BRITAIN.

Great and far-reaching as the political changes that are pending in the United States, and of which 1906 is likely, at least, to see the preliminaries, it is probable that those destined to happen in Great Britain will be not less portentous.

There is much of truth in the claim that the ferment now so apparent in American political life, is due to the work of Ida Tarbell, Lincoln Steffens, Ray Stannard Baker, Chas. E. Russell, and especially of Thomas W. Lawson, during the past two years, but it is almost as certain that it had its initial impulse in the Bryan campaigns of 1896 and 1900, and in the even earlier and since continued propaganda of Henry George and his disciples.

So in Great Britain the conditions which have produced the Campbell-Bannerman ministry had their origin in the "red-van" and other propaganda work carried on there by equally loyal followers. There, as here, the missionaries of the gospel of "the

land for the people" have been fighting the good fight to relieve industry from taxation and transfer its burdens to land values.

From time to time reports of progress there have been made which to many have doubtless conveyed the idea that progress in this country was relatively slower than that being made in the United Kingdom. For instance, the vote in the House of Commons on the Rating Bill—158 to 229, in 1902; of 183 to 170, in 1903; of 225 to 158, in 1904, and of 202 to 112 (a majority of 90), in 1905, has been cited as evidence of a much more rapid progress towards the Single Tax than we are able to show. Especially is this so regarded by those who remember that the high water mark of Single Tax membership in Congress—the 53rd—was but four, Johnson, Maguire, Simpson and Warner, that there was but one in the 58th, and that there are none in the present Congress. But note the difference. Johnson, Maguire, Simpson and Warner, in the 53rd, as well as the lone Single Taxer in the 58th, stood for the abolition of all other forms of taxation and the taking of the entire rental value of land for public purposes. The vote in the British House of Commons, however, has never been anything more than a declaration that there should be a new assessment of land—the present being some 250 years old—and that a figure representing three (3%) per cent. of its selling value should be placed in a new column, and that said 3 per cent. should contribute to the rates (taxes) in the same manner and at the same rate that buildings and personalty are now taxed. The McNamara Bill of 1903 only asked for the right to levy a rate of a penny in the pound, equal to five-twelfths of one per cent. How much would be obtained under the Trevelyan bill of 1905, would depend, I assume, upon the local rates, but as the average rate in England and Wales is now a trifle over five shillings in the pound (rental, not selling value) it would mean an average contribution of not to exceed one quarter of three per cent. of selling value—or three-fourths of one per cent. of its rental value, that is assuming that the assessment was the full selling value and not as with us (even here in New York City) much below it.

Great progress is undoubtedly being made in Great Britain, but we must not forget that they have much further to go than we have. Here in New York City we are now probably taking on an average one per cent. of the rental value of land—the local tax rate being over 1.50 on about two-thirds land valuation.

It is gratifying to know that the Campbell-Bannerman ministry is committed to the principle of the Trevelyan bill, and that we may reasonably expect that with a good plurality in Parliament which the elections about to be held will surely give them they will send to that bulwark of landed aristocracy—the House of Lords—a bill providing for this entering wedge of the Single Tax.

ROBERT BAKER.

## News—Domestic.

### KANSAS.

#### SACRIFICING THE SCHOOL LANDS—OKLAHOMA WISER THAN KANSAS—WORK FOR SINGLE TAX LETTER WRITERS.

There is apparently little direct work in Single Tax agitation in the Jayhawker State just now, but there is considerable along collateral lines of educational influence. The looting of our school lands is attracting attention, and Single Tax writers can do valuable work by showing the almost incredible loss to the people through sale of school lands in the past as well as in the present.

The original grant of lands for educational purposes comprises sections (640 acres) eighteen and thirty-six of each township, or one-eighteenth of the State's area, for common schools, and about a half million acres each for State University, State Normal Schools, and Agricultural Colleges. The total was over four million acres, which now brings an average yearly rental of two dollars per acre, or about eight million dollars. The State constitution prohibited the sale of school lands without a direct vote of the people, but the real estate speculators and politicians soon secured the submission of the question to the people and as school lands always had been sold in other States and as the choice school lands were then in demand, the people voted to sell their patrimony for what has proven to be, a mees of political pottage. The million and a half acres granted for higher education were selected by commissioners when there was little settlement and were the choicest of the State, a third valuable coal lands and much in the present oil and gas belts, the whole now averaging perhaps \$100 per acre in value.

Much of these lands brought but a dollar and a quarter per acre, and the average of all the State school lands sold was but two dollars per acre, or much less than the present annual rental value. The proceeds were invested in municipal bonds, giving a fertile field for official rascality, so that nearly one-third of the permanent fund has been lost. An average country school district would now have a larger income from the rental of the land, if it had been retained, by seven times, than its present share of the interest on bonds in the State school fund, while the loss to the three higher educational institutions was much greater in proportion.

Oklahoma has not yet sold her very valuable school lands, and is deriving a large revenue from their rental, but the leasees and politicians are clamoring and organizing to secure their sale at nominal prices. No better work can be done than by writing letters to the Oklahoma newspapers, most of which are edited by men insufficiently

educated on all economic questions and need good advice and instruction.

The editor of the *Kansas City Star* is a good target. He stated editorially that landlords give as much value to society as they receive from it, and that economic evolution disproved the theories of Henry George, but soon after began a series of articles upon the injustice of taxing water consumers 84 cents per thousand gallons, the cost of pumping being ten cents, the proceeds going to extend and improve the municipal water works and to pay off the bonds for their purchase, while real estate pays no tax whatever on account of water supply that adds so largely to its value, the city getting its water free of cost for public purposes—that is, paid for by private water consumers, mostly tenants. I am inclined to think that this able hired man of a millionaire newspaper owner is either a Single Taxer, or needs to learn where "he is at."

The Republican State Committee of Kansas is said to have sent a circular to all local workers that they should if possible prevent any local debates of political questions or organizations for such debating. At any rate, this is being done and no one dare cheap against monopolies in a school house or hall.

W. H. T. WAKEFIELD.

Mound City.

#### MISSOURI.

##### ST. LOUIS WELCOMES JOHN Z. WHITE—LOCAL ACTIVITY IN ST. LOUIS.

John Z. White spent three weeks in St. Louis in November and talked to many people every night, speaking at some point in or about the city. Altogether his visit with us was very profitable in a propaganda way, much more so than the year before, when his reputation as an entertainer and logician had not been established hereabouts. White grows in strength, and those who heard him on his first St. Louis trip were more than anxious to attend his meetings this year, and to persuade others who had not heard him, to come too. Wherever he goes, White makes friends and converts, for his treatment is so logical and easily understood, and all the elements of frenzy being absent, his arguments are particularly persuasive and captivating, leaving no rancor in any one's mind, no matter how antagonistic he may be to the philosophy expounded. I consider this a great forte, and one that brings strength to the cause wherever and whenever the speaker appears as our representative and exponent.

Prof. White's season in St. Louis was closed out in a blaze of glory at the Planter's Hotel, the leading hostelry of the city. What was at first intended for a dinner at which perhaps twenty-five might be expected to attend, the affair having been arranged after an eleventh hour resolution, developed into a splendid feast of reason at

which something like a hundred and twenty-five sat down, many of the "old guard" being present, feeling as enthusiastic as in times past, with a large number of new faces to an "old stager" like myself.

I notice in this morning's paper (30th) that Harry Sycamore, one of the "old guard," and still active propagandist, was elected President of the Aschenbroedel Club (musicians' union), an organization in which there are several hundred musicians, and which has its own club house at 3535 Pine (a fine building and until recently an elegant residence of heroic proportions). The St. Louis Single Tax League has occupied rooms with the organization for several years and meets at the club headquarters on each Wednesday evening of the week. Gus A. Menger, Owen Miller and P. G. Anton, all Single Taxers, were chosen as the Board of Trustees. It looks like a Single Tax victory in the club, which carries on its roster many of the faithful—men of intelligence and influence in the industrial world.

Prof. Sycamore is a thorough disciple of George, and his election to the chief executiveship of a club such as that consisting of all the leading professional and semi-professional musicians of the city, certainly speaks flatteringly of his personal worth to our cause.

The Ladies' Single Tax Club is meeting at the homes of the members on the first Thursday of each month. The last meeting was held at my house, 1390 Aubert Avenue, and it proved to be not only enjoyable, but profitable, as well, some strangers to the faith being in attendance. Mrs. Hall (104 South Channing Ave.) is the president, and the right woman in the right place. She is developing much ability as a speaker, and is imbued with the true spirit.

L. P. CUSTER.

#### News—Foreign.

##### ENGLAND.

That the agitation for the taxation of Land Values in Great Britain is gradually permeating political thought of all shades can easily be seen, and we Single Taxers may, I think, reasonably assume that it has fairly entered the region of practical politics.

It must not, however, be inferred that there is any great weight of public opinion in favor of the measure, but ground is being gained all along the line, and there is an ever increasing body of men inclining towards it. Undoubtedly the fact of many important municipalities so emphatically declaring in its favor has caused many former opponents to modify their attitude. Even in the House of Commons itself, where not so long since the movement was looked upon with indifference, there is quite an altered feeling in evidence. Not that it is much more favored than formerly out-



side the Radical ranks, but members of Parliament have begun to see in it something which will have to be reckoned with.

In some quarters strenuous opposition is encountered, but generally speaking this method of taxation is becoming the subject of grave discussion almost everywhere.

Quite recently we had conferences at which the taxation of land values has been brought well to the front, and a week or two ago at Manchester one was held for the sole purpose of discussing the advisability of the immediate application to the Government for powers to impose the tax. The ever increasing burden of rates in the larger centres of population has brought about a reaction in our favor of which we must take the utmost advantage. This conference at Manchester was promoted by the Glasgow Corporation, which, as your readers are no doubt aware, is the pioneer of the municipalities in the direction we wish them to go.

The influential co-operative societies also look favorably upon our proposals, and almost invariably at their general meetings a resolution supporting them is put and carried. In various other ways the same tendency is noticeable, thus leading us to believe the day to be not far distant when Parliament will be compelled to admit the thin end of the wedge into the present absurd fiscal arrangements. When that day comes, then ours will be the duty to drive the wedge home, and thus split asunder those bonds which have crippled the British people for so many generations.

In Yorkshire where the inside working of the movement is naturally well known to me, I can speak with some authority. We are going ahead, our membership continues to increase at an entirely satisfactory rate, and particularly is this so when we consider the class of man we are enrolling. Solid business men, professional men and others, all of the type which thinks itself into a conviction, are joining us, and it can therefore be only a question of a short time before the county is fully awakened to the merits of the question. The mass of the people, having neither the time nor the inclination to think out problems of this kind, are quite willing to follow a definite lead, and as in no political body can such unanimity of opinion of social evils and their remedy be found as amongst Single Taxers, we are bound sooner or later to gain the confidence and support of the toiling millions.

As the agent of the league in Yorkshire I feel that an immense tribute of praise is due to the gentlemen who formed the organization. Their untiring advocacy of the cause is worthy of the highest success, and I am fully persuaded they will surely receive the reward they so richly deserve. We are a particularly happy family, and to that fact our progress is largely attributable. Unity is indeed strength.

In other parts of the country the league is moving onward, and with the advent of the Liberal Government we are all looking forward to ours becoming a burning question in the new Parliament. It is a plank in most Liberal platforms, and is also meeting with support from some of the more progressive members of the Conservative party.

The last bill but one for taxing land values, brought before the House of Commons, had for its seconder the Tory Lord Mayor of Liverpool, Mr. Rutherford, which is not without significance.

In this country we have suffered from a long spell of reactionary legislation, and the hands of the clock of progress have been pushed back to a deplorable extent; we are hoping, however, that the change of Government heralds the dawn of a brighter day, and that before the next change takes place a decisive step forward will have been taken, effectually preventing retrogression and leading to the emancipation of labor and commerce from the mill-stone of land monopoly which has hung so long upon their necks.

From various parts of the country encouraging reports are coming to hand, and I can assure your readers that Glasgow in the North and London in the South are great centres of activity.

We Yorkshiremen occupy, geographically, an intermediate position, and are continually receiving the valuable assistance of gifted speakers from each of the two places. During the past fortnight we have been fortunate in having the services of Mr. Lester, ex-President of the Scottish League. He has addressed nearly a dozen important meetings in our district during his visit, and we hope the seed he has sown will result in a fruitful harvest.

Mr. J. H. Whitley, M. P. for Halifax, and President of the English League, and Mr. C. P. Trevelyan, M. P. for the Elland Division, are devoting themselves largely to the movement, and being excellent speakers and thorough masters of the subject, they are making their presence felt in a very marked fashion. Altogether the outlook is good, and we feel that we have now secured a foothold in the political thought of the nation.

FRED. SKIRROW.

Yorkshire, Eng.

#### IRELAND.

The Irish Land Question could not be in a much worse position than it is. Peasant proprietors are taking the place of the old landlords. I am deeply impressed with the conviction that in a few years—say a quarter of a century—the new owners of the soil will reduce Ireland to the lowest level she can fall to. There is not a more conservative man than the Irish farmer, and when he comes, later on, to re-let his land, the new tenant will not only be salted but

pickled until every inch of skin on his body will be rubbed. For instance, a farmer, who before the Land Act was thought of, let a portion of his holding, for which he paid from 5 to 10 shillings at the rate of £4 to a poor half starved laborer. I ask you what may be expected in the future from such landowners? Then again they are running co-operative stores and ruining the legitimate shop-keepers in our towns. My advice is to take no notice of the Irish Land Question in its present phase. It is the greatest fraud ever perpetrated. And think of it! We outsiders are taxed to the extent of twelve millions of hard earned cash to give the whole rural wealth to the farmers. Even that is not all. If a farmer cannot pay up his annual installments we outsiders have to pay that. Could the abuses of private land monopoly go further?

FROM PRIVATE CORRESPONDENCE.

### GERMANY.

#### SURPRISING GROWTH OF SENTIMENT IN THE EMPIRE—THE COLONIES BEING USED AS AN OBJECT LESSON.

The Land Reform Convention, held in Berlin in October last (too late to report in Autumn Number of the REVIEW), gave a most encouraging picture of progress made during the past year. There was an increase of over four hundred names in the roll of members of the parent organization, and the Land Reform League in its entirety, with corporate members (associated societies), now numbers over 210,000. A novelty in this matter of corporate members was introduced when the small but enterprising town of Opladen, near Cologne, desired to be accepted by the League as an associated organization in its entirety. Another community, Mocker, followed this once established precedent; then the governing body of the town of Weissenfels joined in a body, and since the convention, the governing body of the City of Ulm has also applied for membership. The size and importance of Ulm makes this last fact of interest. There was some discussion at first as to whether a town in its entirety could be accepted as corporate member of the league. But the opposition was soon overruled. The largest and most important association to join the League lately is the Society of Postal and Telegraph Assistants. The German Land Reform League has been incorporated under the name "Bodenreform (Land Reform), Lt.," and is now an association possessing legal right to property. The association owns a house in Berlin, where the league has rooms free of rent, and has already, apart from the value of this house, a capital of fifteen hundred dollars to be kept as sinking fund. From the returns on its house or other property, the association can give up to 4 per cent.

dividends. Anything above that, or in case of a dissolving of the association, any capital over and above what was paid in, is to be used for propaganda purposes.

Besides the review, "Year Book of Land Reform," issued in quarterly installments, the league has, during the past year, brought out a book which is of great value in propaganda work. This is entitled "Criticisms of Land Reform" and contains lengthy objections to Single Tax theories, written by opponents of importance. These are followed by answers from the pens of one or two leading German Single Taxers, and in that way the most usual and lucid objections are met point by point by men fitted to argue the matter. It is a sort of printed debate, in the permanency of book form. The opponents were formally invited to give their opinions for the purpose.

The most important matter interesting Land Reformers in Germany at present is the matter of land ownership in the colonies. It must be stated here, to avoid misunderstanding, that reasons of policy and politics forbid German Single Taxers from taking any standing as to the ethical rights of colonial possession. They do not, for the present, argue whether it is right to have colonies, but only as to how these colonies shall be governed in a manner most practical from the point of view of ethics and business. The German colonies are a source of great trouble and expense to the home country, and any suggestion as to an improvement in their present conditions is welcomed. The league is using this state of things to make a persistent and thus far successful agitation to gain the ear of government authorities with its views on the colonial question. It has, through speeches and pamphlets innumerable, called the attention of the government to the fact that the absurd and ruinous land grants to colonial companies have been not only the cause of a lack of financial profits for the home country, but also have generally been the cause of most colonial wars, in bringing about a state of ill feeling on the part of the oppressed and plundered natives. The league calls the government's attention to the fact that no one, neither home government, nor native, gets any advantage from the wealth earned by these great companies, which draw millions from the worst kind of speculation in land. One speaker points out the fallacy of the assertion that the South African negro will not work unless you take his land from him. He says that naturally the negro will not work under some one else for less wages than his work, for himself, on his own land will bring him. But the remedy is not to take his land from him and drive him into the great plantations, but to have him work as an independent farmer on his own land, selling his produce to the home government. And the higher rate of wages that will be possible under a sensible land policy will draw sufficient of the better class of labor to

work larger farms. The arguments against large concessions have been discussed in Parliament, and some deals just about to go through—notably concerning the building of a railroad from Luderitz Bay inland—have been held up pending investigation.

The canal question is still agitating German political circles, and the Land Reform League has taken advantage of this fact to start in circulation a petition to the Imperial Government concerning the speculation now going on, in land bordering canals in building, or just proposed. Many thousands of signatures have already been won, and newspapers all over the country are noticing the matter and discussing it. A very encouraging sign is the manner in which the petition is being discussed, and signed, in meetings of labor organizations, particularly along the line of the proposed new Mittelland Canal, through the heart of the West Prussian manufacturing and coal mining districts.

Exposures of illegal dealings on the part of mining companies, and speculative syndicates, dealing in mining lands, have also been utilized by the League to call attention to the wrong of private ownership of such natural opportunities. It has been discovered that thousands of acres of coal lands are being kept closed and tied up, to artificially lessen the output. *Tout comme chez nous*. One speculative syndicate has just cleared 85 million marks in a deal concerning the ownership of some of these mining lands, and the League has not failed to call attention to the ease with which this big steal was effected, and to follow it up by an agitation for better laws regulating valuable ore bearing lands, and mining grants to private individuals or companies.

Three cities in Germany now take a tax on the increase in value at sales of city lots. Frankfurt am Main, the pioneer, has been joined by Cologne and Gelsenkirchen. The size and importance of the first two cities made this move mere significant.

After a long and hard fight, the city of Dantzic has joined the ranks of the many Prussian towns that now tax city land at its selling value. Land owning interests in Dantzic had so poisoned the public mind against the new tax that it took months of discussion and agitation, in and out of council, to settle the matter. Reports were asked for from other towns having had the tax for a period of from one to six years, and in every case these reports were most favorable. For instance: Breslau reports having received 316,000 marks in tax on unimproved land as over against 10,800 income on the old valuation. This enabled the city authorities to reduce taxes on small holdings to the amount of 105,000 marks. There are now altogether one hundred and fifty towns taxing unimproved land on the selling value.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

## SCANDINAVIA.

THE DANISH LEAGUE DOUBLES ITS MEMBERSHIP IN ONE YEAR—A NEW DANISH TRANSLATION OF PROGRESS AND POVERTY—A SWEDISH BARON LEAVES THE ARMY TO DEVOTE HIMSELF TO SINGLE TAX WORK.

The Danish Henry George League has grown during the past year from 550 to 1100 members, representing 27 different counties of Denmark. 150,000 pamphlets and leaflets have been issued since the League was first founded in 1902, 97,000 coming on the count of the past year. A recent pamphlet gives a full and intelligent account of the Single Tax Colony, Fairhope.

A new and excellent translation of Progress and Poverty has been made by the Single Tax leader Jacob C. Lange, and has just been published by the largest and most important Scandinavian publishing house, the Gyldendalske Boghandels-Forlag in Copenhagen. The translation is said to be perfect from a literary point of view, and the name of the publisher alone would insure the book respectful attention on the part of press and public.

The agitation of the Henry George League in Denmark has so aroused public attention that the University of Copenhagen has found it necessary to announce a series of lectures on "Henry George and His Theory" for the present winter. *Ret*, the organ of the League, says that it is most unfortunate that these university lectures must of necessity be held by an Academician, as the only Academician possible for the purpose was about as clear on the subject as is the usual university political economist. However, even under such conditions, the instituting of such a course of lectures proves an awakening of interest in the subject.

Single Taxers in Denmark and Norway are calling the attention of the latter country to the superb opportunity offered by its break with Sweden. Norway can clean house of all old traditions and start fresh and new now, and the chance for a rational course in the matter of taxation is too good to lose.

In Sweden public attention has been called to the new theory to the extent that several bills bearing upon private ownership of land and the taxation of land values, are to be introduced in the coming Spring session of Parliament. Large syndicates having been quietly buying up woodlands in the northern and middle sections of Sweden, erecting great saw mills and driving the peasants from their farms, thus depopulating whole districts and increasing the number of the workless in the towns. Public attention has been called to this matter, and it is to be opposed by a serious agitation on the part of friends of Single Tax theories, combined with other liberals who understand that the small farmer on his own land is the backbone of the country.

Several men of social and political standing have lately publicly announced themselves followers of Henry George, and ready to devote themselves to the work of propaganda for his doctrines. Baron Erik Palmstierna, a young Councillor in Karlskrona, has left the army with the avowed intention of devoting himself to Single Tax work. Dr. Adolf Aström, of the Law Department of the University of Lund, has already made himself known by his writings on the subject. Dr. Aström has investigated the old Swedish land laws and has found much valuable material concerning the ownership of land and water frontage, to prove that the ideas we are now fighting for were understood and acted upon in antiquity, and that only the abuse of the Roman Code brought about the present wrong conditions. There has been no organized Single Tax League in Sweden as yet, but Mr. Johan Hansson in Gothenburg, a capable and convinced Single Taxer, hopes to found such an organization in the course of the coming year.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

On October 19th, John Z. White arrived at Peoria, Illinois, and spoke before the high school, and a very joyous and appreciative body it proved to be. The principal was courtesy itself, and some of the pupils insisted on attending all meetings held in the city. As usual the strongly self-reliant and thoughtful are attracted, but the attitude of nearly all men marks a change in common thought toward our position. The recent developments as to Mr. Dougherty, who for a generation had been Peoria's most prominent and trusted citizen, both in banking and in educational matters, made many timorous. The business men's association seemed to fear further discoveries if matters were more deeply probed. It was matter for self congratulation on our part, however, that such feeling developed no antagonism to our doctrine. Prominent gentlemen suggested that on another occasion they would be glad to listen. The whole matter revealed a growing good will toward Single Tax men.

Other meetings were held. One at the home of our friendly poet Robert Cumming, which was most enjoyable, and drew several who were of the opposition, but evidently disturbed in their position of supposed security. By the way, if you receive an invitation to visit Robert you will find yourself entertained by a very modest and very artistic lady, and what's more, you'll be comfortable.

At another meeting, much to the enjoyment of that thorough-going Single Taxer Mr. Hill, a socialist broke forth. He evidently did not realize the difference be-

tween assertion and argument, nor the requirements of polite intercourse. His opinions are still unshaken, and therefore he was victorious in the encounter.

Our visit to Springfield, Ill. continued from Oct. 21st to 31st. Some eighteen meetings were addressed, including two at Auburn, a town about an hour's ride from Springfield. The list includes several churches, a Jewish synagogue, two high schools, labor and business societies. The bar association gave us an evening, and the judge of the circuit court was good enough to say that the theory of law sustained by our argument was undoubtedly sound and that the courts were gradually coming to realize it. That theory simply stated is this: The exercise of the police power and the maintenance of a system of land tenure are absolutely necessary to civilization. In the execution of these functions, government enters into contracts with individuals—as supplying materials or erecting buildings. The Supreme Court has decided repeatedly that the government cannot contract away its police power; that to do so is in part to surrender sovereignty. This court has heretofore placed the tenure of land (including rights of way of public utility systems, known as easements, which is merely incomplete ownership) in the same class with contracts that are incidental to the execution of sovereign functions. The true position is that land tenure is an act of the sovereign power, of the same nature as the exercise of police power. To surrender contract of land is in degree to abdicate sovereignty. The institution of private property in land, therefore, implies the inauguration of some plan whereby the people's control of land shall not lapse. The Single Tax on land value is the best plan known to the securing of this end. This is the theory the learned judge endorsed and which he said the courts are slowly coming to recognize. It was noticeable that not one of the lawyers antagonized the position. A gentleman who lends money for a living did, but received little encouragement. He was so reckless in assertion as to declare the Single Tax principle in operation in Russia—having reference to the little communes.

At the Ministerial Association, several clergymen bluntly asserted adherence to our position. One was in opposition, seemingly holding to some fog-bank idea as to value. He declined to develop the thought—as it would take too much time.

At our church the pastor, seated beside the speaker, by more than one earnest "amen" endorsed emphatic declarations against existing conditions and tendencies, and that require us to sustain social theories analogous to that whereby one beauty rose is produced through the sacrifice of numberless buds.

If any one is depressed by virtue of slow progress of Single Tax thought, let him visit Springfield and make the acquaintance



of Messrs. Bode, Lee, Hubbell, Rieffler, and last but not least by several, that seasoned warrior Joe Ferris.

The high school meeting was a sure enough success. The principal is not an enemy. A woman's meeting was held—several ladies saying, I must get my son, my brother, my husband to attend some of these lectures.

The leaven is working. We cannot see the cause grow, but, like corn, we can see that it has grown.

At St. Louis, Mo. between twenty-five and thirty meetings were addressed. These consisted of churches, schools, educational and business societies, fraternal women's and labor organizations, etc. Two of the meetings were practical failures, but these counted for little among so many. Comparatively few socialists appeared, and of those who did, none were especially obnoxious. Socialists are finding it difficult to tell how they are going to do things. In denunciation of existing evils they are excellent, but the elaboration of constructive policy is on other hands.

In St. Louis the good people have on hand a problem of transportation which is peculiar to themselves. Bridges are thrown across the Mississippi River at this point and are privately owned. As a result, there is a special tax or toll on goods from the east. For instance, coal mined some sixty miles away, in Illinois, is charged forty cents for transportation to East St. Louis. To cross the river (a distance of about one mile) the charge is thirty cents. This extra tribute amounts to nearly two million dollars per year on coal alone to the good people of St. Louis. It will be observed that these people do not object to being overcharged for transportation, but do object to a tribute that is much in excess of that wrung from other cities. One of the feudal "rights" of the lords of the eighteenth century in France was that of charging peasants a percentage of the produce they carried over bridges. The citizens of St. Louis are trying to discover the difference between their own position and that of the feudal serf.

This object lesson causes public ownership to be a very popular matter in that good town. It also serves to make plain the fact that existing troubles grow out of legal interferences with industrial operations—as did all feudal "rights." When once this fact is clearly apprehended, it is easy to reveal the Single Tax cat. There is but one thing needed to secure approval of our doctrine—that is understanding. It is more fully understood to-day than ever before. As a result, it commands wider respect. It is consequently easier to secure attentive consideration.

Ex-Attorney General Crowe of Missouri also endorsed the Single Tax at a banquet held at the Planter's House on the last night of our stay in St. Louis. It was an occasion

of much joy to our old friend, Stephen Ryan, the sage, philosopher, Single Taxer and shoemaker. And he had good reason for delight. It was originally planned to give a small dinner to a dozen or fifteen of "the faithful," but one and another expressed a desire to attend until the little dinner at some restaurant grew into a banquet of well toward one hundred and fifty guests at the Planter's. Many prominent people attended and those who thought the Single Tax movement had lost its virtue discovered reason to amend their notions.

At Kansas City, Mo., a dinner brought out, among others, an Episcopal rector, a Catholic priest, a Universalist minister, a popular preacher (Dr. Roberts), besides a mayor, a chief of police and some lawyers—and, of course, some rational people. The chief of police responded to a toast, and the mayor offered to lay odds that there was not another chief in the United States that could make one like—or equal to it. It was a fine talk and the crowd endorsed both the talk and the mayor's comment. A lawyer new to our ranks endorsed our gospel, and proposed vigorous work in Kansas City—on his own behalf promising hearty support. After adjournment Dr. Roberts said he had heard of Single Tax but was not aware of its breadth and far reaching effects. He was asked to give it full investigation. He replied: "Oh, you may be sure I'll do that, now. I want to know the truth." The following Sunday morning his audience, crowding one of the largest theatres in the city, heard a vigorous sermon against land monopoly. He pointed out that oil and coal deposits had been monopolized, but fortunately the sun had been placed over ninety million miles distant. The audience fully appreciated the reference. Dr. Roberts is a polished speaker, of great earnestness, and fearless. The rector said, with much feeling: "Something must be done." The priest sent for the speaker a day or two later, as he wished to know further of the Single Tax. The Universalist is now of us.

A lecture devoted to public ownership before the central labor organization was immediately followed by the adoption of resolutions to begin organization to that end. Things are beginning to crystalize.

A meeting of the Commercial Club at Kansas City, Kan., was addressed, and very much good will for our cause was expressed by the members. One man wished to know how it happened that land owners who improved usually succeeded financially, while holders of vacant property frequently found themselves in distress. He was asked in reply if most improved land is more than partly improved? And if this fact is not in harmony with our contention? That is, we assert that taxes on land value compel improvement. If, therefore, we impose small taxes, slight improvement follows. All this of course on the admission of his asserted

fact, which really has no more than the color of truth. Other meetings at Kansas City show the same general tendency. The power of monopoly is everywhere exerting itself, but everywhere there is increasing resistance.

At Belton, Mo., the high school and a public meeting were visited. The school is small, but the principal is a thorough and a devoted man. The public meeting was well attended by an audience typical of rural Missouri. No pretence to display, but genuine manliness. They wanted to know about the Single Tax, and were in earnest. Jas. A. White, a lumber dealer, was chairman.

A very good meeting was held in the court house at Springfield, Mo. John T. White, whose address at the Chicago conference of 1898 will be remembered by all who attended that gathering, is an active Single Taxer at this point.

Neosho, Mo., was the next point. A meeting was held at the court house. F. S. Briggs, hardware dealer, is the more active Single Taxer of the place. Congressman Benton acted as chairman, and expressed a desire to be fully informed as to our proposals.

Joplin, Mo., was visited and results were not so satisfactory, owing to the fact that T. J. Sheridan, who had affairs in charge was, up to a day or two before our date, absent because of attendance on a labor gathering at Pittsburg, Pa. A small meeting was the result, but a most enjoyable degree of interest was developed on account of certain socialists making a real effort to get our point of view. It was curious to observe how they succeeded in answering their own objections. Whenever socialists begin to think they will be their own salvation.

Many places were visited in Texas, with varying results. Rainy weather was a definite bar at two meetings. Four talks were given on the one day we visited Fort Worth. A. H. McCarty is a whole regiment at this point.

At Bellanger, during an appeal for equity, the speaker asked: "Do you really desire a social condition in which you can force some one to black your boots? Are you afraid to participate in a 'square deal?'" After adjournment the Mayor, who had introduced the lecturer, said to him: "How are you going to get your boots blacked if you cannot force some one to do it?" The reply was: "Well, I might do it, myself." The Mayor asserted that civilization would be impossible on that basis. He was asked: "Do you actually believe, Mr. Mayor, that civilization depends on the fact that you can compel some one to black your boots?" The absurdity was too much for even the Mayor of Bellanger.

At San Antonio a number of meetings were held. The high school was enjoyable

from the fact that the principal was much afraid the subject, "Political Economy," would not interest the pupils. It was further enjoyable because he very emphatically altered his opinion, and wished us to come again. It was one of the finest gatherings of high school pupils thus far visited. E. G. Le Sturgeon is a strong, steady and persistent worker at this point. A debate with a socialist brought out the fact that the local leader is a fine man, wholly devoted, but also wholly uninformed as to economic laws. They will catch the thinking disease in time. The Trades Council was visited, also the Swedenborgian circle and the Scientific Society. The last meeting was a thoroughly enjoyable one. Several members of the military post are members, and the society is made up of cultivated men and women. Intellectual alertness is a good neighbor. Several members are Single Tax men.

Henry George never uttered words more true than those expressing his prophecy, "The future is ours."

At Houston a number of meetings were held, including business men's clubs, the Young Men's Democratic Club, labor and women's associations, the Single Tax Club, and gatherings at the celebrated Log Cabin.

H. F. Ring and J. J. Pastoriza are among the most earnest Single Tax men in the country. Meetings were well attended, and much space devoted to them by the papers. Mr. Pastoriza has just sold his business, and will make our propaganda work his hobby. His business was hardly closed before dozens of men urged him to accept nomination for the legislature. He is a successful business man and has a remarkably large list of warm personal friends.

Throughout this trip of three months the press all along the route has been anxious to report our work. It is most certainly a good indication.

Representatives of the Houston city government have just returned from Cleveland, Ohio, where they have been looking into Mayor Tom L. Johnson's ways. Their first suggestion is public ownership of the city water plant. The papers to-day announce the inauguration of a vigorous public ownership campaign, closing with "The White lectures served as the overture; the curtain will go up very soon." The direct legislation agitation is also active. If home rule can be secured from the State legislature, all these reforms will move quickly in Houston and other cities in Texas.

Some one has finally said, "I know of only one prosperity. Does the human soul prosper here?"

The death of ex-Congressman Jerry Simpson removes one of the foremost of the Old Guard of the movement. At some future time the REVIEW will contain an adequate sketch of his life and services.

### JAPANESE INTEREST IN THE SINGLE TAX.

Some time in November a copy of *Progress and Poverty* and the *Life of Henry George*, by Henry George, Jr., were presented to Baron Kaneko, and through the Baron to the Emperor. The Emperor acknowledged receipt of these through his Minister of the Imperial Household, Viscount Mitsuaki Tanaka, to Baron Kaneko's associate, Mr. Junichiro Suzuki.

Early in December a dinner was given at the Nippon Club, representative of the best Japanese thought in America, 86th Street, Central Park West. This dinner was tendered by Dr. Shigimichi Suzuki, the Surgeon General of the Japanese Navy, who stood with Admiral Togo on the bridge of the Admiral's flagship at the battle of the Japan sea. Present at this dinner were a number of distinguished notables, Dr. Jokichi Takamine and Mrs. Takamine, Dr. Miles (brother of Gen. Miles), and Mrs. Miles, Dr. Lewis Seaman, Dr. Emil Mayer and Mrs. Mayer, Dr. Max Einhorn, Dr. Hammond, Surgeon General U. S. Navy, Dr. Arthur Jarrett and Mrs. Jarrett, Mr. Kenzo Iwahara, a well known Japanese merchant, and Mr. and Mrs. Henry George, Jr.

Dr. Suzuki gave this dinner on his departure for Japan. He will return with Admiral Togo when the latter visits this country some time within the year. But the significant feature of this dinner was the speech of General Suzuki in which, after thanking his guests for their presence and expressing his gratitude to the American people for the courtesies he had received, which he did with the true Japanese delicacy, he said that it would be his purpose on his return to acquaint his people with what experience he had gathered. He spoke of the great contrasts he had observed of wealth and poverty in this country, and then he said that within the past few days he had had presented to him two books. One of these was a novel which he had not yet read. The other was a book which had interested him greatly. That book was "The Menace of Privilege," the author of which was present. He then launched into a discussion of the problems presented there, speaking of it in the highest terms. These problems were among the things he would report upon to his people on his return to his native land and he would acquaint the Marquis Ito with the message of the book.

This is a significant indication of how the world is waking to the importance of the solution of the great industrial problem, and how alive to its importance are the eager minds and consciences of the more intellectual among these "Yankees of the Orient." Ere a year has rolled by it may be possible to report great things of Japan.

See special premium offer on back page of cover.

### CHAS. FREDERICK ADAMS, BOROUGH SECRETARY OF BROOKLYN.

President Coler, of the Brooklyn Borough, has appointed Charles Frederick Adams as his secretary, and this appointment has called forth words of generous congratulations from Comptroller Metz, Edward M. Shepard and the *Brooklyn Eagle*.

Other Single Taxers appointed to office in Brooklyn where the Hearst forces swept the field are the following: To be Deputy Register, Gustave W. Thompson; Chief Clerk of Records, Edwin Hammond; Mortgage Tax Cashier, William Ladd; Assistant Deputy Register, Thos. P. Ryan and Assistant Deputy County Clerk, J. P. Kohler; Chief Clerk Coroner's office, Joseph McGuinness; Deputy Commissioner Public Works, D. B. Van Vleck.

The success of the Monroe Lecture Bureau has suggested many imitations. The Speakers' Exchange of Buffalo, organized under C. D. Blackhall, is the latest. Its purpose is stated to be "a desire to stimulate the interest of the people in their political and civic rights and duties." A half dozen speakers are now on the list to fill engagements. Mr. Blackhall's address is 105 Seneca Street, Buffalo.

### TWO FIRES IN FAIRHOPE.

Fairhope has been the scene within the last quarter of two disastrous fires, one of which destroyed the steamer Fairhope. The origin of the fire is a mystery. There was no insurance. The second fire destroyed a two story building and a large store of general merchandise, on which there was no insurance.

"It is not necessary to be a full blooded disciple of Henry George to believe in the doctrine that land values, as they are created by the population, should flow, not into the pockets of the landowner, but into the local exchequer."—*London Speaker*.

A Single Tax book of 80 pages, a dialogue in Spanish, has just been published in Uruguay. It is said that the author's grasp of the fundamental principles of our cause leaves nothing to be desired.

Brother Caldwell of Amarillo, Tex., has printed and circularized over two thousand copies of a little paper, *The Caldwell Imprint*, a semi-occasional trade paper, the entire contents of which are written by the editor with the view to popularizing the truths of our philosophy.

J. W. Bengough, the well-known caricaturist and a frequent contributor to the *REVIEW*, lectured last November in Schenectady, N. Y., and the *Gazette* spoke of the address as a "Brilliant Single Tax Talk." A recent number of the *Public* contains a long sketch of Mr. Bengough.

"PROPUTTY."

(For the Review.)

A LECTURETTE IN RHYME.

I took up my Tennyson lately and read his  
dialect verse  
Of the sturdy old "Northern Farmer," whose  
soul was in his purse;  
How he berated Sam, his son, who wanted  
to marry for "loove,"  
And the folly of such a notion sought earnestly  
to prove.

"Ear my 'erse's legs," says he, "as they  
canters and canters awaay,  
Proputty, proputty, proputty—that's wot I  
'ears 'em saay!"  
"Proputty, proputty, proputty"—that was  
the only thing  
That to him was of real importance concern-  
ing a wedding ring.

Gentleness, truth and sweetness; a pretty  
figure and face,  
These, and a passionate love, are all very  
well in their place;  
But to be of any account in blushing, pro-  
spective brides,  
"Proputty, proputty, proputty"—that must  
be there, besides!

Now, to many who read the poem this  
Northern Farmer seems  
A sordid old grasping wretch, who only of  
riches dreams;  
"Proputty, proputty, proputty."—so runs  
his one refrain,  
"Proputty, proputty, proputty"—hoarding,  
profit and gain.

But isn't this rather unjust? he may have  
had too much greed;  
We get that impression, somehow, undoubt-  
edly, as we read;  
But to hold it a sacred thing, to be fought  
for with main and might,  
"Proputty, proputty, proputty"—there the  
old man was right!

"Proputty," what does it mean? It means  
what *belongs* to you;  
The things that you really own by sanctions  
both just and true;  
What you *own* because you own yourself  
and all your powers;  
What with those powers you have made,—  
that's Property; that is *yours*.

You work and fashion a coat or hat, a  
picture, a book, or a cart,  
And this result of your labor you take to  
the public mart,  
Exchanging it there for what it's worth in  
money or barter-trade,—  
That's Property—what you fairly get for  
the honest thing you've made.

And the Northern Farmer was right when  
he said it o'er and o'er:

"Proputty, proputty, proputty,"—it ought  
to be safe and sure;  
What belongs to a man is *his*, yea, every  
tittle and jot.  
That's what Property means, that is its  
central thought.

And what is true of a man, is equally true  
of the State;  
There's Property just as real that *public* we  
must rate;  
What belongs to me is mine; what belongs  
to the mass—to all,  
Is their's; and betwixt these rights there is,  
so to speak, a wall.

The Northern Farmer spoke true—Property  
*does* exist,  
And that it's a sacred thing I with him  
would insist;  
And I call it equally theft, in what form  
soever it's done,  
For one to take from all, or for all to take  
from one.

If this is the rule of Justice, then we may  
assuredly say  
That Property rights are set at naught,  
they're null and void to-day;  
For what the private worker makes is sub-  
ject to a tax,  
And communities have monopolists a-riding  
on their backs.

Who makes the coat or table? The toiler  
at his trade;  
Then whose should be the Property but his  
who the same has made?  
And who creates the rent of land? the  
people as a whole;  
Whose Property, then, is rent? Who rightly  
should control?

The Government must be kept alive, and  
taxes are its food,  
And so each man must pay, we're told—  
which is all very well and good;  
But private, personal property rights are  
none the less divine;  
Let the Government feed on what's its own,  
not on what's your's or mine!

If a thief comes into my house, demanding  
some share of my wealth,  
He knows he is breaking the law, and he  
generally does it by stealth;  
But why is there such a law? Because 'tis  
a truth of God,  
That what I have earned is mine, and is  
sacred from force or fraud.

But isn't it still my own tho' the visitor  
wears no mask,  
And comes in the light of day, as a tax-  
collector, I ask?  
When he takes in the name of the State a  
portion of what I've made,  
Isn't the net result to *me* like a burglar's  
raid?



"Proputty, proputty, proputty,"—my wages  
belong to me  
Against either thief or State, and wages are  
what you see  
When you look at the things I own, house,  
books, stable and cow,  
I've earned them every one by the honest  
sweat of my brow.

The Government, as you say, must live,  
and must be fed,  
And taxes, truly enough, are simply Gov-  
ernment bread;  
But why not feed on its own—the values  
itself creates?  
What I make belongs to *me*; what the State  
makes is the State's.

The State, as such, doesn't work; it doesn't  
make visible things;  
But the Public exists as a fact, and that  
fact infallibly brings  
Into existence a fund—a value attaching to  
land—  
A natural source of supply by a wise Creator  
planned.

"Proputty, proputty, proputty," that is  
Property, too,  
And it clearly belongs to the State, and  
neither to me nor you;  
So if the State must live, let it feed on its  
own resource,  
And leave our belongings to us—that's  
clearly the honest course.

Ah! there's the snag, you see! Yes, cer-  
tainly that's the rub;"  
This logic's without a flaw, but 'twill raise  
a precious hub-bub;  
For our laws have given away what belongs  
to the Government,  
And allow the land-owning class to feed on  
its bread—the rent.

And not without a great kick will these  
rent-consumers quit;  
Do you think they would rather work for  
their fortunes? Not a bit!  
They flourish their parchment deeds and  
prate of "Property," too,  
Tho' Property-in-Rent belongs to All, not  
the few.

Now, having given away the natural rev-  
enue spring,  
The State turns to private rights and  
pounces on everything,  
Robbing by charges direct and charges  
crooked, as well,  
Every form of wealth you can see, taste,  
feel or smell!

"Proputty, proputty, proputty," there's no  
such thing to-day  
That the State does not invade, despoil or  
take away;  
And land-rent, springing up by a heaven-  
made, natural law,

Is not true property in private monopoly's  
maw.

Well, what's to be done about it? Nothing  
at all, say you,  
'Twas a sad mistake, no doubt, but it's made  
and it must go through.

No! render to Cæsar what's his, and to me  
what belongs to me.

"Proputty, proputty, proputty,"—let us do  
righteously!

J. W. BENGOUGH.

#### DEATH OF FREDERICK SHEFFIELD.

Frederick Sheffield of West Nyack, N. Y.,  
who died in Brooklyn during the first week  
of the new year, was known to but a limited  
circle of Single Taxers. And even by that  
circle his devotion to the cause and his ser-  
vices, large indeed if measured by the ex-  
tent of his means and the ceaseless demands  
of an exacting business struggle that left  
him few opportunities, were perhaps not  
even suspected. Yet quietly and unassum-  
ingly our departed brother made many a  
convert. He stood for our principles where  
they were despised, and with a courage  
which asked for no other approval than that  
of his own conscience, spoke out for the  
truth when it meant the loss of his prestige  
in church and society, and among his im-  
mediate associates. He was a good friend  
to the REVIEW, and for a long time the half  
tone portraits that have appeared in these  
pages were furnished by him without charge  
—a contribution which when measured by  
his opportunities of giving was one of no  
small magnitude.

He was a man with a mind singularly  
susceptible to the sight of human suffering,  
and the message of Henry George, once  
clearly comprehended, meant much to him,  
for it was a revelation that not the injustice  
of God but the maladjustments of men,  
were the all sufficient reasons for involun-  
tary poverty.

In his death the Single Tax movement  
loses an earnest friend, and the world a  
man of singular purity and elevation of  
character.

#### THE FAIRHOPE CONTROVERSY.

We have received a number of letters  
criticising Fairhope. Among these is one  
from Mr. Norton in which he defends the  
correctness of his assessment figures, and,  
with the exception of a few admitted errors,  
does so successfully. We have also a letter  
from Mr. Ettel, once of Fairhope, now in  
Florida, who, wishing Fairhope well, de-  
plores some of its features. Mr. Cope writes  
a criticism of the plan. From F. L. Brown  
comes a spirited defence of Fairhope and its  
management.

The REVIEW is also favored with a lengthy  
communication from Mr. Gustave Buscher,  
who is on a visit to this country from Switz-

erland, with the object of gathering material for a life of Henry George. Mr. Buscher is a keen and scholarly observer. We think that his wide experience, the fact that he is an earnest Single Taxer and in a sense our guest, will warrant the printing of this communication in our next number, giving in the same issue in which it appears the opportunity of reply by some qualified Fairhoper.

The writers of other communications will appreciate the reasons why we refrain from publishing them. We have not been frightened out of our convictions before expressed regarding Fairhope by threats of withdrawal of subscriptions. But it must be apparent that to continue this discussion indefinitely is to thresh old straws. Developments may at any time arise that may alter this decision, but any further lengthened controversy at this time must be without good results. Constructive, not destructive controversy—controversy that will enable us to get others' points of view, and if possible to harmonize such views for increased unity of effort, is what is chiefly required at this stage.

"The silence or apologetic attitude generally of church and educational leaders in the face of brazen crime committed by high toned criminals, immune from punishment, is not the least of the civic problems that face us. No feature of American life strikes the stranger so powerfully as the extraordinary indifference, partly cynicism and good nature, with which notorious frauds and notorious corruption in the sphere of politics are viewed by American public opinion."

These words of Frederick F. Ingram, whom all Single Taxers know, are quoted approvingly by the *Detroit Evening News*. But the most significant part of this address is its conclusion: "I have referred to the granting of special privileges as the cause of bad government. I mean by that the legislatures, national, state or municipal, giving to private corporations property or rights that call for the exercise of the power of eminent domain. This includes transportation privileges between cities and in cities, gas and electric lighting. A private corporation does not require a franchise or a charter to engage in any private business, any more than does an individual. If all public property was owned by the public and all public business done by the public through its chosen officials one great source of public corruption would end."

The anniversary of the birth of Henry George was celebrated in Melbourne, Victoria, by the production of a play, "The Professor in Wonderland," adapted from "The Story of My Dictatorship." Here is a suggestion for the American cousin to act upon. After twenty-five years of agitation there is yet no distinctive Single Tax drama.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

TOLSTOY AND PRIVATE PROPERTY  
IN LAND.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Tolstoy's recent letter to the *London Times* upon the subject, "A Great Iniquity," is the Russian philosopher's latest utterance upon the land question. In it is declared his belief that the greatest of all iniquities is the private ownership of land, together with his explicit endorsement of the Single Tax doctrine of Henry George.

The utterances of this world-famous man, heralded far and near, are likely to foster the misapprehension that the mutual aim of both Henry George and himself was the destruction of private property in land.

I, therefore, beg, with only a word or two of comment, to call critical attention to one of Tolstoy's statements, leaving it to the reader to make his own interpretation of its meaning.

Notwithstanding Tolstoy's unequivocal declaration that "the soil must be restored to the people" and his reiteration of "the wrong of private property in land," the conclusion that he would destroy the private ownership of land must be, it seems to me, a mistaken one, and out of harmony with both his text and context. Henry George specifically arraigned the institution of private property in land, *as it now exists*. He condemned that feature of land tenure which necessitates the invasion by taxation of the otherwise sacred right of private property in the products of labor in order that ground rent may continue to inure mainly to private benefit. Hence, it must be submitted that what Tolstoy had in mind was private property in land "as now existing." The length and breadth of George's proposed remedy, to which Tolstoy gives full endorsement was, in Mr. George's own words, "I do not propose \* \* \* to confiscate private property in land" \* \* \* but "to appropriate rent by taxation." (*Progress and Poverty*, Book VIII, Chap. 2). In the enjoyment of every other "right and privilege" of tenure, the right to "own, possess, buy, sell, devise and bequeath" excepting only the one privilege of the private appropriation of rent, Mr. George's specific declaration was that the landowner should be left undisturbed. The following paragraph is from Tolstoy's "A Great Iniquity":

"A member of the English Parliament, Labouchere, could publicly say, without meeting any refutation, that 'he was not such a visionary as Henry George; he did not propose to take the land from the landlords and rent it out again; what he was in favor of was putting a tax on land values.' That is, whilst attributing to George what he could not possibly have said, Labouchere by way of correcting these imaginary fan

*tasies, suggested that which Henry George did indeed say."*

Tolstoy's language thus proves beyond a possible doubt that he does not believe in taking the land from the landlords, and that he does not believe that Henry George could have said so, but both are agreed in taking ground rent in taxation.

One more thought by way of comment. George and Tolstoy, in common with Herbert Spencer, found, in the literature of the land question, in the dictionaries and in works on political economy one word, "land," standing for soil and for situation, and they used the one term without defining to themselves and to their readers the two ideas embraced in it. A clear distinction presents itself between what the professors might call two separate "concepts," viz., "land" and "land value." It is as follows: "Land," *per se*, defined as the earth's surface; the inherent capabilities of the soil; the bounties of nature; natural resources; "natural media." "Land value," defined to be the value of "rights and privileges thereto pertaining," as specified in deeds of conveyance; value of the advantages of society and government; value of proximity; value due to command of facilities for commerce and communication with the world; an artificial value, not a value of "natural media." The value of land, *per se*, and land value as above defined may be contrasted by supposing one of two city lots to have a doorless and windowless hundred foot wall around it, or to have no legal right of way to and from it, in either of which cases the value would be that of land *per se*.

If any one will re-read both authors, bearing in mind to apply to private property in land wherever it occurs, the above distinction, as well as the qualifying words, "as at present existing," a great deal of confusion will surely be dissipated and sense will appear in place of what may have been pronounced foolishness.

C. B. FILLEBROWN.

FROM W. I. BOREMAN.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

To be sure, we in this State have home rule in taxation in so far as the State taxes which are restricted to taxes on licenses and taxes on corporations. No other taxes are collected. The county gets all the taxes. But, on the other hand, the criminal expenses of each county are paid from the county taxes, while heretofore the State has paid them. And again, while we assess the value of land separate from the improvements, and each are to be assessed at their full selling value, and this assessment is to be made annually after 1909, yet at the same time a very strenuous effort is being made to tax personality with the usual results of scaring everybody into hiding it or lying

about it or sending it out of the State. What a howl is being sent up over the revaluation of land values. "Tax the lot I paid \$500 for at \$500! Why, last year it was assessed at \$50. That's awful. It will ruin us," etc. It is going to knock the wind and water out of the town lot business, I hope.

On the other hand, they are assessing houses at their real cost. Some old ones are being torn down to escape taxation. One very bad feature of our city charter is the exemption of all land in lots of over five acres from city taxes on the plea that it is farming land. Think of it! But it makes a good text for Single Taxers and Socialists to preach sermons on. W. I. BOREMAN.  
Parkersburg, West Va.

#### JUDGE POINTS FOR POLITICAL ACTION.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

Is it not time to knock out the stays from under our boat and launch it upon the open sea of practical politics?

Will not such a course force our philosophy upon the attention of voters who cannot be persuaded to listen to the discussion of a question so long as it is purely academic?

Is it not time to test the zeal of our reformers and the metal of the martyrs?

J. J. POINTS.

Omaha, Neb.

#### SOME MORE CURIOSITIES OF TAXATION.

*Editor Single Tax Review:*

Your article on Curiosities of Taxation in the *Chicago Public* of Nov. 11, reminds me of another mentioned in *Hensel's Die Familie Mendelssohn*, vol. 1, p. 2. The translation is as follows:

In the middle of the foregoing century [the eighteenth] the Jews of Germany found themselves in the most oppressed condition. Here they were forbidden to live in corner houses, there they were permitted only a prescribed number of marriages, but everywhere they were burdened beyond the ordinary state taxes with the most various imposts, sometimes carefully chosen for their insulting character. For instance, under Frederick William I the Berlin Jews were compelled to buy the wild boars killed at the great court hunts; under Frederick the Great every Jew at his marriage must take porcelain of a certain value from the newly-founded Royal Porcelain Factory in Berlin, and even then not what he might choose, but according to the pleasure of the factory, which naturally got rid in this way of their unsalable wares. Moses Mendelssohn [grandfather of Felix the musician], even at that time a universally known and honored man, received twenty life size massive porcelain apes, of which some are still in the family.

Chicago, Ill.

ELLEN DEAN.

## BOOK REVIEWS.

## \* THE PROBLEM OF THE UNEMPLOYED.

Under the title of "The Problem of the Unemployed" an unknown writer has made a valuable contribution to economic literature of the new school. It is a book of three hundred pages, of convenient size and good print, and is from cover to cover interesting reading. Although political economy is proverbially dull and heavy, yet so simple is the language employed and so clear the presentation of each proposition and argument throughout that even to a mind unfamiliar with this study its ideas are readily absorbed.

As the title indicates the object of the book is to discover the cause of involuntary poverty. Briefly stating the undisputed fact of the vast increase in labor-saving devices for which the last century was conspicuous, and the consequent enormous additions to wealth mankind has thus gained, the author notes that this gain has not been shared in by all, and quotes from the late Thorold Rogers that "relatively speaking, the working man of to-day is not so well off as he was in the 15th century." "If," he continues, "it is true that labor-saving processes do not increase wages in the same proportion in which they increase the laborer's ability to produce wealth, where does the increasing difference between the wealth which he produces and that which he receives as wages go? Who gets it and what becomes of it? What is the law which controls its distribution?" A very pertinent question which he proceeds to answer to the complete satisfaction of Single Taxers, tracing with masterly logic to the monopolization of natural opportunities and to special privileges granted to the few, such as protective tariffs and franchises, the vast fortunes of some of the children of the All-Father and the enslavement and grinding poverty of the majority.

The chapter on Definitions is excellent, grouping into reasonable and natural category the various elements which belong respectively to the prime factors, Land, Labor, and Capital, and showing the confusion which arises from classing as wealth things which should fall under either of the other headings and *vice versa*, as authors of reputation often do in standard treatises on political economy. I have but one objection to make to this chapter. Of Capital, he says: "Capital is the fund from which wages are drawn and it is proper and convenient to refer to the capital in a community or nation as the wage fund of such community or nation."

\* This review is of a book from the author's advanced pages. The work is not yet published. The author is well known to Single Taxers everywhere, and the work will shortly be on the market. This notice is printed by special permission of the author of the work reviewed.

Although in a footnote the author himself observes that it may not be strictly accurate to define capital as the fund from which wages are drawn, since capital is but stored up labor, yet he holds this objection as technical, considering employees as a class dependent upon such fund even though their work each day produces in advance the wealth which really constitutes their wages. One of the important vantage points gained by Henry George over old economists was the refutation of the old wage fund theory, and no writer of the new school should, in my opinion, even seemingly, surrender that point or obscure it. It is not necessary for labor to wait to store up wealth before beginning the construction of some work not immediately repaying effort, but only that other labor engaged in work at once returning results should be willing to exchange such results—say bread and meat—for a future share in the other's work when completed; or, we may put it, for a share in the day's portion of such work while in course of construction. All that is needed is the faith of men who produce bread and meat that the work of their fellow laborer requiring many days' labor before completion is worth the exchange.

While, no doubt, the author of this book has merely given this definition of a wage fund for convenience in other statements, and in deference to the common holding of this idea, I think the chapter would be stronger without it, for it is misleading to one reading such a book for the first time and unfamiliar with Single Tax teachings. It seems a small matter, but the dignity of labor rests on the maintenance of the George axiom that no wage fund is necessary, but that labor produces its wages with each day's work as well as interest to capital and rent to land.

This same idea is elaborated in the chapter entitled "The Wage Fund," and the author here enters upon what seems to me an unproductive argument as to what, by rich people, constitutes the most advantageous encouragement to industry; their expenditures determining production in whatever direction their tastes demand. "The so-called miserly men," he says, "who economize and save are public benefactors as compared with the less provident whose incomes are entirely absorbed in living expenses. The former may not be so popular with tailors and retail store keepers as the latter, but if it were not for the prudence and self denial exercised by them the wage fund would be smaller, rates of interest would be higher, and the comforts and luxuries of life would not be so commonly enjoyed."

We really need trouble ourselves but little as to how rich men spend their money providing it be rightly acquired, nor worry about what effect such spending would have upon determining production in any special field. What concerns us is how the rich man gets his money, not how he spends it. Up to



recent times the possessor of great wealth has been credited with industry, prudence, superior ability and the special favor of Heaven; poverty to the reverse of these qualities and to the will of God. But we have learned a valuable lesson and one that can never again be obscured, and that is that unjust privileges and nothing else, is the basis of all vast fortunes, and that the most fundamental of these privileges is the holding of the earth as the private property of a few. The "Problem of the Unemployed" points this moral in convincing fashion. But I have one serious objection to offer to its pages. This is its chapter on "The Immediate Nationalization of Land."

The author, indeed, disclaims the special favoring of the proposed scheme, merely suggesting it as a possible means to an end. Still, this chapter is an integral part of the book and can not be passed over. The proposition is that the Government shall at once buy out the present owners of land so that the Single Tax on rent might be immediately instituted; the money for this purchase to be raised by the issue of interest bearing Government bonds. The sum required to reimburse present owners he sets at forty billion dollars, the interest for bonds and expenses of government as about two billion six hundred million. The required revenue, it is suggested, might be easily raised by a budget as follows:

Ground rent taxation, not in excess of economic rent. . . .	\$866,000,000
Tariff so levied as to produce a revenue without reference to protection. . . . .	400,000,000
Internal revenue taxes on liquors and tobacco (which would include all license taxes now levied by States and municipalities. . . . .	525,000,000
A general stamp tax. . . . .	100,000,000
An ad valorem tax on railroad freight and passenger rates, collected by stamps applied to tickets and bills of lading. . . . .	500,000,000
An inheritance tax. . . . .	75,000,000
From an increase in postal rates. . . . .	84,000,000
From miscellaneous sources. . . . .	100,000,000
Total . . . . .	\$2,600,000,000

Whether the impetus to all branches of industry which would follow the nationalization of land would quickly liquidate the debt, or whether, as Spencer contended, to properly indemnify landlords would permanently swamp the whole people, is a question which might prove interesting for abstract discussion, but to seriously propose to buy out the octopus who has so long drained the life blood of the body politic is analagous to a proposition to retire a class of Capt. Kidds in opulence and ease. They

have had too much already. Besides to speak of compensation is to lose the moral strength of our position. If land owners have a right to compensation they have the right to retain possession. The Single Tax is not a mere fiscal reform, it is the harmonizing of social law with the law of Justice. Even if we were obliged to wait longer for the day of freedom, better that than attempt to palter with Justice and buy the abolition of this hoary wrong.

This book has been read by me with such pleasure that I am reluctant to set down these adverse criticisms on some points in it, and these objections are made in no cavilling spirit, but with a sincere appreciation and admiration of the good work done for the cause of freedom by its unknown author.

IDA HIBBARD.

#### \*A REMARKABLE WORK.

The author of this book is one of the Republicans whose real democratic instincts were recognized by the Hon. Tom L. Johnson when the latter became Mayor of Cleveland. With that profound knowledge of men which has availed him so well in his selection of individuals in sympathy with those intelligent and far reaching aims which he has in mind for the government of Cleveland, and ultimately for the regeneration of society—for it is no less important a task to which this remarkable man has dedicated the labors of his life—Mayor Johnson from the beginning has sought the co-operation of both parties whose knowledge of municipal problems and high minded devotion to their solution have set them apart from the self-seeking horde of office holders, municipal grafters, and the mass of indifferent citizens.

This book from the hand of one whom Mayor Johnson has so signally honored is by far the best work extant on the problems of the cities. There is not a book on the subject in which general conditions and the many problems of city government are so fairly and accurately stated; and the remedies presented so closely in line with the abstract and practical knowledge of these vexed questions.

If, to begin with, one would know the chief cause of the corruption of cities, and knowing the cause would seek a remedy, this book is of inestimable value. Where others have dealt with the manifestation of civic corruption in their personal aspects, our author has seen them in their true and deeper relation. Forms of social disorganization which Lincoln Steffens ascribes to business our author more accurately attributes to "Business—plus the valuable franchises of the cities." He shows that here is the power which creates the "bosses" and supplies them with the funds needed to

\* The City the Hope of Democracy. By Frederick C. Howe, Ph.D. Cloth, 12mo, 312 pp. Price, \$1.50 net. Chas. Scribner's Sons, N. Y. City.

carry elections and buy legislatures. The fortunes of the bosses are derived from the power to control nominations of those friendly to these interests. The conservation of these privileges secures a perpetual fund for bribery, intimidation and the betrayal of the people through successive legislatures. Behind the boss, lurking in the shadow, looms the power greater than the boss, of whom the boss is but the pliant tool—the franchise magnate.

Specific instances are cited, in which the characters but not the essential drama changes—Chicago, Cincinnati, St. Louis and other cities. It is interesting to note that the author speaks of three cities, Cincinnati, St. Louis and Philadelphia “as remaining untouched by reform.” But time has witnessed even their reclamation.

In the chapter, “The Way Out—Municipal Ownership,” the author says, referring to public utilities: “Before the city dweller can begin to feed, clothe, or take care of his family, these monopolies which the city creates, and must of necessity create, impose upon him a charge of probably one hundred dollars a year. They form one of the largest items in his domestic budget. Nor do these charges tend to decrease. For the same causes which lead to the growth of rent increase the earnings of these companies as well.”

These increases are of course essentially increases in rent. These street railroad values are economic “rent” values precisely as is the income received by the owner of a corner lot. They are the unearned values which must be appropriated by the public before any real and lasting reform in our cities can be brought about. This is the formal justification for public ownership—a method of accomplishing the object which in the matter of general land values of the city may be secured by a change in the methods of taxation. But to this aspect of the problem our author is acutely alive, and his treatment in the chapters, “The City’s Treasure” and “The Revenues of the City,” leaves nothing to be desired.

If any criticism is to be made on Mr. Howe’s book it may be indicated in a somewhat faulty concept of the real office of the State in society, and the line that marks off its legitimate province from the field of individual activities. After unmistakably indicating this line of demarcation in the words, “Whatever is of necessity a monopoly should be a public monopoly,” he writes as follows:

“A generation ago it was urged by John Stuart Mill that the burden of proof was upon those who advocated an extension of the activities of the State; that private initiative should be the rule, governmental activity the exception; and that only in rare cases should this rule be departed from. This burden on the advocates of municipal ownership has been a heavy one, heavy in

the interpretation put upon it, equally heavy in the proof required.”

It should be said that the position of Mr. Mill is exactly reconciled with the dictum which Mr. Howe has laid down, “Whatever is of necessity a monopoly should be a public monopoly.” It is clear, too, that Mr. Mill’s position is a sound one. We are perfectly content that the burden of proof should rest upon those who advocate an extension of the activities of the municipalities involving as it really does a minimization of the activities of the State. But Mr. Howe has enunciated the principle which those who oppose municipal ownership must meet fairly and squarely. Monopoly is destructive; it must therefore be destroyed. In some cases it can be destroyed by introducing the principle of competition; where this is impossible of introduction other methods must be adopted. Therefore the thought that is behind this sentence of our author seems to us open to denial. “A conscious housing problem is one of the pressing obligations of city administration, just as is the supply of water, gas, electricity, police and fire protection. We cannot rely upon the free play of competitive forces for private agencies now have no pecuniary interest in such a problem.” The saving clause of this sentence is the word “now.” But there is “now” no free play of competitive forces. Such forces, if allowed free play, would solve the “housing problem” with no extension of municipal government activity.

Indeed every tenement house law, largely absolute or ineffective under present conditions, could then be dispensed with. Under the terms of a free contract now impossible between landowners and landless the housing problem could be left to the individual. Such necessary socialism as is involved under present conditions in laws similar to these tenement house regulations, could be done away with in a society in which private monopoly becomes public monopoly, and distinctions of *meum* and *tuum*, of *mine*, *yours*, and *ours* are recognized in the laws.

The Single Tax is philosophically and in its concrete application a reconciliation of the individualistic and socialistic claims and tenets. In appearance, and taken in conjunction with the public ownership of municipal functions now privately controlled, it is an extension of the activities of the State; actually, considered in its more general effects, it is a minimization of such activities and a simplification of government. But all this Mr. Howe recognizes, even if it seems to us he has not laid the necessary emphasis upon it.

The municipal unit may increase its functional activities as the State diminishes *its*. The smaller, or at least the more compact and independent the social unit, the more effectively may it organize for increased public activities.

It is not easy to speak of this book in

terms of praise that will not seem extravagant. It is by far the best work on municipal problems of which we have any knowledge. Long before democracy has finally justified itself the student and the practical reformer must return to it again and again for knowledge and inspiration. Severely practical as are the various steps in the processes of its reasoning it is not without that fire of enthusiasm which directs the conscious application of the philosophy of those who have caught true glimpses of the Promised Land of democracy, and the splendid possibilities of its realization.

J. D. M.

---

\* A STUDY OF WILLIAM LLOYD GARRISON.

This little book is not a life of Garrison, though it relates the main incidents of his career, most of which are to be found in "The Story of His Life as Told by His Children." It is not as a biography that this little book appeals to the reader. It is with quite another aim that Mr. Crosby writes. Garrison, the Abolitionist, is famous the world over; but Garrison, one of the earliest apostles of the doctrine of non-resistance, is hardly known at all. It is with this side of his teaching, and incidentally with that phase of his character which illustrates such teaching, that this book is intended primarily to deal.

Even if we do not accept the doctrine of non-resistance it is well to understand it. Single Taxers generally, if we mistake not, do not accept it. But it is not a policy of cowardice. Indeed, it is a counsel of perfection which in many cases requires far more courage to adhere to than the meeting of force with force. It is true, too, that in many cases it is infinitely more effective. Garrison was a man of supreme courage—quite as courageous as John Brown or Owen Lovejoy, one of whom defied a State with arms, and the other of whom died fighting. It was by the merest chance that Garrison escaped the fate of these heroic souls; his policy rendered him no more immune. The gentility, intelligence, and culture of Boston would have lynched him quite as summarily as it would the others, had circumstances permitted, and on one occasion indeed nearly succeeded in doing so.

Mr. Crosby makes an eloquent—and shall we say "logical," which word Mr. Crosby does not altogether like—argument in defence of the doctrine of non-resistance. Certainly it is almost convincing; we are carried along with the gracious and highly reasoned argument until we are almost willing to agree with him, that "violence is played out," by which is meant that it has now lost

---

\* Garrison, the Non-Resistant. By Ernest Crosby. Cloth. 16mo. 144 pp. Price 50 cents, net, with photogravure portrait of Garrison. The Public Publishing Company, Chicago, Ill.

its potency for good if it ever possessed any. The work is dedicated to William Lloyd Garrison, Jr., "a son worthy of his father," and himself one of our honored leaders in a work of wider emancipation.

J. D. M.

---

\* CHRISTIAN SCIENCE AND THE SINGLE TAX.

This work, with its sub-title, "A Feeble Attempt to Unite Two Mighty Subjects," is written to show the identity of what to the author are the fundamental truths of Christian Science with those of the Single Tax philosophy. Doubtless the uniting of two severed truths may establish a medium which will act as a current for the more perfect communication of thought. We are not competent to judge if this has been successfully accomplished, but it appears to have been attempted with much serious thought and the book may be destined to do good among the followers of Mrs. Eddy. All great questions are at bottom moral and religious questions, and we do not doubt that a more than superficial likeness can be established between the Single Tax and what is true in the Christian Science philosophy. The author thinks—and she claims to have the evidence for so thinking—that this attempt at harmonizing these principles will be resented by many of Mrs. Eddy's disciples. But in view of the respectful appeal to the founder of the church, and the seriousness of the general treatment, it hardly seems reasonable that offence can be taken.

The Single Tax Primer which forms the appendix is in the main a very lucid elementary statement of our principles, though in strict accuracy a few of the definitions leave something to be desired. But for Mrs. Goldzier's purposes it may be that economic rigidity can be sacrificed to a slightly more loose but flexible construction for popular understanding. This is always more or less permissible if no positive misconceptions are conveyed.

J. D. M.

---

President Roosevelt has appointed Franklin K. Lane, of California, whose Single Tax sympathies are well known, to be Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

---

At the latest Glasgow municipal elections 20 out of 26 candidates were returned as favoring the rating of land values.

---

W. D. Lamb, of Plumas, Manitoba, has started a weekly paper.

---

\*The At-One-Ment of Christian Science and the Single Tax. With Hints for a Single Tax Primer, Second Edition. Paper. Folio. 76 pp. Price, 60 cents by mail. Julia Goldzier, Bayonne, N. J.

## FROM A BROOKLYN CLERGYMAN.

I, personally, am not a Socialist. I believe in individual freedom and opportunity, first, last and always, consequently I should much prefer Henry George's plan of the Single Tax, holding the land for the benefit of all, because I believe that all the evils which Socialism seeks to destroy will thus be destroyed, and in addition the individual will still be unfettered and free to acquire and grow. Unfortunately, however, the Single Tax program seems more radical than Socialism, for socialism grows upon us insidiously through Municipal and State ownership. Probably Socialism must come first. To us it but remains to pray that out of the chaos of experiment some permanent good will come, some sure advance be made, so that justice and comfort may be more equitably distributed among men.—From Sermon on Garrison, by Rev. John M. Davidson, of the Fourth Unitarian Church, of Brooklyn.

Edward Atkinson, who died last month in Boston at the advanced age of 78, was long an opponent of the Single Tax, which he curiously misunderstood. But he made contributions of signal ability to the causes of Free Trade, the Peace Movement, and Anti Imperialism. He wrote an article expressly for the SINGLE TAX REVIEW about a year ago in answer to a contribution of Mr. Ernest Crosby. He was a man whose great abilities and signal services to many important causes were as remarkable as his limitations.

Wm. C. Miner, of New London, Conn., is one of the Croasdalers of that State. In *The Day*, a local newspaper, is an essay from Mr. Miner covering over three columns. After reviewing the effects of land tenure in Connecticut, he proceeds to a number of striking local instances, showing the impolicy of present modes of taxation. It is an effective article, couched in clear and admirable English. Our Connecticut friends could do no better service to the cause than to circulate it as a tract.

Henry Ancketill, once in the service of the British navy, and later connected with the business department of the *Standard*, has been a member of the Natal Parliament for a number of years, in which body he has been a vigorous and intelligent advocate of our principles. He has publicly announced his retirement from politics, and hints—as we gather from a friendly notice in the *Natal Advertiser*—at his probable departure from the Colony. If he should visit this country he will find many friends who have been distant but interested spectators of the brave fight he has waged in far away Natal.

WANTED.—Vols. 9 and 10 of the Memorial Edition of Henry George's Works, set No. 880.

## WHY I FAVOR THE SINGLE TAX.

Taxation is a subject to which little public attention is given, yet no subject is more vital to the progress of the human race and the establishment of a true democracy.

There are only two things that can be taxed. These two things are man and the earth he lives on. Therefore labor values and land values are the only two things extant upon which taxes are or can be levied. That taxes are essential to the administration of government is undeniably true and that something must therefore be taxed is clearly apparent. The right thing to tax is monopoly, the wrong thing to tax is labor, because government sustains monopoly and labor sustains itself. Not only does it do this, but as taxes are now levied it sustains the government which in turn supports monopolies of every sort. These monopolies exercise the taxing power, sustained as they are by government, and between being robbed by the government in public taxes and by monopolies in private taxes, the workers of the world are kept forever poor. This in turn fosters land speculation, which greatly lessens opportunities for labor. This also gluts the labor market, reduces wages and is a fruitful cause of strikes, which in turn are frequently put down by the strong arm of government. The real reason we have a labor question is because the laborers have been disinherited and the earth, the gift of the common Father to His common children, is held at a prohibitive price. The small portion that is used is artificially high in price, which means high rents while the rest is kept out of the market for speculation. This is the chief cause of poverty among the workers.

Why should wealth production and poverty be always associated? Nature gives nothing to idleness. She, being both generous and just, rewards only the workers. Why should the worker be poor and the idler rich? It is because men are rewarded, not in proportion to what they do, but in proportion to what they monopolize. Divorce government from monopoly, and the latter fails. Separate labor from land, and humanity dies. This is what the land speculator tries to do and in a measure succeeds in doing, though without evil intent. The worker's real enemy is the speculator in land; his imaginary enemy is the capitalist.

No evil can be remedied by merely finding fault with it. The cure must be discovered and applied; heroic remedies alone will suffice. And since the evil has been and is now largely due to unscientific taxation, what more sensible plan could be suggested than to place the burden of government where it properly and justly belongs, leaving industry free to produce and to retain; to build and also to inhabit: to reap as well as to sow?

H. H. HARDINGE  
in the *Arena* for Nov.



## SIX AILMENTS OF OUR SOCIAL ANATOMY.

(For *The Review*.)

With very few exceptions the great fortunes of our times are the logical result, directly or indirectly, of :

### 1. INCREASE IN LAND VALUES, ACCOMPANIED BY CONCENTRATION OF RENT.

Increase in land values is due to the activities of all, without reference to ownership or direct control of land. This increase should, therefore, be appropriated by society for its betterment, and should not become private property.

### 2. PROTECTIVE TARIFF.

The protective tariff gives certain and assured advantages to certain industries by *enforced contributions from all consumers.*

### 3. THE NATIONAL BANK SYSTEM.

Nothing less than the integrity of *all* the people is sufficient guarantee of the safety of the people's currency and savings. And all profit from furnishing the people with currency as well as from the use of the savings of the people should go towards lessening taxation, and not into the pockets of particular individuals.

### 4. PRIVATE CONTROL OF PUBLIC HIGHWAYS.

*Public highways include dirt roads, stone roads, steel roads, roads leading from farms to farms, from farms to towns, from towns to cities, and these roads are the veins of commercial and social intercourse. Their control by private corporations means their use by the public for the enriching of the comparatively few who control them.*

### 5. MUNICIPAL AND NATIONAL GRAFT.

Our senseless system of spoils is alone responsible for the excrement, common to our municipal, State and national affairs known as the "practical politician." Graft is a term which stands for robbery of the people by their employees. Public officials are public servants. It has been a grievous blunder to allow them to grow into the belief that *they* are the Government. The utter incongruity of our civil service can be easily realized by taking as a true analogy the case of a merchant who should engage a clerk on condition that he was to hold his position for a term of years, whether he should serve the merchant's interests or not.

### 6. LIFE INSURANCE BY PRIVATE COMPANIES.

Premiums paid by policy holders represent savings by the people, and should be safe-guarded by nothing less than the stability and integrity of all the people.

All of these sources of concentrated wealth will be found, on analysis, to be flagrant violations of the fundamental principle of

social justice and equity, namely: The natural right of the laborer to the products of his labor. For all of these sources of wealth to trusts and grafters the people are responsible. The trusts and grafters are simply gathering in what we in our ignorance and stupid indifference are making no claim for. We are practically telling them to help themselves to whatever they can lay hands on. J. A. DEMUTH.

## WORK OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.

The Manhattan Single Tax Club of this city has had during the Autumn of this year a great number of public addresses on recurring Sundays. These will be continued during the Winter and early Spring. Readers of the REVIEW are urged to attend and bring their friends. Following is a list of speakers and subjects to be treated during parts of January and February :

Jan. 21, 1906, Rev. Dr. Henry Frank.

Jan. 28, 1906, Mr. Wm. B. Vernam.

Feb. 4, 1906, Mr. Hugh O. Pentecost.

Feb. 11, 1906, Mr. W. F. Copeland.

Following is the list of officers of the Club elected for 1906 :

President—Edw. Polak, 4080 3rd Ave., City.

Vice-President—Jerome O'Neill, 3 Manhattan St., City.

General Secretary—J. L. Stern, 54 St. Nicholas Ave., City.

Recording Secretary—Archibald Dorman, 749 E. 143rd St., City.

Financial Secretary—Wm. H. Smith, 46 W. 129th St., City.

Treasurer—J. V. Gilloon, 160 W. 106th St., City.

Directors—Simon G. Levy, 344 E. 78th St., City; O. H. Geiger, 113 W. 118th St., City; J. C. Neu, 57 W. 30th St., City; Fred. J. Huppert, 752 3rd Ave., City; Thos. Ferguson, 146 E. 128th St., City.

## FOR PUBLIC MEETINGS IN BROOKLYN.

A determined effort will be made to hold Single Tax meetings for the public on Sunday evenings at some prominent theatre in Brooklyn during the Winter and Spring of 1906. The gentlemen who have this work in contemplation are Gustave W. Thompson and Henry B. Maurer. Mr. Maurer has in charge the management of the Monroe Lecture Bureau for the Brooklyn Borough. It ought to be easy to command support for so important a work.

The Public Publishing Company, First National Bank Building, Chicago, publishers of Oliver R. Trowbridge's great book "Bi-Socialism; The Reign of the Man at the Margin," have made a reduction in the price of this book from \$1.50 to \$1.00 (postage 10 cents.) The book continues to re-

ceive the highest commendations from the greatest economic authorities in this country and Europe, and is considered the most important contribution to economic science that has been made in the United States during the past quarter of a century. See adv.

We desire to call attention to the reduction in the subscription price of the *Public*, which is now but one dollar a year. The *Public* has come to be regarded as indispensable to the cause of radical democracy, and its illuminating editorials, its compact and orderly arrangement of current news, its admirably selected miscellany, and its excellent book reviews make it one of the very best weekly papers extant. Every reader of the *REVIEW* should be a subscriber to the *Public*. We therefore call attention to the adv. of the *Public* on another page.

Z. W. Craig, in the *Los Angeles Labor News*, which is issued and controlled by the labor unions of Southern California, and is a large and creditable eight page weekly, is presenting our truths in an unusually forcible fashion. In the *San Pedro News* Mr. Craig is also in evidence. In the issues for November 1st and 2d he has an article under the title, "The Path Reform Should Take."

Andrew Hutton, of Schenectady, N. Y., has many a letter in the newspapers of his city, in which the Single Tax is briefly but strongly presented.

## THE PUBLIC

THE FAMOUS DEMOCRATIC  
WEEKLY AND CHRONICLE  
OF CURRENT HISTORY :: ::

**REDUCED IN PRICE**  
From \$2.00 to **\$1.00** A YEAR

No paper in the country is of greater usefulness to publicists, and to every one wishing to possess a sympathetic record of real democratic progress. :: :: ::

**PUBLIC PUBLISHING COMPANY**

First National Bank Building  
CHICAGO, ILL.

## THE EQUITIST

A new national weekly magazine, will illumine truth and dispel error by a fearless discussion of every phase of Sociology and Evolution, from the standpoint of Equal Freedom and Annular Evolution. Its readers will be encouraged to discuss with the editor every "ism" involved. It will aim directly at the total abolition of all tribute compelling powers; by first securing that unity of conception which can come only from clear thinking, and which, in its turn, necessitates the use of clearly defined words.

The cause and cure of the many ills which beset humanity—social and political, including intemperance, vice, crime and poverty, trusts and "graft," public and private—will be thoroughly discussed.

The important questions which confront the parents of school children from time to time will be thoroughly discussed alternate weeks by the Seabright Child Study Circle, and suggestions and queries from readers will be noted and answered as occasion warrants. Every other week the Book-Lovers' Club will discuss books—new and old—and other publications, in the manner of a group of persons thoroughly interested in the subjects and perfectly free to express themselves.

THE EQUITIST will be edited by Warren Edwin Brokaw. The Seabright Child Study Circle and Book-Lovers' Club will be a distinct department in charge of Estella Bachman. Isaac Newton Vail, as special contributor, will have charge of the Annular Evolution department.

A 16-page weekly magazine: \$1. a year, 50 cents six months, 25 cents three months—invariably in advance. Sample copies free to readers of the *Single Tax Review*.

Send 25 cents in stamps for a trial subscription at once. Address all orders to

**Bachman-Brokaw Publishing House**  
Station A, Pasadena, Cal.

### Henry George's Works.

**PROGRESS AND POVERTY**, \$1.00 in cloth; 50 cents in paper.

**SOCIAL PROBLEMS**, \$1.00 in cloth, 50 cents in paper.

**PROTECTION vs. FREE TRADE**, \$1.00 in cloth, 50 cents in paper.

**A PERPLEXED PHILOSOPHER**, \$1.00 in cloth, 50 cents in paper.

**THE LAND QUESTION, CONDITION OF LABOR, AND A PASSAGE AT ARMS**, Cloth, \$1.00.

**SCIENCE OF POLITICAL ECONOMY**. HENRY GEORGE'S last book. In cloth only, \$2.50.

Sent postpaid on receipt of price.

**SINGLE TAX REVIEW**  
11 Frankfort Street, NEW YORK.