

Aug 7 1912
RECEIVED 1912

The
SINGLE TAX REVIEW

A BI-MONTHLY RECORD OF THE PROGRESS OF SINGLE
TAX AND TAX REFORM THROUGHOUT THE WORLD

This number contains final instalment of Dr. W. Schrameier's Land Reform in Germany; Henry George, the Man; Origin and History of the Women's Single Tax League, with Sketches of the League's Officers; News from Special Correspondents.

JULY - AUGUST, 1912

VOLUME 12 x x x NUMBER 4

Yearly Subscription, \$1.00 >> Single Copies, 25 Cents

PUBLISHED AT 150 NASSAU STREET
NEW YORK CITY, N. Y.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, Editor and Publisher



TABLE OF CONTENTS

HENRY GEORGE, THE MAN.....	<i>Edward R. Taylor</i>	1
LAND REFORM IN GERMANY (Concluded).....	<i>Dr. W. Schrameier</i>	13
LAND HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.....	<i>Dr. Thos. L. Brunk</i>	29
APE ECONOMICSS.....	<i>J. B. Forbis, Jr.</i>	44
TAX THE RENTAL VALUE.....		47
ANTONIO ALBENDIN.....		48
TESTIMONY OF THREE GREAT NOVELISTS.....		49
NEW YORK CITY VALUES.....	<i>Geo. White</i>	49
A QUESTION FOR DEBATE.....		51
NEWS—DOMESTIC—A. D. Cridge, S. L. Moser, J. J. Pastoriza, L. F. C. Garvin		51
ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE WOMEN'S SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.....		55
OFFICIAL BOARD OF THE WOMEN'S SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.....		55
CONVENTION OF THE WOMEN'S SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.....		57
FROM DR. KUEHNER.....		59
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....		59
THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE US FREE.....	<i>Charlotte Schetter</i>	60





MRS. JOHN S. CROSBY, Chairman



MRS. JENNIE L. MUNROE, Vice Chairman



DR. MARY D. HUSSEY, Secretary



MISS JENNIE A. ROGERS, Treasurer

WOMEN'S NATIONAL SINGLE TAX COMMITTEE

(See page 55)

THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

HENRY GEORGE, THE MAN.

(For the Review.)

By EDWARD R. TAYLOR.

I first met Henry George at Sacramento in the year 1870. At that time H. H. Haight was Governor of the State and I was his private secretary. George and I then formed a friendship which became deep and intimate, and which lasted without a break until the moment of his death. He was a little below the medium height, of stocky build, with sandy hair and whiskers, including moustache, with a large, dome-shaped head, bright blue eyes, very erect and dignified in deportment, yet alert and quick in all his movements; in countenance frank and open, somewhat careless of dress, and with an extraordinary capacity of meeting everybody upon his own level and of interesting him and of being interested by him. He had reached San Francisco on the 27th of May, 1858, after a voyage of 155 days from Philadelphia, on the little steamer "Shubrick" of the U. S. Navy (named after Admiral Shubrick) which was to undertake light-house duty upon the Pacific Coast, and on which George had shipped as steward. He had received but little schooling, and had always felt a strong yearning for the sea, as was evidenced by his having sailed as foremast boy to Australia and India, and to Boston as ordinary seaman on a coal schooner. At the time of his arrival in San Francisco he had not reached twenty years of age by four months, and between that time and the time we first met he had, like so many other thousands, gone to Frazer River,—borne thither on the wings of an excitement which led to nothing but irremediable disappointment; he had learned to set type; had found employment as weigher in a rice mill; had tried to mine and to farm; had got married; had peddled clothes-wringers; had worked on newspapers as a compositor; had secured an interest in a newspaper which almost died aborning; and had suffered poverty to such an extreme that on the day of the birth of his second child, he begged money on the street. He has related this incident as follows:

"I walked along the street and made up my mind to get money from the first man whose appearance might indicate that he had it to give. I stopped a man—a stranger—and told him I wanted \$5. He asked what I wanted it

for. I told him that my wife was confined and that I had nothing to give her to eat. He gave me the money. If he had not I think I was desperate enough to have killed him."

The truth is that George seldom had money beyond his needs, while many times throughout his life he was greatly distressed for lack of it. He seems to have had but little practical business ability, and not the slightest desire for money beyond that necessary for the immediate moment. Yet there was no man with a higher sense of pecuniary obligation. He was wholly insensible to falsehood in the matter of procuring money to meet his necessities, and he repaid his loans with the most scrupulous exactitude. The truth is that business as business had no attractions for him. He seemed to be insusceptible of bringing himself into sympathetic relation with anything connected with it. He was rather singularly constituted, for while he was essentially of a contemplative nature, yet he was fond of action and was remarkably energetic therein. He was ever ready to respond to any call for money if the money were in his pocket; and in such generousities, in his occasional unremunerative employments, and in his indifference to business methods, lay most of his pecuniary troubles.

It will be asked why he did not profit greatly by the large circulation of "Progress and Poverty," as he certainly did not. This was mainly due to the cheap editions which he promoted in the interest of propaganda and from which he derived but little. In all this he was but like himself. He never dreamed of coining the book into money. What he primarily cared for was to have the seed of his doctrine sown far and wide; all else was secondary.

During the period above mentioned George had become managing editor of the *San Francisco Times*, had waged an unsuccessful but courageous war against the press and telegraph monopolies of the day, and was indeed, after the *Times* had breathed its last, the first managing editor of the *San Francisco Chronicle*, which position, however, he held but a short time. During all his life he had been an omniverous reader. He was gifted by nature with intellectual powers of a high order, and with the faculty of expressing his thoughts in engaging and lucid style, and had hence done more or less writing which had promise at the heart of it. He was among the first to point out the dangers of oriental immigration, and had written convincingly thereon. It will be remembered that he had some interesting correspondence with John Stuart Mill on this subject. He had also written for the fourth number of the *Overland Monthly*, then edited by Bret Harte, his noted article on "What the Railroad will Bring Us"—the first trans-continental railroad being then near completion. It is interesting to record that the article was seven thousand words in length, and that George was paid forty dollars for it. It contained these pregnant words:

"The truth is that the completion of the Railroad and the consequent great increase in business and population will not be a benefit to all of us, but only to a portion. As a rule (liable of course to exceptions) those *who have it* will make wealthier; for those *who have not* it will make it more difficult to get.

Those who have lands, mines, established businesses, special abilities of certain kinds, will become richer for it, and find increased opportunities; those who have only their own labor will become poorer and find it harder to get ahead—first because it will take more capital to buy land or to get into business; and second because as competition reduces the wages of labor this capital will be harder for them to obtain.

"And as California becomes populous and rich, let us not forget that the character of a people counts for more than their numbers; that the distribution of wealth is even a more important matter than its production. Let us not imagine ourselves in a fool's paradise where the golden apples will drop into our mouths; let us not think that after the stormy seas and head gales of all the ages, our ship has at last struck the trade winds of time. The future of our State, of our Nation, of our Race, looks fair and bright; perhaps the future looked so to the philosophers who once sat in the porches of Athens, to the unremembered men who raised the cities whose ruins lie south of us. Our modern civilization strikes broad and deep and looks high. So did the tower which men once built almost unto the heavens."

Governor Haight had initiated a campaign against Railroad Subsidies which up to his time had maintained an unobstructed course in the legislatures of California; and as he had become interested in George as a writer, he offered him inducements to become the managing editor of *The Reporter*, a democratic paper then published at Sacramento. Haight had started in politics as a Republican just as George had, but each one of them had been moved by reasons satisfactory to himself to join his political fortunes with those of the Democratic Party. George entered with ardor upon the editorial management of *The Reporter*, and continued therein until Haight was retired to private life at the end of his term by reason of his defeat at the hands of Newton Booth. It might be well to note here how little adapted George seems to have been to make himself successful in the newspaper field. In addition to the papers we have already mentioned, he started *The Evening Post* (which was his most successful newspaper venture) and managed to keep it going until it was bought from under him; *The State*, weekly paper published in San Francisco; and in New York, *The Standard*, which did indeed keep its light burning for a few years.

George liked politics apparently as well as he liked the sea, for he was secretary of political conventions, and indeed of the Democratic State Convention in 1871, and was a delegate to the Democratic National Convention at Baltimore in 1872 which performed the preposterous feat (preposterous from almost any view-point) of nominating Horace Greeley for the Presidency. He also in 1871 ran for the legislature unsuccessfully, and was twice a candidate for Mayor of New York,—at his first candidacy running ahead of Roosevelt but behind Hewitt who was elected, and at his second candidacy dying a few days before the election. I never shall forget the great interest he took in the Tilden presidential campaign, and with what boyish glee and hurrahing he and two others, on the night of the election, marched arm-in-arm through the

streets of San Francisco in the assumed certainty of Tilden's election. Nor is it easy to forget our sickening depression when reading on the following morning Zach Chandler's official statement to the country (Chandler then being the Chairman of the Republican National Committee) that Hayes had 185 votes and was elected. This depression was in no wise made the less when, on communicating the bulletin-board announcement to Ex-Governor Haight, he quietly said: "They will put him in"—and they certainly did.

As George had been a very strong supporter of William Irwin for Governor, and as his thoughts on those things nearest his heart were demanding study and expression, he deemed it well to secure a public office, if such were possible, from Governor Irwin, that might give him the leisure he so much desired and so much needed. Governor Irwin thereupon appointed him State Inspector of Gas Meters. As his income from this was sufficient for his simple mode of life, and as the duties of the office did not consume the whole of his time, he was thus furnished with a leisure which he had never before enjoyed. This is not to intimate that he was not faithful in the discharge of the duties of his office, for he in truth was both diligent and faithful.

While he was in Sacramento during Governor Haight's Administration he entertained the notion of making himself a lawyer, and to that end, on the advice of a friend, who was asked by him which book he should first read, he went over the four volumes of Kent's Commentaries. This cured him entirely of all desire for the law. The truth is, never was there a man so little cut out by nature for the practical duties of a law practice. He was wise to stop where he did. He was essentially a thinker and writer; and although he did well as a lecturer, yet he spent much time on the platform that might better have been devoted to the practical use of his native genius. Still, his pecuniary necessities were at times so great as to drive him to the platform in order to secure the lucre without which bread can not be procured even by thinkers. George was, in realty, quite uneven as a speaker, sometimes being tame even for a lecturer, and then again rising to the height of real oratory. In fact, after his first speech in London he was spoken of there as a great orator.

The land and man's relation to it had engaged George's attention to a far greater extent than had any other subject, and in 1871 he published a pamphlet of considerable size which he entitled, "Our Land and Land Policy, National and State." In this he very graphically showed the almost criminal prodigality with which land grants had been made to railroads, and it contained indeed the germ of his great book, for in it he called attention to the fact, as it appeared to him, that a tax on the value of land is the most equal of all taxes. Soon after this he started the *Evening Post* as a penny paper and conducted it as such with more or less success for a period of about four years. He was an ardent advocate of Mr. Tilden for the Presidency, as has already been mentioned, and made many speeches throughout the State on his behalf. But whatever it was that filled his thoughts, or in whatever work he was engaged, the land question was ever present with him; to him it was the greatest of all questions. The first light that shone through his darkness flashed sud-

denly upon him, as a light of another kind had flashed upon Paul under circumstances quite different. This experience was his while he was riding on horse-back in the hills back of Oakland. We have it stated in his own words as follows:

"Absorbed in my own thoughts, I had driven the horse into the hills until he panted. Stopping for breath, I asked a passing teamster, for want of something better to say, what land was worth there. He pointed to some cows grazing off so far that they looked like mice: 'I don't know exactly but there is a man over there who will sell some land for \$1,000. an acre.' Like a flash it came upon me that there was the reason of advancing poverty with advancing wealth. With the growth of population land grows in value, and the men who work it must pay for the privilege of working it. I turned back, amidst quiet thought, to the perception that then came to me and has been with me ever since."

We have seen how he utilized this institutional suggestion in his "Land and Land Policy," but which only came to its full development in his famous book, "Progress and Poverty." The collected works of Henry George published after his death consist of nine volumes; but the two volumes making up "Progress and Poverty" are those alone which will keep his name forever on the tongues of men. The genesis of that book and the writing of it will always be among the most interesting of the memories of my life. Our friendship and intimacy had never ceased, and at his request I had written articles for *The Post*. I remember well what a literary debauch we had in the editorial office on the evening of the overwhelming defeat of Newton Booth's Dolly Varden Party—each one of four or five of us sitting down to write on the subject, myself contributing some half dozen pieces of verse, and all in the midst of the greatest hilarity. It was therefore quite consonant with our relations for George to ask me to come to his residence on a Sunday in the Autumn of 1877, for the purpose of his taking my judgment on something he had just written. He was then living in a small frame cottage on the west side of Second Street some little distance north of Harrison. When I arrived at the house I found him and Mrs. George sitting alone in the front room. Without any ado George produced a number of loose sheets of manuscript, at the same time telling me in substance that it was a magazine article on the cause of industrial depression and of increase of want with increase of wealth, and was to indicate a remedy. He said he wished to read it to me and thereafter take my judgment upon it. He thereupon read the article aloud quite deliberately, and at its close asked me what I thought of it. I responded that it was something beyond the ordinary, but that it would be a great mistake to publish it in that form; that the thoughts in it needed very much more expansion and elaboration than could be given in a magazine article, and that he should expand what he had written into a book. What I said had such immediate impression upon him that he resolved to cast aside the article and do as I had suggested. With very little delay he began the composition of the book, and after some little work on it he moved with his family to the top of Rincon Hill into a house known as the Cutler-Mc-

Allister House at Number 417 First Street, where the work was continuously carried on until its completion two years and a month from the time of its commencement. It will not be thought remarkable that George was able to rent this large house in such a neighborhood when it is remembered that the Second Street Cut had pretty nearly destroyed real property values on the hill, and that one of the supposedly choicest places for residence purposes in San Francisco had lost both character and reputation as a fashionable residential district. The selection of this house was of the greatest benefit to George, for it had a delightful outlook on the Bay, and it gave him opportunities for boating, which he embraced eagerly when his work permitted.

George carried on the work of composition upon the book with the greatest care; he wrote, and rewrote, and rewrote again, revised and re-revised proofs until he felt himself satisfied. I myself went over his manuscript as he prepared it, and over the proofs. He wrote all the book on sermon paper, using deep blue ink; and although he was always disorderly in the use of his tools and generally worked in the midst of a litter of papers and books, yet his manuscript looked very neat. The book was completed in October, 1879—completed after an agony of thought and labor and under difficulties that were simply enormous, not the least of which were pecuniary ones. But the author never flagged, he would not permit himself to grow weary, but toiled on and on, often late into the night, with Hope singing in his heart, till the great travail was over. The book having been born, the next thing to do was to find someone who would give it to the world; and this George fancied was easy enough. Imagine therefore his great disappointment when Appleton rejected the book, and in turn Harpers and Scribners. He then determined to be his own publisher, and to have his old friend William Hinton do the printing. Before, however, putting the manuscript into Mr. Hinton's hands he went over the whole of it with great care, not only making some changes, but rearranging the chapters, and somewhat altering the sub-title. He himself set the first two stickfuls of type on the book; and one day, when the book was about half set up, upon our meeting on the street, he insisted that I likewise should contribute. So, yielding to his insistence, I went at once to Hinton's printing office and set up a stickful of type of the manuscript. As soon as the book was printed he sent a copy of it to his father in Philadelphia, who was then 81 years of age, and who wrote him a very affectionate letter of acknowledgment. A copy was sent to Appleton, who on renewed examination agreed to undertake its publication, which accordingly was done after some months of delay.

In response to copies sent to important persons George received some encouragement, particularly from Sir George Grey of New Zealand, and from Emile de Laveleye, but none whatsoever at home. On the contrary, the newspapers either spoke contemptuously or in hostility. How, some suggested, could an Inspector of Gas Meters be able to write a great book on any subject, much less on one involving questions of Political Economy? In fact, even after George had become a great celebrity, some of our newspapers persisted in speaking contemptuously of him. It is difficult for the man in the street

to understand how it can be possible for the person whom he has frequently met in common salutation to be of larger dimensions than himself. The residents of Nazareth found the same difficulty in recognizing the superhuman proportions of the son of Joseph the carpenter. However, important reviews in the East began soon to appear and thereupon George deemed it well to go to New York. In some way he raised money sufficient to travel thither on a third class ticket, but he had to leave his family behind him. This he did in August, 1880, and thus severed all his residential ties in California. For the remainder of his life he was a resident of the City of New York, making from there numerous trips to Europe and to different parts of his own country. Soon after he went away his library of something less than a thousand volumes was sold at auction. The books fetched but little, as they were all commercial, and many of them in poor condition. On some there were no bids at all, and these were knocked down to friends at any price the auctioneer saw fit.

Appleton soon got out a cheap edition of "Progress and Poverty," and in this and other ways it began to circulate. Before long it was translated into every language of Europe, and it has had in all an enormous circulation.

It has been said that there is nothing essential in George's book, as to remedy at least, that was not derived from the Physiocrats. His answer to this is to be found in his last book—"The Science of Political Economy." The following extract is sufficient here:

"In what is most important I have been closer to the views of Quesney and his followers than was Adam Smith, who knew the men personally. But in my case there was certainly no derivation from them. I well recall the day when checking my horse on a rise that overlooks San Francisco Bay, the commonplace reply of a passing teamster to a commonplace question, crystallized, as by lightning-flash, my brooding thoughts into coherency, and I there and then recognized the natural order—one of those experiences that make those who have had them feel thereafter that they can vaguely appreciate what mystics and poets call the 'ecstatic vision.' Yet at that time I had never heard of the Physiocrats, or even read a line of Adam Smith.

"Afterwards, with the great idea of the natural order in my head, I printed a little book, 'Our Land and Land Policy,' in which I urged that all taxes should be laid on the value of land, irrespective of improvements. Casually meeting, on a San Francisco street, a scholarly lawyer, A. B. Douthitt, we stopped to chat, and he told me that what I had in my little book proposed was what the French Economists a hundred years before had proposed.

"I forget many things, but the place where I heard this, and the tones and attitude of the man who told me of it, are photographed on my memory. For, when you have seen a truth that those around you do not see, it is one of the deepest of pleasures to hear of others who had seen it. This is true, even though these others were dead years before you were born. For the stars that we of to-day see when we look were here to be seen hundreds and thousands of years ago. They shine on, men come and go in their generations like the generations of the ants."

But after all, George's book is his own, notwithstanding anything contained in the work of the Physiocrats. Their ideas in regard to the question of land and the true basis of land taxation are quite different from those of George. Besides, nothing came as a result of their doctrine. Their recommendation of the *impôt unique* faded away as though it had never existed. The same can be said of the "unearned increment" of John Stuart Mill, so far as it exerted any influence upon methods of taxation. But far otherwise in the case of Henry George and his Single Tax doctrine with the solid foundations on which it is based. His book arrested the attention of the world; humanitarians saw in it a new Star of Bethlehem; and already it has been put into successful operation. It was, indeed, an arrow of logic which, feathered by love, went direct to the heart of Humanity. Quesney, Mill and others somewhat resemble the Norsemen whose keels touched the American shores centuries before those of Columbus; but nothing followed upon the event; they might just as well have stayed at home; while George is like the immortal Genoese on whose discovery the fortunes of mankind were changed.

Not long after the time when the book began to circulate freely, George made a tour of Great Britain and Ireland during which he delivered a number of lectures in the interest of propaganda. These were deemed to be of such importance as to command the attention of the principal newspapers in the cities where they were delivered, some of these journals going to the length of publishing the lectures in full. As was always usual with him, he submitted to questioning after the lecture was over, and in his answers he proved himself a past master at the game; while in Scotland he submitted to any amount of heckling with the utmost good temper and never with any disconcertment. He also delivered a number of propaganda lectures in Australia, and met with the same hospitable reception as in the case of Great Britain and Ireland. To these latter countries he made visits in 1882, 1884 and 1889, making numerous speeches and meeting many important men. During the visit of 1884 the Duke of Argyle bitterly attacked George and his doctrine in an article published in the *Nineteenth Century* entitled, "The Prophet of San Francisco." To this George immediately replied in the same magazine in an article entitled, "The Reduction to Iniquity." So pithy and so convincing was George's reply that the Scottish Land Restoration League printed both articles in a pamphlet entitled, "The Peer and the Prophet," and circulated it freely throughout Great Britain.

Mention has already been made of George's being drawn into politics, and of his two candidacies for Mayor of New York. In the first, Hewitt defeated him, in the second, Death. In 1897 he deemed it a call of duty to take up arms against Tammany by accepting the nomination of several political organizations in hostility to that organization. He was then ill and with but little of his former physical strength; and yet he entered upon the campaign with the greatest ardor, speaking at three, four and five meetings every night. That George appreciated the situation is evident from the following conversation which he had with one of his physicians shortly before accepting the tendered nomination:

"Tell me: If I accept, what is the worst that can happen to me?"

The physician answered: "You have a right to be told since you ask. It will most probably prove fatal."

George then said: "You mean it may kill me?"

"Most probably, yes."

George replied, "Dr Kelly says the same thing, only more positively. But I have got to die. How can I die better than in serving humanity? Besides, so dying will do more for the cause than anything I am likely to be able to do in the rest of my life."

The physician was a true prophet. On Thursday, October 18th, but five days before the election, after George had spoken at four different meetings, he took to his bed with feelings of extreme fatigue, and early the next morning expired. This caused the greatest possible sensation in the City. The morning papers were filled with laudations of him. All day of the Sunday following his death his body lay in state in the Grand Central Palace, and his funeral was the most impressive ever accorded a private citizen in this country. At the time of his death he was fifty-eight years of age, he having been born on the second day of September, 1839. His parents were of American birth with English, Welch and Scotch blood in their veins, and had lived long in Philadelphia where George himself was born. Of his four children, three are living, one of whom (the oldest who bears his fathers' name) is at present a member of Congress from one of the districts of New York, one a sculptor, and the other the wife of a playwright.

George's domestic life was of the happiest, his wife being as well suited to him as though she had been especially born for his mate. She was charming and sweet-tempered with a voice both soft and low, and she was in addition sympathetic in all his work, and with sufficient intelligence to be of assistance to him in the way of criticism and advice. The attitude of Mrs. George to her husband is well exemplified by what follows: When some friends visited her for the purpose of persuading her to use her influence to dissuade him from entering the mayoralty contest, she replied:

"When I was a much younger woman I made up my mind to do all in my power to help my husband in his work, and now after many years I may say that I have never crossed him in what he has seen clearly to be his duty. Should he decide to enter this campaign I shall do nothing to prevent him; but shall on the contrary do all I can to strengthen and encourage him. He must live his life his own way and at whatever sacrifice his sense of duty requires; and I shall give him all I can—devotion."

Such a wife was almost a necessity to George, for he was without method, inclined to disorderly arrangements, and irregular in his habits. He was abstemious, however, both in eating and drinking, never doing either to excess, but smoking, at times, rather more than was good for him. At table he was occasionally a very poor companion, falling then into a train of absorbing thought and mechanically eating what was easily within his reach. When in the humor he was fond of raillery, and would gird at me for what he deemed

to be my inordinate love of pictures and fine books. He himself cared little or nothing for either. A book embraced for him its contents only; as for the artistic clothing of those contents they were apparently of no moment to him. This might seem exceptional in a printer did we not know that George never learned anything of printing beyond type-setting. He seemed to have but little understanding of graphic art and not true feeling for it; and while he liked poetry, it was of the thought poetically expressed that he cared, not for any form in which it might be couched. Yet, his literary art was of the finest: his sentences are never involved, his choice of words is exact, his diction is simple, yet rich; his thought expressed with transparent lucidity, and the different parts of the subject thoroughly well joined. His great book is a delight to read for the mere sake of the composition and the style. And independently of the economic matter of the book, there are so many facts contained in it, so many illustrations, and so many similes, all so interestingly combined and so eloquently told, that the book on these accounts alone is unique; while considered merely as a politico-economic treatise it is safe to assert that it is without a rival in the matter of interestingness. As to the style we might quote from every page of the book, but I can only give here a short extract, and that shall be a part of what the author says about the difference between man and the animal:

"But not so with man. No sooner are his animal wants satisfied than new wants arise. Food he wants first, as does the beast; shelter next, as does the beast; and these given his reproductive instincts assert their sway, as do those of the beast. But here man and beast part company. The beast never goes further; the man has but set his feet on the first step of an infinite progression—a progression upon which the beast never enters; a progression away from and above the beast.

"This demand for quantity once satisfied, he seeks quality. The very desires that he has in common with the beast now become extended, refined, exalted. It is not merely hunger, but taste, that seeks gratification in food; in clothes, he seeks not merely comfort, but adornment; the rude shelter becomes a house; the indiscriminating sexual attraction begins to transmute itself into subtle influences, and the hard and common stock of animal life to blossom and to bloom into shapes of delicate beauty. As power to gratify his wants increases, so does aspiration grow. Held down to lower levels of desire, Lucullus will sup with Lucullus; twelve boars turn on spits that Anthony's mouthful of meat may be done to a turn; every kingdom of nature be ransacked to add to Cleopatra's charms, and marble colonnades and hanging gardens and pyramids that rival the hills arise. Passing into higher forms of desire, that which slumbered in the plant and fitfully stirred in the beast, awakes in the man. The eyes of the mind are opened and he longs to know. He braves the scorching heat of the desert and the icy blasts of the polar sea, but not for food; he watches all night, but it is to trace the circling of the eternal stars. He adds toil to toil, to gratify a hunger no animal has felt; to assuage a thirst no beast can know.

"Out upon nature, in upon himself, back through the mists that shroud the past, forward into the darkness that overhangs the future, turns the restless desire that arises when the animal wants slumber in satisfaction. Beneath things he seeks the law; he would know how the globe was forged and the stars were hung, and trace to their origins the springs of life. And, then, as the man develops his nobler nature, there arises the desire higher yet—the passion of passions, the hope of hopes—the desire that he, even he, may somehow aid in making life better and brighter, in destroying want and sin, sorrow and shame. He masters and curbs the animal; he turns his back upon the feast and renounces the place of power; he leaves it to others to accumulate wealth, to gratify pleasant tastes, to bask themselves in the warm sunshine of the brief day. He works for those he never saw and never can see; for a fame, or maybe for a scant justice, that can only come along after the clods have rattled upon his coffin lid. He toils in the advance where it is cold, and there is little cheer from men, and the stones are sharp and the brambles thick. Amid the scoffs of the present and the sneers that stab like knives, he builds for the future, he cuts the trail that progressive humanity may hereafter broaden into a high road. Into higher, grander spheres desire mounts and beckons and a star that rises in the east leads him on. Lo! the pulses of the man throb with the yearnings of the god—he would aid in the process of the suns!"

It is one of the most noteworthy facts connected with Henry George, that he, with but little schooling, should have achieved a style so marvellously excellent. He was one of those unique characters that are sufficient unto themselves.

George was in essence a revolutionary. In any country where a revolution was in progress he would likely have been a part of it, if he thought it was based on any principle of right; and in fact he became a member of a military organization got up for the purpose of freeing Mexico from Maximilian. Notwithstanding his devotion to wife and children, and his love for home with all that home implies, yet he was Bohemian in his tastes and somewhat so in his habits. He was one of the founders of the now famous Bohemian Club of San Francisco, and was delighted to participate in its club life. The writer and he passed many pleasurable moments in the early very humble home of the club at the southeast corner of Sacramento and Webb Streets. It would have been impossible to bring him under any set rules, or to bind him to conventionalities. He was self reliant and opposed to restraint of any kind. His marriage was a run-away affair, and he left home without parental consent to go on a sea voyage. He could never see that President Cleveland was right in interfering as he did in the great Chicago strike, and ever afterward entertained feelings of more or less hostility toward him. While he was good tempered and considerate of others, he was quick to anger and easily tempted to personal conflict. He was what we might call pugnacious, yet without anything of the bully. He was courageous to the last extremity of courage in any cause he espoused and seemed to be without feeling of fear. He was the soul of truth and honor, and exceedingly nice in the performance of his obligations, particu-

larly his pecuniary ones, and these he never forgot. As an instance of this I may mention that upon his arrival in San Francisco on his way to Australia, about the first thing he said to some of us who had met him was: "I must find the butcher that I owed when I left here so that I can pay him the amount of his bill." He was, as has been said, not at all fastidious about his dress, but he was cleanly in his person and linen. He always wore a black soft felt hat, but at times Mrs. George would succeed in getting him under a tall silk one when some function demanded it. I can not recall that I ever saw him outside of the house in any coat except a frock coat, and as this was seldom made for him it seldom fitted him. At his desk he generally worked in a jacket or in his shirt-sleeves. His sense of humor was not over developed, yet it was sufficient to be of a saving quality. In essence his nature was deeply religious, but he was not a church attendant except when a boy, nor had he framed for himself any specific creed. His spiritual vision was sufficiently penetrating to see through the materialisms based on mechanical theories of the universe, and always held himself to be under responsibility to God and his conscience. His talk was seldom frivolous even when giving the whole night to conversation. The writer recalls two such nights, one in Washington City where we met by appointment in the evening, George then being on his way to a town where he was to lecture and to reach there was to take an early morning train, and the other in a Massachusetts town where he had lectured and where he was, as in the other case, to take an early train. In each of these instances we embraced the opportunity presented and spent the night until train time in smoking and talking.

He was sincere to the core. He never under any circumstances sought to be anybody but himself. He was a strong individualist and was opposed to socialism and all its ways. He believed in competition, but under conditions which would not be mutually destructive, and these conditions he believed could be brought about by taking all taxes off personal property including improvements on land and placing the whole burden of taxation upon ground rents. He was nearly always cheerful. He neither whined nor complained but patiently bore every burden put upon his back. He was a strong man morally, mentally and physically. Neither ridicule nor criticism could depress him, nor laudation unduly exalt him. He was self-centered, and feared nothing the future might bring him, for he felt in his heart of heart that his was the torch to light suffering humanity out of the abysmal torments of poverty to the high ground of a new hope and a new life.

His most striking element of character was his sympathy for his fellow-man. This was the fire that burned in his soul, and in reality was the main cause that incited the production of his great book. He was not only a political economist—that and nothing more; had he been merely that, he would have written well on economic subjects, but he would not have produced a book which served to carry his name and message to all the peoples of the earth. It took love of man to do that; and in George's breast such love never abated. Men to him were not very much unlike; he did not believe there was that great

difference between the mentalities of men which is popularly supposed. He acted according to this belief. It was always pleasurable to him to talk to men whom he casually met, and he gladly improved every such opportunity. He liked particularly to talk with street car conductors, which in old horse-car days was easier than it is at present. All men engaged in manual labor were interesting to him, and all such men he met in the most natural manner possible. He never affected the attitude of a superior person. Very early in life, the poverty incident to all large cities, interested him, until it began to tug at him for solution. Why was it, that the larger the city, the larger the slum? Why was it that with plenty of unused land within the city limits the tenement houses reared their horrid heads? Was this a natural condition, or was it not rather an artificial condition produced by man, and if indeed it was artificial, then it was surely remediable. On this he pondered, and pondered, and finally by slow approaches reached the conclusion expounded in *Progress and Poverty*. His was a receptive soul awaiting the call that was to set it in responsive vibration; and when the call finally laid its imperative voice upon him, it found him ready and eager.

California no longer looks askance at him. She values him now as one of her most precious jewels. He is in very truth her own, for he came to her when a boy, and remained with her until his final message was delivered. She can proudly say that probably more people to-day are familiar with the name of Henry George than they are with that of any other man. He experienced all kinds of life within her borders, and he often went an-hungered; but his heart kept beating, his mind kept working, and his courage kept burning, until at last he stood on the mountain top of Truth with the breezes of heaven singing anthems of glory around him.

LAND REFORM IN GERMANY.

(For the Review)

By DR. W. SCHRAMMEIER.

Concluded.)

PROGRESS OF THE LAND REFORM MOVEMENT IN GERMANY.

What kind of influence has the Kiaochow Land Ordinance had on the efforts of land reformers in Germany, beyond its importance to our colonial possessions? If, on the one hand, it was the demonstration that the doctrines of Henry George can be realized in our own times, it was on the other hand the means which opened entirely new avenues of thought. Public landed property in the hands of States or of municipalities, right of expropriation for public purposes, leasehold law, taxation of site values, direct and indirect increment taxation, obligation to build on urban land,—all these measures stimulated emulation and further development at home. If we follow up the

publications of the League within the last few years, we find a very brisk discussion of all these questions combined with practical experiments aiming at their realization.

THE CANAL PROBLEM.

A tremendous success has attended the agitation of the League in connection with the scheme of the Prussian Government to extend the network of waterways. Roused to action by the unsatisfactory occurrences at the construction of the Teltow Ships Canal, which was built at the expense of the district, and gave rise to wild speculations in land and undue forcing of prices, the League placed itself at the head of a movement inaugurated to avoid similar conditions.

It is remarkable that the essence of the Kiaochow system is, in many quarters, not fully appreciated yet in its full importance as a land reform measure in Germany. Foreigners have been quicker in this regard. Poultney Bigelow stated at the seventh congress of geographers at Berlin in 1899: "Kiaochow deserves, in a very high degree, the widest attention of the general public. Here, for the first time, the principles of land values taxation are applied in practice. And the much opposed doctrines have been brought into operation under the jurisdiction and authority of the German Empire. This fact has an importance that cannot yet be appreciated. In the whole world—in America, in Australia, in England, and wherever the doctrines of Henry George are understood—the development of this colony is watched with the keenest interest." Already Josef Walton, M. P., who visited the colony in 1899, declared it desirable that the system be adopted also for English colonies, wherever the formation of new towns takes place. None less worthy than our English fellow-worker, Verinder, asked the question: "Why wait for new situations if a good thing is to be created?" The conditions obtaining at Kiaochow repeat themselves everywhere. "What passed there," I said in my own report in the *Land Reformers' Annual*, "happens day by day in every colony, in exactly the same manner, in every industrial place at home, in every town in which the modern evolution of industry moves."

But the confinement to formations of towns evinces a want of understanding of the problem. In this regard the well known Professor of Laws, von Stengel, states in the *Land Reformers' Annual* for 1908, page 65: "It has to be admitted that the principles underlying the land ordinance of Kiaochow, be it with some alterations, ought to be adopted for all colonies. The question is, that if the leasehold system can not, for any reason, be applied, the Government reserves a suitable share of the increment in value, which, on re-selling, is realized in land originally bought from the Government, and which is not due to any exertion on the part of the owner, a different quota to be levied for urban and agrarian land. Furthermore, a reasonable land tax should be introduced, not proportionate to the rent, but to the capital of the selling value of the land, and finally a reasonable obligation to utilize the land should be stipulated. Above all, it is necessary that the colonial land policy be

carried out on fixed, clearly defined principles which duly keep in view the interests of the commonwealth. It is notorious that, with the one exception of Kiaochow, this has not been sufficiently considered. Particularly the so-called concession policy, which in spite of all criticisms, has been stubbornly adhered to by the colonial administration, has proved an utter failure."

By the example of the English Protectorate of North Nigeria it is shown that the principles of the Kiaochow Land Ordinance are capable of varied application. The fundamental article in the first Ordinance of North Nigeria in 1900 runs as follows: "No person other than a native of the protectorate shall, either directly or indirectly, acquire any interest in, or right over land within Northern Nigeria from a native without the consent in writing of the High Commission first had and obtained." And the Kiaochow Ordinance of 1898 stipulates: "Previous to each transfer of landed property among the villagers, the consent of the Colonial Governor has to be obtained; every transfer of property or lease of property to other persons but the inhabitants of the same village or members of the same family are prohibited." On comparing these two, it is at once obvious where the work has to set in. The masterly legislation for North-Nigeria which is due to the efforts of our English land reform friends, overturns the harmless phraseology of some German theorists, who for colonies of a non-urban character conclude that the utilization of land should be left entirely free. England has been the first country to intentionally draw the consequences of land reform for the colonies on a large scale.

On the 20th of February, 1901, the League petitioned the Prussian Diet, to protect the shores of the new ship-canal against artificial enhancement by speculators. This petition had 94,000 signatures, and 20,000 pamphlets were distributed, among them Pohlman's "Die vergessene Grundrente" (The neglected Groundrent), and Latscha's "Nationale Wohnungsfuersorge" (National Housing.) In a report the League addressed the following words to the Government: "The Prussian Government is facing here a very serious question. We land reformers know that every organic reform can not be achieved but with patient, plodding work, proceeding step by step. We can afford to bear the reproach from the radicals that we greatly esteem the smaller reforms also. There are occasions when small things become petty, but there are opportunities which must be grasped in a wide spirit, and which call for measures on a large scale. Such an opportunity is doubtless offered by the opening and utilization of 'Virgin Land,' the treatment of land in connection with which there can be no question of vested rights in the conventional sense. Furthermore, the Prussian Government, in stating the motives for the large expenditure caused by the construction of ship canals, has pointed to the increase of our population. If they want to bring a boon to their children and preserve them from the fate which results from the tenement-barracks of our large cities and the handicaps of our industry, on account of the prices of land artificially enhanced, they have only to muster sufficient courage to take sweeping measures necessary to create such conditions

alongside the canals which ensure free development of manufacturing districts and the possibilities of cheap houses for workmen. If the Prussian Government were to proclaim these intentions, and were to demand the means for their execution, they would have the unanimous support of the Diet." The Government demanded at the time 16 Million Marks for extended purchases of land on the Rhine-Weser Ship Canal; the Prussian Diet granted, in June 1907, not only this amount but some millions in excess thereof, and it was expressly stated that further larger amounts would be granted, if they were required for the shores of the Canal.

EXPROPRIATION.

The law passed contained a passage which may become of importance to the entire future question of expropriation. It is stated thus: "The State is vested with the right of expropriating such land, the acquisition of which is required for public purposes, contemplated in the interest of the common weal in connection with the enterprise. This right of expropriation has to be availed of prior to the 1st of July, 1909. It is not to apply beyond 1 Kilometer on either side of the canal." "How far the State has actually availed itself of the right of expropriation is a matter of secondary importance, as far as the principle is concerned," said Professor Ortman in a lecture at the congress of the League in 1911. "It is of great value that the existent law has, in an important case, with great clearness of purpose, taken up the principle of expropriating zones, inasmuch as it takes in adjacent land, not immediately used, but the comprisal of which may eventually contribute to the success of the enterprise, and which is thus of public interest." This result has to be credited to the League of Land Reformers.

MUNICIPAL REFORMS.

The preceding illustrates the efforts of the League of Land Reformers to move the State Governments to take up energetic action against private land speculation in connection with public enterprise. At the same time they directed their energies to the system of municipal taxation, of town extension and of the development of suburbs. With the rapid increase in the population of Germany the Housing question in towns has become one of the most urgent and intricate problems. Land being indispensable for housing, and being available in limited extension, every speculation in land causes a rise in price, which finds expression in increased rents; higher rents again are tantamount to increased labor or a lower standard of living, or both. It is the merit of Henry George to have demonstrated that the speculative increase in land values has the tendency to force labor and capital below the level of normal productivity. The fight of the League for a just valuation of land aroused the fierce opposition of capitalism, particularly of the large banking concerns which control nearly all the land in the suburbs necessary for town extension. The colony of Kiaochow is proof of the social possibilities a town would have if the municipality instead of the banks were in control of the

outskirts, and thus could influence prices for building land; this example, however, demonstrates that the mere possession of the land will of itself not suffice. Possession must go hand in hand with the proper disposal of the land. The difficult part of the problem is to find measures which ensure, for ever, to the common weal that part of the increment values which is due to the development of the locality, and the expenditure of public money.

MUNICIPAL LAND ACQUISITION.

The efforts of the League gave impetus to a more active land policy in the municipalities. Several municipalities have begun of late years to acquire large tracts; others have created a special land purchase fund in order to have the necessary means at hand whenever required to forestall private speculation in town expansion. The axiom of the land reformers is: Neither State nor Municipality should unconditionally surrender an inch of land to private speculation; it should further take all feasible means to increase its holdings of land. The land reformers can really not be blamed if this idea has not yet taken root in all quarters. But cases like the sale of the "Tempelhofer Feld," the large drilling ground of the Berlin garrison, will scarcely recur again unchecked. There are reasons to think that the Government will not occasion a repetition of the outcry which came from all sections of the populace. When the scheme became known, Dr. Neuhaus wrote: "One is really sometimes inclined to believe that there is no more central leadership over the various ministries when it is observed how the Forestry Department by its sales of forests, and the Military Department by its sales of land, do a splendid business for their individual offices, but which in their entirety prove very expensive indeed to the State. What an enormous price is paid for these results, if the loss in people's health and defensive force is considered. How political animosity is incensed by this defacement in the surroundings of the Empire's Capital and by the reckless destruction of natural sport and recreation grounds."

MORTGAGES.

The enormous speculation in land is considerably facilitated and fostered by the Mortgage Banks. The action of the League is thus directed against these as well, and in truth against all the public institutions connected with mortgage affairs; the juridical formalism of which, as is generally admitted, legalizes the grossest injustices and has produced the worst monstrosities. Eschwege's excellent pamphlet, "Privilegiertes Spekulantentum" (Privileged Jobbery), which is directed against the privileged treatment of mortgage bonds issued by the mortgage banks and which has been distributed by the League in many thousands of copies, has had the result that a motion for further privileges in favor of mortgage bonds was rejected in 1899 by the Reichstag.

The mortgage reduces land to a commodity easy to sell. Mortgages facilitate acquisition with comparatively small means and this increases the

number of those who can engage in land speculation. Pohlman has set himself to the task to point out again and again the dangerous sides of our mortgage system, and how they have been allowed to form, favored by the institution of the Public Land Registers. His aims are: Closing the land registers against private entries, restriction of the mortgage rights to the State or Municipality and the introduction of irredeemable amortisation mortgages; finally, restriction of the right of forced sales, in case of rural landed property, to the State, Parishes or Co-operative Societies, the latter with the intention of protecting personal credit. The accuracy of the postulates advanced by this distinguished expert has been corroborated by the researches of Dr. Weyermanns, "*Zur Geschichte des Immobiliarkreditwesens in Preussen*" (The History of the Credit on Real Estate in Prussia). He proves that the increased indebtedness of real estate is due to artificial influences, which have turned the natural evolution upside down. The knowledge of the development furnishes the guiding points for an improvement on existing conditions.

Land reform without reform of things connected with mortgages is, in Germany, impossible. Here lies the fundamental difference in the method which recommends itself for Germany, and that in other countries where such indebtedness and such possibilities of indebtedness are unknown. This shows that, notwithstanding the aims of the land reformers being identical, the means to attain them must vary with the different historical development. The cry, "Land Reform," would be lost like the voice of the preacher in the desert, if it were not simultaneously shown how to go about it, how to stir the conscience of the people, and how to influence the opinions of the responsible leaders and the legislative bodies. And I believe the success attained by the German movement must be largely attributed to the unfaltering instinct which has recognized the weak points in the conditions connected with real estate in Germany, and which has made this the object of their efforts.

MORTGAGES AND BUILDING TRADE.

Weyermanns' book has given a further brilliant justification of the League's action on the question concerning workmen engaged in the building trade. The difficulty here rests in the fact that according to German law, land and building are treated as one. A mortgage registered on a site, is not secured by the land only, but inseparately also by any buildings constructed or to be constructed. This state of affairs was often taken advantage of, to the disadvantage of third parties. The building plots are sold at excessively high prices to building contractors of small means. The purchase money is registered as a first charge on the unimproved land. The sellers can hardly lose much; if the buildings erected are coming to a forced sale, the proceeds of land and buildings first serve to satisfy the mortgage. The land speculator is generally satisfied in full, the tradesmen often receive nothing. A new law has recently been passed under which a mortgage for building moneys is granted, subject to the condition that these moneys have actually been

spent on the building. Only to the extent that this condition has been fulfilled shall the precedence be admitted in the future. This protection of building claims may eventually be introduced by municipal and parish regulations.

In these struggles it was the President of the league, Freese, who, with never failing discrimination, devoted himself to the accomplishment of the postulates advanced by the League. Finally he was in a position to write in the Annual for Land Reform: "The Land Reform Movement has achieved a great success. The Reichstag on the 5th of May, 1909, has unanimously passed the law for the protection of building claims. On the 8th of June the law was published. For the land reformers who, with a petition to the Secretary of State of the Imperial Court of Law in 1891 had undertaken the first step, it was not so much the assistance given to those in the building trade; the intention was not merely to protect the workmen against unbearable losses, the question was to go to the bottom of these things and to show that only a thorough change in the principles of our law concerning mortgages can afford redress. We had not alone to take into account the utmost resistance of the land speculators who had in the past been favored by the law, who from our first appearance deluged the newspapers with their communications, together with the other extraordinary difficulties arising from the subject itself, but also with many of the very same workmen who were to be protected, because they either considered the fight hopeless, or allowed themselves to be influenced by the selfish counsels of the land speculators."

COALS AND KALI.

On the same line with these efforts against land speculation, was the action of the land reformers against the monopolies of Coal and Kali deposits, and of running waters, as far as utilized for the production of electric currents. The fact that the Prussian Government recently joined the Coal Syndicate for a period of three years, has forced the League into strong opposition. In Prussia we have free right of mining. This has led to the practice that privileges granted by the State are treated as commodities and objects of speculation, which accumulate more and more in the control of powerful rings, excluding free competition. Only a few years ago, the first legal regulations were introduced against the squandering of natural deposits. The question is now, to interpret these laws in such a manner as to render abuses impossible. As excessive demands on the part of the land reformers would jeopardize the whole work, Pohlman, in his pamphlet, "*Bergbaufreiheit und Staatsinteresse*," formulates the points of interest to land reformers thus: If it is demanded that everybody should have his share in the natural deposits, it is, of course, not meant thereby that, in the sense of 'Free Mining,' everybody should go and claim possession of these deposits for himself, just as little as the term 'Common Property' for railways entitles him to appropriate, say the funnel of a locomotive as private property; but the postulate is: Mining should be done by those who are best capable of doing it, and doing it in the most

rational manner; they shall be entitled to full remuneration for this service done on behalf of the Commonwealth, but the latter is to have the following inviolable claims, viz:

¶ (1) That the coal deposits, entrusted to the miners, must be mined and not kept back for selfish motives.

(2) That every fellow-countryman is entitled to the delivery of coal if he is prepared to pay the stipulated price (*Lieferungszwang*).

(3) That they retain a share in the mining rent, i. e. the law must prevent their disappearance in the way of capitalisation, and that their revenue be used for relieving other burdens of taxation.

Whether the State shall eventually undertake the mining, depends entirely on the question whether the above three postulates can be accomplished or not. Above all we endeavour to obtain not the appearance but the essence; for a bad governmental management may be much less in conformity with land reform than a good private one working under the necessary guarantees for the protecting of public interests."

AIM AND OBJECT.

From the foregoing it is clear that during the last few years one part of the land reformers' activity has been concentrated on the problem which may be condensed in the question, what are the legal forms guaranteeing a social utilization of public land, and what reforms are desirable? All over Germany experiments have been made, chiefly on the part of the municipalities and communities, with various legal forms as set forth by the land reformers, and they wait for further development. Everywhere new problems present themselves; the idea of utilizing the land for the Commonwealth is trying to find means and new forms of application; these present themselves in abundance, and experience generally spells success. Before the leasehold system had been defined and fixed in German law, it had already been applied in Kiaochow in a form which ensured its use in the service of Commonwealth. Prof. Sohm declares that this legal form was drawn from "beneath the bench" by the land reformers. Its practical application has been recommended by statesmen like Earl Posadowsky; he was bent on doing all he could to prevent the surrender of any land owned by the Empire to private speculation. In his last speech as Secretary of State he was able to point out that a beginning with leasehold had been made with 520,000 square meters of public land. Men like Dr. Erman, Sohm, Zitelmann and Pohlman deserve special credit for the scientific elaboration of this special legal form.

UTILIZATION OF PUBLIC LAND.

The leasehold system has found its strongest application at Frankfort-on-Main, where the Burgomaster Adickes has achieved great things in the way of practical land reform. In Frankfort the leasehold right was not only granted to co-operative companies and public institutions, but to every citizen who desired it. It is essential with this form that either the State or the

Community is always the holder of the leasehold right, and that the profits will go, undiminished, to State or Community. In another town, Ulm, where 75 per cent. of the entire town area is owned by the municipality, Burgomaster von Wagner has arranged that in order not to surrender all land to individuals, that the land be sold, but reserved the right of pre-emption. Similar innovations have been introduced by Max Roemer at Opladen. The owner may cultivate the land, give it away or bequeath it, as he pleases, but the town has reserved the right to re-buy the land within 100 years at the original selling price. In that way the possibility of speculative raising of prices is excluded. It would have been consequent to combine the right of pre-emption with the right of re-buying. Should the owner be disposed to re-sell his land below the original price, the right of pre-emption could take place; should he wish to sell at a higher price, the right of re-buying is made use of. In that manner the public interest is protected. This suggestion was made by Dr. Spitta, of Bremen, in a report which offers much worthy of notice. "Selling contracts with simultaneous granting of the rights of re-buying and of pre-emption have, in the land policy of communities, a great future before them, especially in such places where the people using the land for dwelling purposes (chiefly semi-detached houses for one family only) are opposed to the leasehold system, because they have a strong desire to live on their own soil. The right of re-buying, in conjunction with the right of pre-emption for the community, meets the wishes of the people to acquire a home on their own soil, and at the same time guards the interests of the public, particularly where the increment of land is involved." The general introduction of this legal form is hampered by the difficulty of obtaining money from private capitalists on such houses; but efforts are made to remove these obstacles, and practical results are slowly coming into evidence. In still another legal form—the Rentengut (holding leased out by Government to German settlers, or more usually selling to them against payment of a fixed annual rent redeemable only with the consent of both the contracting parties)—the results are materially facilitated by the action of Government institutions.

LAND REFORM AND LEGISLATION.

It is of no less importance that all these experiences and results, as far as they are connected with the postulates of the land reformers in regard to the disposal of land on the part of the parishes and the State, began to have an effect on the transformation of legal principles in Germany. The Land Reformers' Annual in 1910 reprinted an inquiry instigated by the congress of lawyers (Juristentag) on the question how the existing laws could be amended in regard to housing. The inquiry comprised Communal Land Policy, Leaseholding, Mortgages, exactly those things the importance of which the unabated activity of the League had brought home to the people. Whatever may be the eventual position taken by the congress of lawyers in regard to the question, the document bears evidence to the fact that the revision of our legal status, in accordance with land reform principles, has been set going.

It will make further progress and will not be taken from the order of the day until the object has been attained. Some of the open questions are the right of expropriation by the State over building land not used for streets, the separation in the land registers of land and buildings erected thereon, the confinement of leaseholding to the Imperial and States Governments and parishes. If only these have been solved satisfactorily we shall have come considerably nearer to the achievement of our aims.

LAND REFORM AND TAXATION.

In line with the problem of developing the various legal forms of utilizing the land for the public benefit, stands the one uppermost in importance to land reformers, viz: the taxation of land values. The teaching of Henry George may be condensed in a few words thus: to abolish all taxation save that upon land values. That is the high aim, which the German land reformers are working for, and if they have not yet succeeded in removing old relics of taxation, their agitation has attained this much, that, not only in the parishes and individual states but also in the Empire, more and more recourse is had to the taxation of land values. A beginning has been made, but it is in the nature of the circumstances that here also progress must move slowly. In this regard the taxation of the capital value of land, not of its productiveness, ranks first. According to the Prussian Act of 23rd of April, 1906, the districts were entitled to base land and building taxes on capital value. As declared at the time, the Government, in promulgating this act, had acceded to a demand often expressed. The act was found to be deficient, inasmuch as improvements were treated as one with the land, whereas it is, of course, essential to levy a pure ground tax by taxing merely the capital values, and to encourage improvements and buildings as much as possible by exempting these from taxation. An important improvement in this respect was the Act concerning the declaration of communal taxes of 24th of July, 1906. Such a pure land tax has, for instance, been introduced at Königsberg, where 8% and 4%, respectively, are levied upon the land only, from land improved and unimproved alike. If the League of Land Reformers have, of late years, devoted their activity to other problems, this is because it may be said that the principle is now quite generally admitted to be right; in most parishes and districts it has already been accepted, and time will do the rest in this regard.

The above leading problem is supplemented by the Tax on the unearned increment (Wertzuwachsteuer). Every public improvement—the construction of tramways, bridges, schools, museums, the laying out of parks, and roads—is followed by enhanced values of the adjacent land. The increment thus accruing to the owners, without any effort on their part, attracts speculation in an increasing degree. Several municipalities have favored Betterment taxes and special taxes on site-values when not covered by permanent structures. The Increment Tax may be described as an impost falling on the advance in price of real estate, i. e., on the difference in price at which it was purchased and at which it was sold, less the value of improvements added during the

period it was held. A taxation of this increased value reduces the chances of speculation and contributes to its restriction. Thus an effectual taxation of the increment would tend to keep prices on normal levels, and cheap land facilitates cheap housing. Henry George in his *Social Problems* says: "To appropriate groundrent to public uses by means of taxation would permit the abolition of all the taxation which now presses so heavily upon labor and capital. It would utterly destroy land monopoly by making the holding of land unprofitable to any but the user. There would be no temptation to any one to hold land on expectation of future increase in its value when that increase was certain to be demanded in taxes."

The first experiment with increment taxation was made at Kiaochow. Not as a revenue expedient, but as a mere preventative against injurious land speculation, it there maintains itself. Its true purpose has been accomplished. No considerable collections have resulted from that source, nor are they likely to result, as long as the combination of increment taxation with ground values taxes, building obligation and the other devices connected with the disposal of land provide against violent increases in land values. The demand for land has always been amply satisfied; land has never been held back by the Colonial Government. The Colonial Government is not speculating in land. To acquire land beyond requirement has, economically, not been lucrative. Wherever there is no such perfect system of land taxation the increment tax would be an expedient in the sense of Henry George, inasmuch at least as there would be no temptation to any one to hold land in expectation of future increase in its value when that increase was certain to be demanded in taxes. The tax is thus a step on the road to general taxation of land values.

In recognition of the importance of the means for the purpose in view, the League of German Land Reformers has conducted its campaign for both the taxes on capital values as well as for increment taxes. While there was a general recourse to the tax on sale of property (*Umsatzsteuer*) based on the selling value of real estate and payable on the full value at every transfer consequent on sale, yet with its modification, the Increment duty, very slowly some modest experiments were made. The first German communities to adopt increment taxation were Frankfort on Main, in 1904, and Cologne, in 1905. A general outcry of indignation arose against the course of action in the two towns. Suddenly there was a change in the prevailing opinion. The tax as it were became the ideal of all the communities eager to discover new sources of revenue. On the 1st of April, 1909, not less than 259 German communities of all sizes with an aggregate of nearly 8 Million inhabitants had introduced the increment taxation. Some of the federate states followed the example. On the further development of this taxation objections were raised that this rich source of revenue should be placed at the disposal of the single communities. Added to this, the communal constitutions give, in many places, to house owners such a preponderance that they have it in their power to thwart any reasonable taxation disagreeable to them, much to the detriment

of a fair and equitable distribution. As early as 1905, Pohlman in an article appearing in the Land Reformers' Annual pointed out that, welcome as the proceeding of Frankfort and Cologne was, this kind of taxation ought to have been reserved to the legislation of the Federate States, or better still, of the Empire. For, as he says, the increment in land values is not due to the communities alone, but also to the States and, in a greater measure, to the Empire. This view was defended later on by Chief-Burgomaster Wilms in the Prussian Upper Chamber, and, with greatest closeness of argument by Professor A. Wagner, in 1908 in the land reformers' congress at Stuttgart. As he puts it, the enormous unearned increment, not due to any individual labor of the land owner, especially on town land, which almost exclusively serves to render the wealthy richer still, is the product of the labors of the whole German people since and owing to the foundation of the German Empire. The increment tax ought thus virtually to be an Imperial tax. True to the programme, the League started a tremendous agitation in favor of such imperial taxation. On April 11th, 1910, the Government Bill was submitted. Over 600,000 leaflets, 12,000 pamphlets and a great number of other publications were distributed, and about 800 meetings held in favor of the taxation of land values. Besides organizations with an aggregate of 730,000 members handed in petitions to the Reichstag advocating the tax. On the 1st of February, 1911, the bill was passed by the Reichstag. With the details, as the outcome of compromises, the League does not, of course, identify itself; the land reformers were satisfied that a start had been made, the truth dawning that the increment produced on land without any effort of the owner, and due entirely to the common exertion of all, belongs to the Commonwealth.

TAXATION OF LAND VALUES.

In order to ascertain this value Pohlman, in his publication "*Der Erste Schritt zu Gesunden Finanzen*" (The First Step Towards Sound Finances), places the valuation of all land by its selling value, less improvements, above everything. There can be no doubt that such a valuation of all land in Germany, which with the magnificent working of the cadastral offices, would offer no special difficulty, becomes necessary if real land reform is to be carried through. And if the League had the power to fix the stages marking the march of development, the order, in the opinion of Damaschke, would be thus: first, valuation of land, then taxation of land values, and finally increment taxation.

INCREMENT TAXATION THE MEANS NOT THE AIM.

The League of Land Reformers has never allowed the slightest doubt to exist, that the solving of the increment tax is not, and cannot be, the solving of the land reform problem. Only because it was instinctively felt that this tax was the beginning of a practice directly opposed to the legislation on taxation obtaining up to the present, did the land reformers consider it their duty to devote all their energies in its favor. With good reason the

basis of the social problem can be considered to be a problem of taxation. The correct taxation of the really unearned income, or, what is practically identical, of land values, is of far-reaching social effect. Relieving the earnings of direct taxation, it gradually leads to the establishment of equal rights for all to the national land, and by preventing private speculation to cheapen land and living. Beyond the increment tax the aim is taxation of pure land values, i. e. taxing the land at its capital value apart from improvements. Not confiscation nor nationalization, but the compelling of the Government to put the burden of taxes in an increasing degree on the unearned income and the monopolized land. This is, according to Friedlaender, one of the best judges and greatest admirers of Henry George in Germany, the real aim of "Single Tax." Max Hirsch, another admirer of Henry George, in "Democracy versus Socialism," puts it thus: "When by slow increment of justice, general conditions have gradually improved, such a gradual moral growth will take place as will ultimately enable men to live under conditions of absolute justice. For these reasons the sudden transformation of unequal rights into equal rights to land must, if possible, be avoided."

EXPANSION OF THE MOVEMENT.

With the tasks and the work the number of adherents and members of the league has steadily increased. The income amounted to the following figures, viz:

1897.....M	1257
1901.....M	7837
1905.....M	21895
1908.....M	33624
1909.....M	38834
1910.....M	54766
1911.....M	104000

The number of corporate members, communities and associations amounted: 1906, 256; 1908, 381; 1911, 583.

The number of personal members is, of course, subjected to great fluctuations, but has been increasing from year to year.

The committee consists of:—Presidents: H. E. Prof. Dr. Adolf Wagner, Berlin; Heinrich Freese, Berlin. Chairman: Adolf Damaschke, Berlin. Deputy Chairmen: Carl Marfels, Berlin; Adolf Pohlman, Detmold. Hon. Treasurer: Carl Zohlen, Berlin. Hon. Librarian: Dr. W. Schrameier, Berlin. Hon. Secretary: Dr. van der Leeden, Berlin. Foreign Corresponding member: Joseph Fels, London.

Careful attention is bestowed on lectures treating the various more important lines of land reform. Besides Damaschke and Pohlman we find the names of von Schwerin, Lubahn, Rueppel, Doehring, Grunder, Kuehner, Feucht, and others in the first ranks. The lectures are generally followed by a debate. Every year a general meeting is called when the Report and Balance Sheet is submitted, officers elected, and questions of the day discussed.

The most important subjects treated at the annual congresses embrace: Housing, Colonies, Rural Land Reform, Communal Policy, Mining, Taxation, Roads, Railways and Waterways. Among the referees we find, outside the Chairman's, the names of distinguished experts in matters of administration, Burgomaster Wilms (Posen), von Wagner (Ulm), Metzmacher (Langenfold), Sembritzki (Koenigsberg), Fuchs (Karlsruhe); of members of the Reichstag Dr. Jaeger, Potthoff, Behrens and others; of Professors of Universities Prof. Adolf Wagner (Berlin), Prof. Oertmann (Erlangen), Prof. Erman (Muenster), Prof. Schaer (Berlin), Prof. Rein, (Jena), Prof. Blume (Halle), Prof. Koeppe (Marburg), further, the names of Chairmen of industrial organizations and a long list of other leading public men: Freese, von Schwerin, Roemer, Admiral Dr. Boeters, Danneel, Victor, Marfels, Fluegel, Polenske, Neuhaus.

At the annual congress we had the good fortune to receive a good many foreign friends; the last congress was honored by the presence of the enthusiastic patron of the Single Tax Movement, Joseph Fels, who, high-minded as ever, promised the League a substantial contribution for the next few years. This promise, and the glowing convictions of this man, last year proved a strong stimulus to the development of the League.

WORKING OF THE LEAGUE.

As may be required, at least once a month, the Committee meets. Regular lectures on the leading principles of land reform are, in the course of the winter, delivered by Damaschke in a university college. They are well patronized. The large lecture room of 700 seats is, at times, insufficient for the audience. In addition to Berlin, such lectures are held in other large towns in Germany. Quite a new departure are certain lectures with practical demonstrations during the Easter week. These first took place in 1910. More than 300 hearers from all parts of Germany had assembled. One hundred and one new members joined the League on that occasion.

LITERATURE.

The most important means of instruction on the aims of the land reformers is offered by the literature of the League. The regular Journal *Bodenreform* (Land Reform) appears twice a month and is now in its 23rd volume. A comparison of the copies of 10 years ago with the present numbers furnishes evidence of the growth in size and contents. Each number gives a review of everything worth knowing concerning the movement. There are essays on the problem of land reform, clippings from the press, parliamentary speeches, articles on the topics of the day concerning the same, communications of a personal or inquiring description, a review on books received, and finally "a letterbox." Damaschke is the editor. The more scientific journal, *Jahrbuch der Bodenreform* (Annual of Land Reform), is in its 8th year. It contains researches and suggestions, articles on land reform, literature, and notes. On account of its comprehensive contents and of the excellent contributions it is indispensable to all those who want to inform themselves on the state

of land reform in Germany. The movement in other countries is also followed up by reports and special articles, and there is a reproduction of the more important documents relating to land reform.

Of books on land reform the following deserve special notice:

Damaschke's standard work *Die Bodenreform, Grundsatzliches und Geschichtliches zur Erkenntnis und Ueberwindung der Sozialen Not* (The Landreform, Fundamental and Historical Researches for the Knowledge and Overcoming of Social Misery), of which 6 editions have appeared.

Damaschke's *Geschichte der Nationaloekonomie, eine erste Einfuehrung* (History of Political Economy, a first introduction) of which 14,000 copies have been distributed.

Damaschke's *Die Aufgaben der Gemeindepolitik* (The Problems of Communal Politics), in 5 editions with 14,000 copies.

These publications are intended to carry the knowledge and understanding of Henry George's teachings to the masses of the people, and to furnish a comprehensive review of the movement, not only in Germany, but elsewhere. The *Land Values*, December 1911, called Damaschke's "Bodenreform" "An able historical statement of the land question, and of the present position of land reform in various countries. Fifty pages are devoted to Henry George and his work. The book is well up to date, for both the Land and Taxation Reform Memorial, and the recent Glasgow Conference are described and pointed to as proofs that the Taxation of Land Values holds a very prominent place in Great Britain. Damaschke is one of the most prominent of the popular authors in Germany." We must further mention here Freese's *Bodenreform* (Land Reform), a series of contributions to the League's periodical of the same title within the last 20 years.

Lubahn's *Zweck und Ziel der Bodenreform* (Intents and Purposes of Land Reform).

Pohlman's *Laienbreiver der Nationaloekonomie* (Layman's handbook on Political Economy).

Pohlman's *Bergbaufreiheit und Staatsinteressen* (Mining Privileges and State's Interests).

Pohlman's *Die Abloesbarkeit Laendlicher Schulden und Lasten* (Redeemability of Rural Debts and Burdens).

Pohlman's *Der erste Schritt zu Gesunden Finanzen* (First Step towards Sound Finances).

Pohlman knows exceedingly well to combine independence of thought with clearness of style and by drawing from the treasures of his experiences collected in a long and successful life, to avoid narrow and one-sided views. On Henry George we have excellent and exhaustive accounts. I should mention, too:

Friedlaender's *Die Vier Hauptrichtungen der Modernen Sozialen Bewegung* (The four cardinal lines of direction in the modern social movement).

Henry George's works have been translated into German and are distributed by the League. On the question of taxation in its relation to land reform

we have exhaustive researches by Prof. Ad. Wagner, Dr. Brunhaber, The Hon. Mr. Boldt, Prof. Koeppe, and others.

ALL OR NOTHING.

Parties who are not in close touch with the movement in Germany have not always formed a correct judgment, holding as inadequate our methods compared with the aim aspired to. It may be pointed out that the only consequential realization of Single Tax has been achieved in Germany, i. e. in Kiaochow—a complete application of Henry George's principles, though originated, it must be admitted, without the knowledge of Henry George and his doctrine. The circumstances given, it was easy to carry out the work on large lines. But such conditions are wanting in other places and there the question is, to first prepare the ground for greater things. "All or nothing" is no wise counsel for a movement making for practical results. Bismarck said of politics, that it is the art of the attainable, and the same may be applied to land reform in Germany. As long as the movement confined itself to proclaiming the "Pure Truth," it failed as a popular movement. Only since the movement took up a position with regard to actual questions of the day and treated them in their relation to land reform have we made for ourselves a position in public life. What is true of all social movements may be said to be true of land reforms: There is no single programme of action suitable to all countries, and methods must in each case be made to suit particular conditions. The masses of the people can only be interested by a sober policy based on realities of life, and then only for attainable aims. Each country requires special methods of propaganda. Whatever may have proved effectual in Germany, may be utterly unfit for other countries, on account of entirely different conditions, socially, economically, and politically. The League has passed through its experiences and through different phases before it attained success. The good results obtained in public life justify the course of action it has pursued. But the aims of the German League are the same as in all other countries, where land reform exists, i. e., the gradual abolition of all taxes except those on land values.

MR. JOSEPH FELS recently sent a copy of "Progress and Poverty" to the Archbishop of Canterbury, whose chaplain wrote back to say that the Archbishop was glad to have in such a handy form a book with which he had long been acquainted, and of which he had a well-thumbed copy on his shelves.

TO TAX houses is to make houses dear. To tax land values, on the other hand, is to make land cheap, not only for house building, but for shops, factories, warehouses, etc.

LAND HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES.*(For the Review.)*

By THOS. L. BRUNK, B. S., M. D.

CHAPTER V.

PENNSYLVANIA.

In the study of Virginia, Massachusetts, and Carolina, the three leading colonies that had most to do in after years in moulding the character of our people and in contributing most to the genius of our political and social institutions, we found these colonies were Royal grants to a collection of individuals. We have now to consider the history of the largest Royal grant ever made to a single individual. It consists of 40,000 square miles of territory west of the Delaware river and north of Maryland, or nearly all of present Pennsylvania. Then, to round out this gift and secure complete control of the Delaware river and thereby of the traffic to this extraordinary grant, the whole State of Delaware was also given to this same person, William Penn.

From the land question point of view, there is no more interesting nor instructive portion of our early history than colonial Pennsylvania. There is none aside from Massachusetts that started with higher ideals of equality, of the rights of men, of brotherly love, of peacefulness, of true democracy, and of those altruistic instincts that beget genuine neighborliness and general thrift, and then in less than a century come to such an ignominious end; an end filled with the fruits of speculation and greed that always ripen on the boughs of our inherited land system.

At the beginning I should state that in our school-books, purposely or otherwise, this part of our colonial history is so colored and enveloped in misty tradition that the true inwardness of William Penn's motives is concealed. He is commended to our rising generations as the model Christian, the protector of his religious convictions, the sainted patron, the mildly ruling demigod of his chosen people, the defender of the Indian. While there is no scar upon his integrity nor shadow upon his honor, yet we will find he was very human; and when under the charm of the serpent of magic riches, he yielded to it as many others have done before. He had as keen an insight into the possibilities of land value growth and what it meant to him financially as any modern exploiting landlord. In fact, he was a past master as a real estate manipulator, and being an influential courtier, with a large estate in England and another in Ireland, he was at the beginning of his career a long way on the road toward reaching his life's ambition of great riches.

While at Oxford, the training school of nobility, he wandered away occasionally to listen to a Quaker minister. The plainness of dress and sincerity of speech touched his refined, sympathetic nature, and he finally became infatuated with the doctrine and the people. He heard of George Fox and

his futile effort to find a home in the new world for his people. He saw about him corruption, imprisonment, tithes. He began to dream of a home for his faith in the virgin woods across the seas. He left college and for twenty years learned the world. "He became by turn a soldier, traveler, fop, courtier, fanatic; his nature shifting and hesitating between the two influences he had received at college,—the love of pleasure, distinction, and a courtier's life, and the religious infection which his father detested." (Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth. By Sidney G. Fisher).

At the age of 36 his father died, leaving him to collect a debt of £16,000 due his father from the Crown for his services as Admiral in the English Navy. To cancel this debt he asked Charles II. for a grant of land in Pennsylvania where he might make a home for his religious sect and at the same time build up a great fortune, one of the chief ambitions of his life. The grant was completed and authority given him to adopt for the new province any form of government he chose, provided the majority of his colonists consented. The vastness of this grant and the ease by which he obtained Delaware from the brother of the King, shows how powerful was his influence at Court. Though an avowed Quaker, he was popular among the aristocracy of England. "Besides being the political governor of the province, Penn was also the feudal Lord and owner of all this land." Notwithstanding this, only on two occasions was he the resident Governor; the first time for a year and ten months, and the second time, eighteen years later, for ten months. He ruled, and his sons after him, almost exclusively by deputy Governors; he and his sons after him, being the true Governors, residing on their estates in England.

The colossal real estate feature of Penn's plans reveals the leading motive directing his genius. "It was his intention to *sell* to the settlers from time to time in such tracts as should be convenient, reserving on the tracts sold a *small quit-rent to be paid to him and his heirs forever.*" As the historian says, "Although neither the selling price nor the rent was very large, yet when 40,000 square miles had been sold in this way, the Governor would be a very rich man." "The reservation of rent to be paid forever assured him the position of Lord of the Manor, and made the colonists his tenants." The system "was thoroughly feudal and always a cause of more or less dissatisfaction among the people; but as Penn was liked personally, there was not so much protest against the rents as might be expected."

It would seem that Penn would have preferred to make his colony an exclusively Quaker settlement, but he advertised in England for promiscuous settlers and while the Quakers predominated, he did not object to "the numerous nationalities and religions which soon made up the population of the province." "The Dutch, Swedes, English, Germans, Welsh, and Scotch-Irish settled there and later many New Englanders came in." It can be gathered that the quit-rent was as good to him from Lutheran, Episcopalian, Menonite, or Presbyterian, as from a Quaker. Religious toleration in this colony had a decided tinge of real estate exploitation.

In 1681 as deputy Governor, he sent his cousin William Markham with the first band of settlers and to arrange for the purchase of the land from the Indians. Penn arrived in October of the next year with many settlers on the ship *Welcome*. To the Swedes and Dutch who had already settled in Delaware, "he exhibited the deeds of the Duke of York giving him that territory and placed the government of those settlers in the hands of a deputy." Even the established government of a people crumbles before the power of individual ownership. Penn said: "Let there be a change, I own the country." The same is true today. The landowners say, let there be a change of government officials, and there is change. Knowing that the Penn government would give them better protection than their home governments, these Swedes and Dutch afterwards asked to be under his government; so it was mutually agreeable in this case.

Penn's insight into empire building led him first to found a city that would be the gate-way to his vast possessions and also the seat of his government. Therefore, the next day after landing, he was rowed down the Delaware river from Chester till he came to the fascinating spot with high banks at the fork of two rivers. Here with appropriate ceremony he dedicated the place for a great city. At once his commissioners began to lay out the streets and a large number of lots. Within nine months Philadelphia had 80 houses with 300 farms laid out around it. Within a year 3,000 settlers arrived.

Penn's affability, fairness and frankness not only won the complete devotion of his people, but his liberality was also shown somewhat in the form of government which he instituted. The basis of government was framed according to the "Laws Agreed upon in England" and a constitution known as the "Frame of Government." The first were rules which defined who should be freemen. They designated that all voters were to include "landholders and also such inhabitants as artificers who paid 'scot and lot' to the government." Only those who believed in God and were Christians could hold office. They abolished oaths and established freedom of worship.

The Constitution provided for a Council of 18 members, at first elected by the people and later appointed by Penn, and a General Assembly of 36 members also elected by the people. The Council for several years proposed all laws and submitted them to the Assembly for approval. This was a constant source of friction. The Governor and Council formed the executive part of the government and appointed all the judges, sheriffs and justices. Thus we see how guardedly Penn gave the people a voice in their government, and how careful he was to close every avenue to their asserting their rights in case any question arose that would jeopardize his own interests. The Council and Courts were all appointive, hence tools in his hands.

During Penn's first short period as Governor in person, he brought a state into being and gave it his laws and constitution. He made his famous treaty with the Indians which gave the colony peace for seventy years. He also began the erection of his mansion on the grounds selected for his country seat at Pennbury, about twelve miles north of Philadelphia. He went home

in August, 1684, to settle the boundary dispute between Pennsylvania and Maryland.

No sooner had he gone, than confusion and strife began in the government of the colony. The Assembly had no right to originate bills, but was determined to use its utmost power to reject those originated by the Council. Numerous reports of this trouble reached the ears of Penn, and becoming disgusted with the show of democracy he determined to use his full authority by appointing five commissioners whom he endowed with power to enact, annul, or vary the laws as if he himself were present." Some writers question whether he had this power, but he exercised it and proved that he considered himself a Feudal Lord. The commissioners wisely kept these instructions a secret, knowing that it would produce a great commotion among the colonists if they became known. Instead of exercising their powers, they proceeded to give the people as much of a voice in the lawmaking as possible under the constitution. But as we will see later their rights were not secured till they pressed their demands and had the constitution remodeled. In this colony as in all the royal colonies, even in Pennsylvania, all the liberty secured by the people for eighty years was by "exchanging supplies the Governor wanted, for laws the people wanted." In all the colonies outside of New England the people fought for all the liberty they at last enjoyed. What was given they asked for and in some cases rebelled to secure.

At the close of 1699, Penn returned to his colony to act as its Governor for only ten months. In point of numbers and prosperity, it had been successful. Already it had become the wonder and talk of all Europe. But it was not all joy and happiness with the colonists. There were excesses and disorders among the lower classes who were inflamed at the licensed drinking houses, and there were petty bickerings among the colonists over the laws, the church, and the courts. Penn came to put a stop to all this and at the same time to retire from his arrests and struggles in England. He was now 55 years old. He was heartily received by the people.

There was so much to engage his attention that he was a very busy man. He traveled over the country on horseback, preaching at Quaker meetings, visited New York and Maryland, met with the Council and Assembly, and gave most of his time to the planting and care of his country seat, Pennbury Manor. Here he spent much money for "personal display, high life, and distinction." In fact Penn displayed all the characteristics and tastes that develop in men whose wealth is obtained from land rent or its equivalent. He was the Quaker exhorter, a man who suffered imprisonment for debt and for his belief, an altruist, but he too became a captive and a devotee of the goddess of unearned wealth and yielded to her entreaties by lavishly expending money for self-aggrandizement. His castle at Pennbury cost £5,000 or \$100,000 in present values. Its spacious parlors often became the seat of government, for when he did not feel disposed to go to Philadelphia he had the Council and Assembly meet him there. It "was built of brick, wainscoated with English oak, and furnished in a manner which considering the surroundings may be



ANTONIO ALBENDIN

(See page 48)

called extravagant." "There were Turkey-worked chairs, plush and satin cushions, satin curtains, and a carpet, which at that time was an article seldom seen outside of palaces." Penn had a well known fancy for handsome dress and probably wore a red sash when he met with the Indians to make an impression on the savage. In all his dealings with the Indian, he was shrewd and tactful. To use a street expression, he was a good "jollier."

"Penn was by far the most sumptuous of all colonial Governors, and a striking contrast to the economical rulers of New England." The liberality of his entertainment may be judged from the presence of "six vessels called cisterns for holding water or beer." "Madeira was his favorite wine, but his cellar was not without canary, claret, and sack." For his beer supply, "he built a brew-house as a part of his country place." "Unlike most of his sect, he approved of dancing and sports and encouraged them by his presence." 'He was skilled in the use of the sword,' had great 'natural vivacity, and gay good humor.' He employed black slaves without scruple. 'He failed in his attempt to secure to the negro slave mental and moral culture, the rights and happiness of domestic life, and he died a slaveholder.' " (Bancroft's History of the United States.)

He took much pleasure in his barge in which he was rowed to and from Philadelphia. He also had a fine coach, a light calash, a sedan chair, and saddle horses for his wife and children. Judging by the entries in his cash book, he gave away a great deal in charity. He went to all the fairs and Indian Canticoes, and gave the Indians a great feast under the trees in front of his mansion. It can be seen that William Penn was fairsighted enough and versed in all the tactful influences and courtly finesse to hold the good will of his people and at the same time further his own interests. He appeared liberal, but at heart was grasping and avaricious. When he governed in person, he was more successful and popular than any deputy he appointed, for he knew how to give rights and privileges that would rebound to his ultimate advantage; he dealt frankly and openly with the people and yielded to circumstantials to preserve essentials. On this last visit he gave the people a new constitution which gave the right to the Assembly to originate bills, to determine their time of adjournment, and other important democratic powers. But he made the Council appointive instead of elective as before. He had no deliberate intention of oppressing his people, but "if he was to maintain his position of Feudal Lord and Proprietor, it was natural he should err on the side of power." (Fisher's Pennsylvania and the Commonwealth.)

After a stay of less than a year, he issued his last letters of instruction and farewell, and sailed, never to return. Being a favorite of Queen Anne, he returned to his old court life that he might ward off any movement against proprietorships. A bill was then before Parliament to turn the Proprietary colonies into Royal ones; but his influence was great enough to stop it. His was an expensive life, and as his quit-rents were in arrears, he could not meet the demands of an extravagant, dissipating son and the salaries of his deputy Governor and other officials. He declared that with all his sales of lands he was £20,000 in debt.

To rid himself of debt and the trouble created by the anti-proprietary party that arose in Pennsylvania against him, he tried to sell his political power in the colony to the Crown. With this load removed and with it all the expenses of the government while he yet remained Proprietor of the lands, "the sales and quit-rents would in a few years restore his fortune." To make a good bargain with the Crown in this sale, he upheld his Governor Evans in refusing his assent to a bill confirming the right of the Assembly to adjourn at pleasure as his new constitution granted. He reasoned that the fewer the privileges he allowed the people, the more the Crown would be induced to buy and the higher the price it would pay for it. Surely the saying is true, "The government cannot enrich one man without despoiling another." In this case the exalted Quaker ruler and preacher was willing to sacrifice the freedom of his people for self-enrichment.

The Assembly was indignant at Evans and at once prepared nine resolutions to be sent to Penn. It was a detailed attack on Penn full of invective, bitterness, and insinuation, accusing him of taking sides with the enemies of the Province, and of extortion and corruption in the sale of land. They referred to the increase of vice since the arrival of his son William. This son was a trial to his father as many a son has been under the corrupting influence of wealth gained without honest labor. This son lived in sumptuous style at his father's mansion at Pennbury where he dissipated and drank. But this memorial to Penn was not popular with the people who had not forgotten the many liberal privileges he had given to them; so the Assembly had to retract what they had said though they believed what they had written to be largely true. It was Penn's strong effort and intent to be so kind and affable that when enemies and accusations arose against him, his people would remain loyal to him.

To note further the tribulations that grow out of privately owned land and the undue advantage even the best of men will take of others when such ownership is involved, let us refer to the Ford incident. Penn's English and Irish estates were under the management of Philip Ford whom Penn considered to be an exemplary Quaker. He trusted him implicitly, and thought so much of him that he gave him 10,000 acres of land in Pennsylvania, a city lot in Philadelphia, and 150 acres in the suburbs, as a present. Ford, however, seems to have rendered accounts from which it appeared that although he had received £17,000 of Penn's money and the expenses were only £16,000, yet he figured that Penn owed him £10,500. Ford pressed for payment. Penn neglected to make an investigation, and foolishly gave Ford a deed to Pennsylvania as a mortgage, to secure the debt. Then later he committed another piece of folly by accepting from Ford a lease to the Province which was used to show that the deed was intended as an absolute conveyance. Ford died and his widow and son made this public and professed to be owners of Pennsylvania. They brought suit against Penn for £3,000 rent in arrears and got judgment. As Penn could not pay it, he was imprisoned nine months. Finally a compromise was reached and a settlement

made with the Fords for £7,600 pounds. Under new management his estates in England and Ireland began to bring some returns.

Penn was now nearly seventy and he ceased active life. He became gouty. He still tried, however, to sell his government of Pennsylvania to the Crown to restore his family to prosperity. The sale was delayed, but finally an agreement was reached by which he was to have £18,000 and £1,000 was paid to him. The deed was ready to be signed when he was stricken with paralysis. He lingered for six years with his mind affected. The deed was never signed and the government of Pennsylvania was never sold. During these last six years he lived in ease as his lands began to sell more rapidly and his quit-rents increased. He died July 30, 1718.

Thus ended the life of a man who had the rare opportunity to establish a government and system of land tenure based upon the natural rights of all men. Instead of leaving a monument to eternal justice, he chose to grovel to the promptings of "pelf and place" and to listen to those suggestions of rivalry within that give to many that intense thirst for riches, power and dominion. He could not have been totally ignorant of the Puritan system which had been established for sixty years before he founded Pennsylvania. The Massachusetts system of free lands had been exciting both the interest and jealousy of Europe for years. Penn must have known how New England flourished under the land allotment system, but with all his professions of religion and pretence of making a place of refuge for his despised people, he deliberately planned to profit by their presence on his empire land. Life is the sum total of deeds and the motives that inspire them. The man that leads a useful life is too busy to give much time to the mere frills of existence. Penn appropriated the earnings of the settler without giving anything in return. As a result it gave him a life of worry, of contention, of ruin to his eldest son, of the sacrifice of the freedom of the people he professed to protect. His course was the means of inducing his colonists to become speculators and many to engage in privateering, and of fastening a quit-rent system upon the colony which to this day are paid to heirs, all ending at last in debt, disappointment, bickerings, and a train of misfortunes.

While Penn created a commonwealth with more freedom than was given the people of Virginia and Carolina, yet he planted in his State a tenure of land which developed the very institutions of oppression from which his people had fled. What then did he really do for his sect or for the world? Doubtless he treated the Indian kindly and justly. But the motive was to make his lands more available to settlers who would become his feudal tenants. That was a good business reason. While he sold to actual settlers in amounts they would actually use, thus preventing the early amassing of lands by the few as in the southern colonies, it nevertheless was a gigantic real estate deal that excited jealousies and the spirit of emulation both in England and in the colony of those who wanted also to get rich by increased rents. Then his example of building a large Manor house for show and added distinction was followed in the next century by scores of others till all the

aristocratic got the craze for a country seat. Evidently, William Penn is the progenitor of our modern rent-baron who draws each year a princely fortune from a few city lots supporting skyscrapers, without lifting his hand to do one thing for society.

But the story of William Penn does not end with his death. He dictates by a Will who shall enjoy the special privileges and powers that were his during his life. If the private ownership of land is a violation of justice to all men, then the Will being a part of our land system is also a violation of justice. "The Will, if not purely Roman in origin, at least owes to Roman law its complete development. Its original object was to secure the perpetuation of the family, and was at first the peculiar privilege of the Patricians or noblemen. On the advent of Christianity into Rome, the duty of bequeathing to the Church was inculcated, and in England the Church succeeded in holding in its own hands for centuries jurisdiction in testamentary matters. In some countries in early times, the right of disposing of property by will did not exist: as among the ancient Germans, and with the Spartans under the laws of Lycurgus, and the Athenians before the time of Solon."

The Willing of personal property or of buildings to heirs can never produce social evils or an injustice to anyone, for such property being the product of labor depreciates in value, is lost or requires labor to keep it in a useful condition; but land is the bequest of the Creator to His children as a whole and if controlled by a few involves the control of the fruits of those who toil. Therefore in its broad sense, the Willing of land by our present laws is handing down to the next generation the right to appropriate wealth that labor produces in the form of ground rent. As all available land is owned by fewer persons, it inevitably follows that labor must pay higher rents till it reaches the point where it will accept a wage so low that it can just live and reproduce.

It is argued that lands given to heirs divides the land and prevents its hoarding. That, however, is not the case. While it may seem to divide an estate, yet when carefully investigated it will be found that the increase of land in the hands of fewer owners is greater than the division. A father may have managed to buy farm after farm till he has a thousand acres. If he has four children and each gets an equal share, they will each start in life greatly in advance of their father or of thousands who start with nothing but their hands. "Illinois in 1900, had 15,044 fewer owners and 23,454 more tenants than in 1880." "In the young State of Oklahoma, for the ten year period ending 1900 there was a 200 fold increase of tenantry and only a six fold increase in ownership." (Ghent's Benevolent Feudalism.)

If every child had the same opportunity to get land under our laws as was accorded to its father, what would be gained by the Will? Nothing at all. If the government would guarantee to every human being under its flag the absolute equal right to the soil and prevent its monopoly by taking ground rent as the only revenue to defray its expenses, all would have as much land as they could use, absolute justice would prevail, and Wills would be of no use except for all movable property.

Pennsylvania is a conspicuous example of the injustice of the Will. Here had settled a half million of people who were to be subjected to the whims of seven heirs, no one of whom had the liberality and broadmindedness of their father. To his daughter Letitia by his first wife, Penn gave 10,000 acres in Pennsylvania; to his dissipated son William by the same wife, he gave his English and Irish estates then having an income of £1,500 a year, or about \$30,000 in present values. The rest of Pennsylvania he left to his second wife to be conveyed to her five children then under age. The government of Pennsylvania was never sold to the Crown, hence Mrs. Penn became for a few years the Feudal Lord Proprietor over Pennsylvania, the only instance in history of a woman holding such an office. Under her deputy governor Keith, there was a popular administration of the Government. It was during this time that Benjamin Franklin went to Philadelphia as a youth of seventeen.

In 1732 Thomas Penn, one of the three remaining heirs, began the administration of affairs in Pennsylvania and for the next forty years was regarded as Proprietor of the colony. While he was a careful man of affairs, he had none of the daring energy or broad, generous temperament of his father and often ruled the colony narrowly and sordidly, although he had a more difficult task. He governed a rapidly increasing mixed population filled with advanced ideas of liberty. He had the collection of all the purchase money, the rent, and the interest of a great estate rapidly rolling up millions of pounds of value. He arranged treaties with the Indians and purchased their titles to lands on the frontier.

And what good thing did these Penn heirs do with the vast income from this immense estate? We are told that, "The large fortune which rapidly began to accrue to Thomas and his two brothers was spent upon their country seats in England." Wisely spent, wasn't it? But the prodigality of men has always come out of rent or some form of land slavery. Thomas Penn's place at Stoke Park, enlarged and beautified by his son, has in the present century been pointed out as one of the finest country seats in England with a magnificent mansion house, library, game, and herds of deer." This is what William Penn's Will did for humanity. Does not this waste of wealth, earned by labor of others, illustrate what is taking place daily before our eyes due to the same system? Had Penn been given the whole United States, his heirs today would be ruling us and gathering quit-rents from the larger part of the millions now here. Probably there would not have been a Revolution and Washington and Jefferson may have been their feudal tenants.

But what influence did this land system have upon the plainly dressed, peace loving Quaker? "By the year 1745, the Quakers, especially those in the city, had become very much like the founder of their province and were largely men of the world. They had grown rich and prosperous, and they had grown accustomed to political power. They were becoming a sect of the upper class and on account of the strict discipline of their church, hundreds of them were becoming Episcopalians." Thus we see the demoralizing effect

and tendency toward aristocracy which this private land ownership system engendered even with the ascetic Quaker.

The Quaker too "had always professed to be very much shocked at the way in which Christians deprived heathen nations of their lands, and robbed, defrauded and murdered them." "The legal theory of Indian land ownership at that time was that the Indians owned only the land they actually lived on and cultivated. Their right was simply that of occupancy, about the same as the land title of a wolf or bear. The general rule of law, as laid down at the time by every writer and judge, was that no heathen people could acquire a title to land, except that of occupancy, which would be invalid against a Christian who wanted it; and the first Christian who took it could keep it." This rule of law, sometimes called the "Heavenly Title," has been recognized by modern courts as the original basis of ownership of a large part of the territory of the United States." (Fisher's Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth.)

This law originated with the Pope and was a part of his policy for the increase of his temporal power. When Columbus discovered America, it will be remembered that the Pope claimed it as his of right, and kindly gave it to Spain. The comment has often been made that the Romans were arrogant despots and conquerors; they took what they wanted, and because they wanted it, but they never claimed that there was enough magic in their religion to change the universal rights of property in land.

Massacres and wars were frequent among the Indians in New England, Virginia, and Carolina, which checked the advance of those colonists, while the entire absence of such difficulties in Pennsylvania for the first seventy years was one of the causes of her wonderful growth and prosperity. Penn paid the Indian for every acre of land he took from them and at a price that satisfied the Indian. While cold investigation of Duponceau, Fisher, and Stone show that the great Penn treaty with the Indians, that has been exalted and embellished by historians, is probably pure fiction with hardly even a respectable tradition to rest upon, yet Penn had an understanding with his red friends; and his fine tact in treating them as friends and in making them presents of wampum always made a strong impression upon the savage mind. The white man agreed with the red man to love one another; and Penn's last words which tradition says he used, that so touched the children of the forest, "We are the same as if one man's body were to be divided into two parts; we are all one flesh and blood," are as applicable today to the oppressor and the oppressed as they were then.

While Penn's sons followed their father's policy in the main, yet they took advantage of the Indian in several cases. In the great purchase of 1754 of about 7,000,000 acres, they gave for it but 750 pounds, or at the rate of about a penny for every 39 acres. The Indians became dissatisfied with this sale; so the land was bought over again in small tracts. The Penns did not buy the frontier land fast enough to keep pace with the advancing pioneers; as a result the settlers encroached upon Indian land and would not vacate when

the Indians made complaint. The delay of the government to act irritated the Indians, and the French in Canada a few years later took advantage of this and secured the alliance of the Indians against the English.

The famous "Walking Purchase" was another event which helped to increase the discontent of the Indian. Chief Justice Allen, connected with the Penns by marriage, selected 10,000 acres in the very fertile region known as the Minisink lands. Settlers went onto this land in large numbers and began clearing and building. But this land belonged to the Delaware tribe and they clamored incessantly for their rights. To meet their demands, an old deed purporting to give the settlers a right to extend a line that could be walked in a day and a half, was brought into requisition. If this line could be made long enough, it would include all of this valuable tract. This line had never been run, so the whites surveyed and cleared it beforehand so there would be no delay in walking. When the morning came to do the walking, the most active woodman had been selected to cover as many miles as possible in twelve hours. The line was walked in part, but he ran most of the time so that by night he had passed the point the Indians had estimated could be reached only at the end of the day and a half. By the next day at noon the line was extended to thirty miles beyond what would have been a fair distance had the whites walked. Then, too, the line drawn from the ending point to the Delaware river to make the northern boundary line, was run northeastward instead of directly east as the deed required, and thus the whole territory was enclosed.

This was fraud and the Indians not only would not move from the tract, but never forgot this treachery of the Penns who were responsible for it all. Then to get the Indians to move off, the whites sent for a delegation of the Six Nations to order them away. The Delawares were at this time a subject tribe to the tribes of New York. The whites took advantage of this fact and bribed the delegation by a present of £300 to make the Delawares move. A speech was made by one of the delegates calling them "their women" and ordered them to move to Wyomen. At this command they slunk away like whipped curs; but they never forgot this wrong and the French and Indian war gave them a chance to wreak vengeance on the frontier whites for the wrong done them by the land grabbers.

But the greatest fraud was the grasping purchase of 1754 by the Albany treaty. This treaty included nearly all of Pennsylvania west of the Susquehanna River. It was obtained by such irregular practices as deceiving the Indian by the compass courses, having the deed signed without proper notice to the Six Nations, and including lands of tribes who never signed the deed. When the import of this deed became known, their lands being gone, the Indians went over to the French in a body, when the latter promised to restore their lands to them.

Not only was Thomas Penn responsible for these causes of the French and Indian war, but when the colonists wanted to contribute his share of the taxes to carry on the war to protect the settlers on the frontier, he flatly

refused. But they retaliated by sending a commission to England to place the matter before the King and Parliament.

Benjamin Franklin and a man by the name of Norris were appointed, but as Norris was in ill-health, he remained at home and Franklin started alone. He had become famous abroad from his discovery of electricity in the clouds. He was warmly received, was dined at country seats and at London houses. Everywhere he made known his complaints against the Penns; wrote articles for the public press and worked up a public sentiment in favor of forcing the Penns, whose property was enjoying protection by taxes raised in England, to pay their just proportion.

Franklin was in England two years on this mission and while there a bill was passed in the Pennsylvania Assembly subjecting the estates to taxation. The bill was sent to England and the Penns opposed it before the Privy Council as hostile to their rights and ruinous to themselves and their posterity. "They professed to believe that all their wild and unmarketable lands would be taxed at the same rates as the cultivated lands, and *that their lots would be taxed at such rates as to cut off all profit from a rise in value. The taxes would be increased until their income was cancelled, and all hope of speculation gone.*" In other words, "they believed that the *colonists would apply* to them the *Single Tax* which has been so much discussed in our time, and which by putting all taxes on land and taxing them to their full value, will, it is supposed, cut off speculative profit and turn it in the direction of the laborer instead of into the hands of the landlord." (Fisher's Pennsylvania Colony and Commonwealth.)

Franklin replied, "All that was asked was equality; and that the assessors were honest men under oath who would take no advantage." The outcome was that the King approved the papers giving authority to tax the Penn estates, and Franklin's work was done. The tax was assessed and the Penns had to pay £566. They had expected to use the war to control provincial rights; but the end of the war brought a curtailment of their own excesses. This was a step toward constitutional liberty, and Franklin returned home covered with honors and glory.

At this early date these Penns saw how easily their profits in the advances in land values could be taken away from them by the simple process of making the tax on land values high enough to take all the profit for the support of government. Had these colonists seen the wisdom of such a tax and applied it, they would have rid themselves of the Penn proprietors without sending anyone to England to make a formal complaint against them. Quit-rents, and the vast domain held by the Penns to despoil the earnings of the colonists, would have vanished as dew before the sun. They would have had to sell what they could and abandon what they could not actually use. Those seeking land under such a system could enter such lands without paying a speculative value for it to an absentee monopolist. Also hoarding wealth by the rent process would have been an impossibility and no one would have held more land than wanted for actual use. Therefore

labor would have had free access to the 10,000 acres tract that the favorites of the Penns had appropriated. Moreover, they would have left a history of the same thrift and high moral character and development as handed down to us by the Puritans.

Under this system, also, no one could have rented his land and moved to town to live on the product of another's toil as we see all over our country today. The Puritans had no such class as the "retired farmer." When a man will submit to pay rent to another who owns the land, it is the unmistakable sign that land in general is monopolized. The system induces men to buy more land than they can use in the hope of profiting by the future increase in value.

While Franklin was chairman of a committee to prepare a report on the country's condition and prospects in 1759, he estimated the wealth of the Penns' Pennsylvania holdings, not including Delaware, at about £10,000,000 or in present values \$200,000,000; their annual income from quit-rents at £58,936 or \$1,178,720. Some recent writers claim that Franklin's estimate is too high and place their wealth at £4,000,000 and their annual income at £10,000. Whichever estimate is taken, the principle is just the same. They were able through their ownership to command half a million people to pay to them either of these large sums every year. The useful members of society were taxed to support these heirs in idleness; and the princely income led the Penns to lead lives of prodigality and luxurious leisure. How much has the world been benefitted by the coming of Thomas Penn or his brothers? They can be classed only as parasites on the toiler and as wasters of wealth.

After the Revolution all the American colonies threw off the Royal and Proprietary governments and in most cases confiscated the lands of the Royalists who left this country or were living in England. Pennsylvania had never become a royal province, although it would have been one had William Penn signed the deed of transfer. While the Assembly abolished the political power of the Penns and their feudal title to the land, yet they were allowed to keep certain private estates which had been settled on the children of Penn's first wife, all their manors, and some of their quit-rents; and to reimburse them for what was confiscated, the Assembly stupidly gave them £130,000 in money. This was as unjust to labor as paying the Penns a quit-rent for which they did not in any sense give a value in return. Hence but little was gained by confiscation. "Private property in land is a bold, enormous wrong, like that of chattel slavery," (Henry George) and when an owner of land is paid by the government for the value the community creates, the people at large are wronged. This same money paid by taxation can be used in buying more land and the same monopoly established as before.

Buying land is simply prepaying rent, therefore. If money is raised by taxation to buy back great tracts of land appraised at present values, as they are doing in New Zealand, they have simply paid the landlord his rent in advance and very little is gained. Land values belong to the people; why should they pay for a thing that already belongs to them? A stolen horse

is not paid for by his rightful owner when found; it is simply taken. Taxing land values is taking the stolen horse that belongs to society.

The audacity of the Penns did not end in being reimbursed by the Pennsylvania colony. It was estimated that they lost by the Revolution about £944,817. This they claimed from the British government; and by an act of Parliament, filled with sympathizing landlords, the tax-payers of England were made to pay the Penns an annuity of £4,000 on this claim. This was paid annually down as late as 1884 when it was commuted by a grant of £67,000. At the present time, the Penn heirs "own a few manors in the interior of the State of Pennsylvania, and collect a few quit-rents through their agents, and some of the land on which quit-rents are paid lies in the most populous part of Philadelphia."

Thus we come to the culmination of a great land grant with its full quota of woe and retrogression following in the wake of a century of land speculation. While we may ascribe to William Penn the noblest motives in planting a refuge for his people, concede that he dealt more fairly with the natives, that he was in many ways liberal with the emigrants, that he was sincere and honorable, and with a brave, courageous spirit opposed evil and intolerance, yet he upheld and engrafted upon American soil a pernicious system of land tenure which so conservative a writer as Bancroft admits gave Pennsylvania, even under this just Quaker, a century full of strife, in which the colonists were led "to complain, to impeach, to institute committees of inquiry, to send persons and papers, to quarrel with the executive." Bancroft further say: "Pennsylvania, for nearly a century, sought to impair the executive right to pre-emption (to buy land first) and to compel an appropriation of the income from quit-rents, in part at least, to the public service. Jealousy of a feudal chief was early displayed. The maker of the first Pennsylvania almanac, Franklin, was censured for publishing Penn a Lord." "William Penn established a democracy, and was himself a feudal sovereign. These two elements in government were incompatible; and for ninety years the civil history of Pennsylvania is but the account of the jarring of these opposing interests."

If Pennsylvania suffered contentions for a century by the conflict of democracy with feudal aristocracy, may we not conclude that with the same conditions existing today of great tracts of land equally as valuable as the whole State of Pennsylvania in the hands of feudal corporations and individuals, we are suffering from the same chronic disease of the body politic as then? Do we not hear of "complaints, of committees of inquiry, of sending persons and papers"? Yea, more, do we not hear of magnates conniving in their secret places to destroy all freedom in production by owning all the best of our natural resources that they may dictate both the wage to labor and the prices for necessities? Do we not hear of legislative scandals, bribery for office, court intrigues, secret plots, colonization schemes, strikes and riots, and dynamited buildings? Do we not hear of increasing crime, insanity, suicide, tenantry and poverty?

We did not hear of such complaints under the New England system.

They did not have the quit-rents and the rapid sale of lands to build up a great fortune for one man and his family from the honest toil of the many. We did not hear of jealousies, of agents sent to England to implore the aid of the Privy Council to compel the large landholders to pay their just portion of the taxes and prevent them from annulling the rights of the legislative Assembly. Neither did we hear of great country seats and manor houses of an over-rich ruling class growing, separating society into two widely divergent classes; the one a leisure, pleasure-seeking, idle class living in mansions, the other producing all wealth by its toil, bearing all the burdens of government, and building all the mansions while modestly sheltering itself in the humble cottage.

Social conditions among the Puritans remained undefiled for a century and a half while the Pennsylvania people after a century of growth threw off the restraints of Quakerism and began a life of gaming and debauchery. The Quakerism that said, "The word of an honest man was evidence without an oath"; that checked "the mad spirit of speculation by a system of strict accountability applied to factors and agents"; that prohibited "pleasures of the senses, masks, revels, stage-plays, bull-bates, and cock-fights"; that esteemed marriage a civil contract; that did not allow poor rates nor "tithes" that had worked out a rule of equality in families and had annulled the law giving the eldest son the estate; were swept away when the sluice-gates to unearned riches were opened.

In place of this sound social equilibrium and a state of solidarity in which all were prosperous and none poor, the church of aristocracy was substituted which encouraged speculation, luxurious living, and the building of country seats about Philadelphia similar to those of England. Society became loose in its habits and morals, was broken up into opposing classes, with an idle set at the top throwing those below into mad frenzy in their efforts to obtain money at any hazard or by any means to keep up to the prodigal pace the rich displayed on every hand. Privateering was encouraged and became "a regular part of a merchant's calling." Among these merchants was Robert Morris, the wealthy financier of the Revolution who was ready at any time to turn over to Washington the cargoes he had stolen from the French or Spanish vessels. Are we not proud of such benevolence and of such forefathers? Was this country born in the "Cradle of Liberty" or in the Cradle of Graft and Plunder?

Is not Pennsylvania, in fact, typical of what is true of the history-making of the present? We have a population from every corner of the earth, striving to make an honest living, endeavoring to live virtuous, upright lives, in most cases liberal and benevolent, courageous and tolerant; but under the powerful influence of corporate and private monopoly of the tremendous land values piling up wealth to staggering heights, our ship of State has long since heaved her anchor at the moorings of peaceful, honest industry and social contentment, and has these many years been floundering in the rough sea of class-struggle, class-rule, and class-exploitation.

APE ECONOMICS.

[(For the Review.)]

By J. B. FORBIS, Jr.

There was a beautiful country like this fair land of America. The mountains were filled with all kinds of ore, the prairies were covered with grasses that yielded nutritious grains, and the trees bore a super-abundance of fruits and nuts that were good to eat. In that country there lived a race of apes. They could not consume all the grains and fruit. None of the apes ever went hungry, for all they had to do was to exert themselves to pluck and eat. About one-third of their time was occupied in going about to procure food, one-third was devoted to enjoying themselves, and the remainder, which was during the night, was given to sleep. They had everything their hearts desired, for nature liberally supplied their wants. They thought that a good Spirit did all this for their comfort and happiness, and in the groves they would assemble to voice their thanks and sing praises to that good and great Spirit of nature.

It finally occurred to some selfish, short-sighted, predatory apes who had accidentally discovered a big cave, that they would persuade the other unsuspicious apes to gather and bring to them the crops as they matured to be stored in the cave. It was done, and the selfish apes put others with clubs around the mouth of the cave to guard the stored crops. Because they had possession of the crops they claimed that the grains and fruit in the cave were their property to do with as they pleased. They had more than they could use, but they would not let the race of apes have anything in the cave, unless they brought them yellow pebbles to give in exchange for the grain or fruit. By so doing, they established the yellow pebbles as a medium of exchange. These greedy apes considered themselves and their families as better than the others, and as they controlled the necessities of life they lived an idle luxurious existence that was not good for them. They began to demand other things that the country produced and the race of apes had to work very hard to find things to supply their growing wants. The selfish apes also induced the race of apes to think that the proper thing to do was to apportion the land, which was the source of everything needed by the apes, to them, so that they could own it absolutely. They did not realize what harm would result from doing so, but it was such a big country and there were comparatively so few apes at the time to occupy the country, that they virtually gave the land to the predatory, designing apes, who exacted a rental from the others for using their land. As the caves at stated times contained nearly all the crops, great numbers of the foolish apes abandoned their homes in the country and came to live at a congested station around the cave. They were known as the "cave" or "cliff-dweller" apes, for they were compelled to build hovels in which to reside and big structures in which to transact business. All of them had to work for the ruling, greedy apes, and many of them had to do unhealthy work. Some were

made to dig underground for fuel, some where crowded into unsanitary factories, and some spent their time in small, cramped rooms bending over desks. Many of the half grown apes also had to work. Some were drilled and educated to use deadly weapons, and taught that it was right to kill any apes who helped other ambitious ones to get control of affairs. More caves were found and the designing ones, profiting by the example of those who found the first cave, induced more of their fellows to leave the country and work for them. So here and there throughout the land, wherever there was a cave, the silly beasts left their natural outdoor life and sought to live the artificial life of cave apes.

Social injustice and economic inequality were marked. The wily, greedy apes used every device they could think of to get them to be their slaves. It was pitiful to see them so crowded together. They forgot their former natural way of living and became weak and sickly. The ruling apes became greedier and lived more luxuriously, but the majority of those around the caves became weaker and weaker and less able to take care of themselves, became underlings and thought they were fortunate to have a job. Many became absolute paupers and were put in stockades to be taken care of. The land was neglected, for the apes that continued to live naturally in the open air were regarded as ignorant, old foggy and countrified, although they lived better, longer and more wholesome lives than the apes around the caves.

Matters kept getting worse and worse and food more expensive to the cave dwellers. Suffering and want increased among them. Crime became rampant and pens were established in which to confine criminal apes. Finally a rumor was started among the cave apes that the great good Spirit said that the whole country, its increment values and its natural resources belonged to all the ape race alike, irrespective of their parentage or condition. But the strong apes, having control of affairs and the stores in the caves, laughed at the suggestion and said, "No, it belongs to us and everything above and below the ground that the land yields and produces is ours to do with as we please, for did not the race of apes a long time ago consent to such a plan." The servile apes replied, "At one time when there were few apes in the country our ape ancestors did not consider the land of much value, as there was an overabundance of everything for all and there were no caves or cave dwellers, but now that the race of apes has increased so largely in numbers, we demand that our natural, inalienable rights that were given away by our ancestors be restored to us and that equity be done to all." Did they get it? No, the drilled fighting apes shot the protesting apes, and the others, cowed to subjection, led a more miserable life than before.

The consequence was that selfishness began to be the general principle of all the apes, and they also began to think that self-preservation was the first law of nature, whereas formerly they had thought that the great Spirit of nature was generous and kind and had intended it to be a happy land for their race. Cheating, hypocrisy, lying and stealing became common among them. Some "holier than thou" apes told them there was an evil Spirit that was the author

of this great injustice, but it was not so, for the selfish apes had created all these wrongs. It required more and more fighting apes, as the years moved on, to preserve order. These fighting apes were wholly unnecessary if the race had lived unselfishly. A great deal of the stored crops also were required to feed and support the fighting apes who did not work, for those who did not work had to be fed and supported by those who worked. The race began to degenerate and the apes were very unhappy. Those living around the caves lost all memory of how their ancestors had lived, and tried to occupy their idle time in foolish sports. Many of them would spend much of the night time in trying to amuse themselves or in dissipation. Still the select, greedy class of apes could or would not see what was the matter. More arduous labor was imposed. The supply of food was held at higher prices, and the stations around the caves were filled with angry, chattering apes who sought to change and better their conditions. Instead of joy, they experienced want and sorrow, and they complained, "Why were we born into this country that could easily afford food and comfort for all of us and not be permitted to have our just share without these strong, selfish apes interfering." At last it occurred to them that the plan of giving the natural resources of the land into the charge of the few, and permitting them to have absolute control of it, was wrong. So the race revolted, induced the fighting apes to join them, slew the arrogant, greedy, predatory ones, closed up the caves, and lo they found that all had more than enough to supply their wants. In fact, there was so much that they could not use it and they preserved the great surplus for apes who would afterwards be born to use it. What a pity that they had to experience all that trouble because of the greed and selfishness of a few of them and because of those ugly caves. Then a more natural and diversified industrial state of affairs prevailed among them, and they began to be less selfish, grew stronger physically, and lived a happier life. Is it not strange what sorrow and misery a few apes can cause by monopolizing what belongs to the living and the unborn?

THE plute papers pretending to discuss the high price of living never mention the high price of land, yet the people who work for a living in the United States are paying twice as much for the use of the land now that they did ten years ago. They get nothing for it, and the land owner only gets out of the way. This item must be added to the cost of every labor product, and labor pays every cent of it to idleness.—Portland (Oregon) *Labor Press*.

THE more we tax business, or improvements, or incomes, or anything else except land values, the easier we make it to hold land idle and dis-employ labor.—*The Square Deal*, Toronto.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An Illustrated Bi-Monthly Magazine
of Single Tax Progress.

Edited and Published by

JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 150 Nassau St.
New York

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

Entered at the Post-office, New York, as Second Class Matter.

JULY-AUGUST, 1912

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

AGAIN we desire to announce that the Vancouver, Edmonton and German Special Numbers of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW may be had at ten cents a copy, postage paid. No better educational documents can be secured than these numbers. They tell of things done.

OTHER Special Numbers are in course of preparation and will follow in due season.

THOSE who have not renewed their subscriptions are urgently requested to do so at once.

TAX THE RENTAL VALUE.

Perhaps the point raised by Mr. Bolton Hall in a recent issue of the REVIEW, a point which has called forth several communications, namely that the Single Tax should contemplate the taxation of the rental rather than the selling value of land, may be looked upon as academic, or as a matter of detail, or as a problem to be met when we come to it. Yet both Mr. Bolton Hall and Mr. William Ryan have proved, it seems to us, the difficulty of assessing the selling value of land under the Single Tax, which involves if carried

far enough, the disappearance of the selling value.

In this connection we quote from a little pamphlet written by Thos. G. Shearman, "Objections to the Single Tax" as follows:

Objection 2—How could the value of land be ascertained under a system of taxation intended to absorb all the rent of the land? What basis would exist for estimating the tax?

Ans.—The basis of valuation would not be the selling value, but the rent—that is, the actual or possible income derived from the land. The assessor would not ask for the price at which the land could be sold, but would ascertain the rent which tenants would be willing to give for it to a landlord who paid all the taxes. The rate of taxation would be estimated, not as now, at a percentage of its selling value, but at a percentage of the annual rent, like an income tax.

This little pamphlet was one of the tracts of the Land and Labor Library and was published by Henry George in 1889. This statement then must seemingly have had his approval.

Obviously there will come a time when the Single Tax must be levied on the rental value. Those who believe with Messrs Hall and Ryan will ask why we should not begin where it is possible with a method to which we must inevitably revert at some period, and to us it seems that they have rather the best of the argument so far as it has gone.

In another column of this issue an interesting point is raised by Mr. George White. Let our readers be sure that they understand him before hastening to disagree with him. If he is in error it is not so great an error as that of Single Taxers who argue as if rent were a deduction from wages and interest. Thus, in a review of several years ago of a pamphlet written by J. P. Kohler, we were compelled to take exceptions to statements of this sort. It seems to us that his illustration of a pie cut into three pieces, one of which he calls Wages, one Interest, and a third Rent, and his contention that if the Rent piece grows larger the pieces called Wages and Interest must grow smaller, is faulty

in statement—and more faulty in what it seems to imply.

But we leave Mr. White to the mercies of our correspondents.

ANTONIO ALBENDIN.

(*See portrait*).

Antonio Albendin, the leading Single Tax apostle of Spain, was born at Madrid in 1874, and received his early education at a primary school, which he attended from 1881 to 1884. From 1890 to 1893, awaiting better times for himself and his father's family, when he could enter a private academy or public school, he assisted his father in the business of importation of fancy goods from Paris, and busied himself in his leisure moments in gaining a knowledge of French literature and institutions for which he had cultivated an extreme fondness.

In 1893 he resolved to wait no longer to enter a private academy, but instead to take up a course at the National High School of Agriculture. This he did, following with private study of English, in which he has achieved a large degree of efficiency. This was an important preparation, for it enabled him to grasp the doctrines of Henry George in the original instead of resorting to the imperfect Spanish translations.

There came to Madrid in 1897 a great business depression, and this was felt by Senor Albendin's family. The young man now gave lessons in mathematics and qualified to become telegraph officer. Later in 1900 he became Agricultural Engineer. He then left Madrid for Southern Spain, but managed to spend much of his leisure time in Madrid, for here dwelt Maria Garcia, who in 1904 became his wife. This charming lady is an earnest Single Taxer and gives to her husband the beautiful encouragement so helpful to him in the prosecution of his work for the cause. The couple spend their summer holidays in the Pyrenees, going thence from their home in Andalusia, and so have derived a more intimate knowledge of the misery of the French and Spanish masses.

Puzzled and dissatisfied with the ex-

planations of the leading French authors on Rural Economy, and trying to settle the grave doubt and perplexities that were rising in his mind with respect to social problems, he bought a copy of "Progress and Poverty" in 1906. On his return to Andalusia he read the book. As he turned the pages his interest grew. He at once ordered all of George's works and busied himself with their perusal to such an extent that his devoted wife grew jealous of this new rival that had risen to usurp his time and attention. But the matter was explained to her, and the great vision that had come to the young husband now dawned to her in the vivid explanations that he gave her of this great discovery of the distinguished American writer. From that moment she helped him, and his work became hers.

Not knowing whether Henry George was alive or dead he wrote to a friend in America, expressing his desire to cross the Atlantic and meet the great thinker who had set at rest the doubts that had troubled him. He then learned that the prophet had passed away nine years before.

In 1908 Senor Albendin learned of a very poor translation of "Progress and Poverty" in Spanish. He bought fifty copies and sent them to friends, acquaintances and others with no results. In 1909 he began to write articles for the Madrid *Herald*. In that year he visited London and met Mr. Fels.

Our friend rarely rests from his work. He corresponds with Single Taxers all over the world. In December, 1911, he had succeeded in getting together a small group in Madrid, the work is broadening out, and even now the results of his activity are becoming manifest. There is at last a Spanish Single Tax League, which distributes pamphlets and magazines, and is helping to influence public opinion.

Music and Single Tax are Senor Albendin's two passions. The great musicians and the great philosopher who had discovered and made plain to him the economic harmonies, are his heroes.

"You take my life when you do take the means whereby I live."—SHAKESPEARE.

TESTIMONY OF THREE GREAT NOVELISTS.

The following bits of testimony from three novelists of world-wide distinction have never been brought together, and they form an interesting series of quotations.

"The men were at least as well clad as those of the same condition are now; and their robust limbs and ruddy cheeks showed no lack of the fare that supports labor. Indeed the workingman of that day, if not one of the absolute theowes, or slaves, was physically speaking better off, perhaps, than he has ever been since in England."—Bulwer's "Harold, Last of the Saxon Kings."

"Certainly a landed estate is 'an animal with its mouth always open.' But compare the physical perception and enjoyment of landed wealth with that of Consols and securities. Can I get me rosy cheeks, health, and good-humor, riding up and down my Peruvian bonds? Can I go out shooting upon my parchment, or in summer sit under shadow of my mortgage deed, and bob for commas and troll for semi-colons in my river of ink that meanders through my meadows of sheep skin?

Wherefore I really think that land will always tempt the knowing ones until some vital change shall take place in Society."—CHARLES READE.

"And is it possible, after all, that there may be a flaw in the title deeds? Is or is not the system wrong that gives one married pair so immense a superfluity of luxurious home and shuts out a million others from any home whatever? One day or another, safe as they deem themselves, and safe as the hereditary temper of the people really tends to make them, the gentlemen of England will be compelled to face this question."—NATHANIEL HAWTHORNE.

THE taxation of land values will make the urban land monopolist let go his vacant acres, so workers will have more space and lower rents.

NEW YORK CITY VALUES.

FROM A PAPER READ BEFORE THE NATIONAL CONVENTION OF REAL ESTATE EXCHANGES AT LOUISVILLE, KY., BY GEORGE T. MORTIMER, VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE U. S. REALTY AND IMPROVEMENT CO.

Years ago they told me in New York that we had reached the top notch in prices, but since then values have gone up by leaps and bounds, until we have reached the maximum at the rate of seven hundred dollars per square foot, and still we are not up to the top prices of either London or Paris. The net increase of land values in the City of New York for a period of ten years, from 1900 to 1910, was more than the combined gross output of all the gold and silver mines of the United States by one hundred and seventy million dollars, and greater by two hundred and seventy-eight million dollars than all the dividends paid during this time by all the railroads of the United States. And during this time this land was paying satisfactory dividends on its investment. This is the land, which in 1626 was bought from the Indians for twenty-four dollars, or approximately nine cents for each one hundred acres. True there are occasional recessions, but these are mostly of a local nature, due to trade changes.

What applies to New York, is, I believe, true of all the other large cities in the land: Chicago, Cleveland, Detroit, Denver, Omaha, Seattle, Louisville and the entire South are going through a re-building process. The method of steel skeleton frame construction, developed by George A. Fuller in Chicago, a little over twenty years ago, has created a new era in the building business, making it possible to reap a greater crop from our city lots, and introducing conditions which have brought about the replanning and rebuilding of most of our large cities.

THE popular cause has always been the cause of the laborer struggling for a right to live and breathe and think as a man.—JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE.

A QUESTION FOR DEBATE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

It is not an uncommon occurrence to find in printed matter relating to tax reform the expression of the assumption that land values are very much higher than they should be, that they constitute a tremendous burden upon the people, that they increase the cost of goods and living, and that in the case of city locations land values are double what they should be, placing in the way of business enterprise a handicap equal to fifty per cent. of current location values. Omitting for the present all reference to the relation of cost of goods and living to land values, I suggest that some of those who believe city land values are double what they should be undertake to show how this can be.

One explanation I have received is that speculation, leading to the withholding or poor use of valuable locations, increases values so much that it is a conservative estimate that land values would be cut in half by the adoption of the taxation of land values to the full extent.

How can this be the case? The well established explanation of the working of the law of economic rent is that there is a tendency for land value premiums to equal—not to exceed, and not to be less than—the difference in productiveness—or potentiality for use—between any given location and those available at a nominal price. If the best land to be got without price is ten bushel land, then all of greater productivity or potentiality than ten bushels will command a premium. Thirty bushel land will be worth in rent twenty bushels, and so on. Now, if speculation in locations results in depressing the margin of cultivation so that labor has to resort to five bushel land, the net return to labor will be cut in half—from ten to five bushels—but the rent of thirty bushel land will not be doubled. Not at all. It will be increased simply in proportion to the difference between the potential returns at the margin. This is for illustration assumed to be five bushels. Thirty bushel land rent will, by the assumed effect of land speculation, be changed from twenty

bushels to twenty-five bushels. That is all.

Now the difference between the potentiality of locations in cities and at the margin very much exceeds any reasonable variation in the capacity of land for wheat production, so that if we attempt to apply the reasoning used in kindergarten explanations of the law of rent we get into figures that look ridiculous, but for the sake of illustration it can be done, nevertheless. If we assume that the land now in this year 1912 in this country which is at the margin of cultivation is ten bushel land, we may also assume that land in cities is 60,000 bushel land, and we may assume that speculative withholding of usable land exists to the extent of forcing the margin down from thirty bushel land to ten bushel land. We here concede that speculation in land has resulted in cutting down wages at the margin from thirty to ten bushels, or in other words has cut wages two-thirds. Does it follow that city land values are in any similar ratio changed. It does not so appear to me. A change in net return to labor at the margin of twenty bushels will make a change only in same proportion at the most valuable locations in potentiality. The 60,000 bushel land will still bear a rent of 59,980 bushels.

In other words, to assume that the economic rent of extremely valuable locations is doubled by speculation in land is to set up a claim that land values do not depend upon the difference in potentiality between locations above and at the no-rent margin, and if this claim is set up some sort of kindergarten proof should be offered.

As at present advised I prefer to believe that economic rent is not materially changed at the most valuable locations; that the greatest change is quite near the no-rent margin; and that as land in possibility of use develops wider differences as compared with land at the present or at what may be assumed to be the normal margin, the change caused by land speculation becomes less and less of consequence.

However, I am no authority, and am willing to be shown as in error.—GEORGE WHITE, Hackensack, N. J.

NEWS—DOMESTIC.

OREGON.

The tax fight is getting interesting in Oregon. The Graduated Single Tax and Exemption measure is filed. There are seven others. The Equal Taxation League, a fake organization of the plutocrats, circulated a petition that purported to make the Single Tax forever impossible in Oregon. It was found, however, that it absolutely destroyed the power of the initiative to apply to any tax measure whatever. Its father had to kill his own child! It was withdrawn after enormous expenditures had been made to secure signatures, and the entire electorate had been given two rounds of the most mendacious aggregation of appeals against the Single Tax that has ever been published.

The measure relied upon to defeat the Single Tax in Oregon now is one repealing the local option county amendment passed in 1910 and needing only the vote of the people in some one county to be tried out. Under this present constitutional provision three counties will vote on measures putting all county, city, school, road and special taxes on land values only. Should the anti-measure carry this will be done away with. The anti-measure was passed by the legislature. It forbids poll taxes and "emergency" tax laws. This latter are laws passed with a clause preventing the referendum. Oregon has been running under such tax laws for over eight years.

The other tax measures submitted are not direct attacks on the principle of land value taxation, but homeopathic doses of it to cure the disease. One abolishes taxes on household goods; another on certificates of indebtedness, bank deposits, etc. Another provides for an income tax.

The opposition has a retinue of writers, speakers and mailing clerks and is spending fully \$10,000 a month to oppose the graduated measure and to pass the anti-measure. Boiler plate matter is offered in any quantities. Special articles against the measure and speakers at pleasure.

The sentiment against the Single Tax is strong throughout the rural sections of

the State. Wherever the farmers read the graduated measure they drop their antagonism; but to get them to read it we must send out speakers.

This has been impossible to do. The resources of the Graduated Single Tax League are absorbed in securing the initiative petition and in literature.

As an instance, F. E. Coulter recently addressed an audience of 150 farmers in a remote part of Marion county about 60 miles from Portland. At the start all but three were opposed to the measure. After two hours of questions and elucidation all but four endorsed it. Two men brought out by the opposition to debate with him respectfully declined. They said they wanted to know more about the measure before they undertook to controvert it. One of them said he was in favor of the measure if it was as represented.

We hope to secure the services of Mr. Coulter for three months to tour the State. What is wanted is more men like him to carry the gospel of economic justice to the farmers who have had dust flung in their eyes by the landed plutocrats misinformation bureau.

A few years ago a measure to abolish the poll tax would have been considered progressive. Now no body of men dare propose anything else! If in 1908 the tax commission had proposed to exempt all household goods and personal belongings in use, and to give power to the legislature to enact an income tax, graduated and from any source, we would have said the commission was headed for the Single Tax. Now, with such measures this body proposes to head off the Single Tax, and writes a note to the plute anti-Single Tax league to say that these measures will do the trick.

Out of the eight tax measures something is going to happen. If all are defeated we will be where we are now. If any three of them pass we will be making progress.

Some eastern criticism of the graduated measure has come out to us. The situation here is not understood. The measure is a distinct and positive step toward the placing of all taxes on land values. The opponents recognize this and fight accordingly, for they know that the people will

not stop short of the real thing if they once get the bit in their teeth.

Their frantic opposition, their teeming lies, their expensive campaign, their muzzling of the press, their costly mistakes, their flood of literature—all show that they realize that the people must be fooled now or never. It is with regret that the workers digging trenches on the firing line see that the forces of economic justice are squabbling over details and criticising the gun that is to smash down the fortifications of the enemy. Perhaps it is not perfect; perhaps it overshoots its mark; perhaps it should have been dragged up this way and mounted that way, loaded with less powder, or more; but the battle is on, and the firing has begun. Already its shots are telling. We should afford it massed support and not allow the enemy to sneak up on the blind side and spike it because its shells spread havoc among them, while we are debating whether it is a flawless, perfect Single Tax measure. A gun that can draw the fire and the desperate assaults of the enemy is worth defending.

Constitutionality? Well, it is constitutional enough. Don't worry. The people have a tame supreme court in Oregon. It eats out of their hand!

The supreme court of the United States! Oh, that body is likely to let Oregon alone. It has trouble of its own, and more coming. The plutes howl "unconstitutional!" at everything progressive proposed! Let them do it by themselves. We don't need to holler for them.

What we want in Oregon now is light to spread among the people. We have the men who can spread it. We have printing presses. We have examples of land monopoly, robbery and fraud. The Single Taxer who is determined to wait until a full, straight, out-and-out Henry George Single Tax measure is put before the people of Oregon that is approved unanimously by every Single Taxer in the United States—well, he is dead in the shell. The people of Oregon may accept this measure, and if it looks good to them after trial we know, and the opposition is tearfully admitting, that they will go further. If they want to they can go back. Every endeavor is now being made to push them

back before they can enter the gate of the Promised Land. Should they get a glimpse of its beauties, should they secure a whiff of the feast the Almighty has spread for the children of men, they will crowd through until every nation of the earth shall have passed over.

Which way are you pushing, you who boast that you once touched the hem of the garment of Henry George?—ALFRED D. CRIDGE, Portland, Oregon.

MISSOURI.

Attempts to in some degree correct existing absurdity and injustice in the laws of taxation are quite a different matter from a clean cut discussion of the theories of public revenue. Theories deal with a complete application of a given method, while practical proposals deal more largely with the opinions and interest of individuals or groups.

In the latter case, the manner of presentation usually is determined on the disposition of votes, rather than by the essential validity of the argument. Because of this, we find in Missouri that opposition to the proposed constitutional amendments in relation to taxation is directed chiefly to exciting the wholly unreasoning prejudice of the farmer. To this end, there is no limit to utterly absurd assertions to the effect that farmers will be completely ruined if the proposed plan is adopted, and that owners of farms will advance rents to defenseless tenants, who will be compelled to put up the price of their produce—to the entire ruin of both!

To induce a reasonably careful consideration of any phase of taxation among the noisy speculators is a considerable task. To the claim that the less land value is taxed the easier it is to hold land vacant, the reply comes back—"You want to rob the poor farmer." If it is asserted that taxes on business operations are burdens that retard development and place producers here at a disadvantage with those of the other States, response is made that we wish to let off the money lender. In the absence of any other reply, we are informed that Joe Fels makes soap.

The Missouri proposed amendments are asserted to be the full doctrine of Henry George, also they are asserted to be socialism—likewise robbery, destruction of prosperity, and evidence of various sorts of dementia.

Meanwhile the petition for their submission has been filed with the Secretary of State, and during the solicitation of signatures for the same, many men who at first flatly refused to have anything to do with so nefarious a proceeding, finally signed their own names, and became active in securing other signatures.

In one city every business man solicited spoke favorably of the measure, but not one would sign our petition because of fear of giving offense to the well-to-do farmers of the surrounding country. The fact is that owners of good farm land and public utility corporations are not paying their proper share of the public revenue. An honest equalization under present laws would really hit all of these harder than would the amendment. Owners of inferior farm land and city property are paying more than their share of taxes. Of course this statement applies to the majority of those included in the groups named.

Owners of good farm land very largely evade personalty taxes. It is common talk among tax students that the farmer's personalty is exposed and easily assessable, while city personalty is hid, but when the assessors election depends on the farmer's vote, the case may be altered. It happens, then, that where a farmer owning good land pays on personalty in proportion to his farm taxes, he will benefit in direct cash by our amendment, and where his personalty taxes are largely evaded, his taxes will be increased.

In one township of three hundred and two taxpayers, thirteen will find their tax bills raised over \$20.00 each, the highest being some \$43.000. Each of these own from Two Hundred to Five Hundred and Sixty acres of good farm land. The whole thirteen pay less than \$56.00 in personalty taxes. The fetish of sympathy for the farmers does not apply to all cases. Farm land in Missouri has doubled in value in the last ten years.

Turning to instances of city experiences

in our work, we find that the largest blank book manufacturer in the State is opposed to the adoption of our amendment. The reasons given by the gentleman himself are characterized by a frankness more or less unusual.

He said that his concern makes from two-thirds to three quarters of all the blank books used by the public offices throughout the State, and that the adoption of the proposed amendment would very largely curtail the demand, on account of the consequent greater simplicity of method of assessment and levy.

His attention was called to the fact that he would enjoy a considerable reduction in tax payment, when he replied that it was unnecessary to argue the matter with him, because on hearing the subject presented at the City Club in St. Louis, he at once recognized the correctness of the principle involved, and the general benefits arising from its application.

Meanwhile the loss to his business indicated above far outweighed all other considerations, and therefore for purely selfish reasons he stood in opposition to our work.

Isn't that an exhibition of a public spirit that is worth while? If every other voter in the State of Missouri did but as fully realize his personal interest and act from the same purely selfish reasons, we would easily carry the good people of Missouri bodily into the promised land, by an overwhelming majority.

It really should not be difficult for other voters to appreciate the fact that they are paying in taxes the profits on blank books—making what this gentleman is so very anxious to retain. The recipient of these profits freely acknowledges that not only the profit, but the entire extra cost, is pure waste.

The title to our amendment prepared by the Attorney General for the Secretary of State to go on the official ballot, is as follows:

"Providing for raising all revenue by taxes on land, inheritance and franchises for public utilities; exempting from taxation all personal property and improvements on land; abolishing all poll taxes and occupation taxes for revenue purposes;

abolishing the constitutional limitations upon the rates of taxation for State, county, school and municipal purposes and providing that the laws regulating the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquors shall remain unaffected hereby."

The editor of a county democratic paper refused in writing a communication from one of our committee, but accepted the same as an advertisement. Subsequently the author published both the communication and the editors written refusal in *St. Louis Labor*. We are having many instances of "perfectly free discussion."—S. L. Moser.

HOUSTON, TEXAS.

GOOD WORK OF THE CITY TAX COMMISSIONER

I have kept you pretty well posted as to my difficulties as Tax Commissioner of Houston. The work is now nearly completed and so far along that there can be no further changes.

The net result after being harassed by the demands of a committee from the large tax payers that we reduce land values, and after my interviews with prominent business men and after the Mayor had received a special deputation of several owners of large buildings, who demanded that my assessment of 25% should stick, we closed our books with the following:

Land assessed at 70% on the dollar; improvements on land assessed at 25% on the dollar; merchandise, stocks of goods, at fifty cents on the dollar; automobiles assessed at any old price the owner sees fit to put them in; banks assessed at same rate as real estate upon the capital stock, surplus and undivided profits.

EXEMPTIONS.

All other forms of personal property, not enumerated above, in the hands of individuals, such as cash, stocks, bonds, household furniture and effects of every nature, and all other movable property.

When I came into office there was a law charging for the privilege to erect a building; I had this law repealed.

The city did not tax the franchises of

public service corporations. This year I have gotten their signatures to assessments amounting to nearly \$2,000,000.00. There is no tax, (a new State law), on useful occupations. Formerly every business man had to pay an annual tax before he could engage in business. This is abolished, except as to undesirable businesses, such as saloons, etc.

Assessment on all property raised from \$63,746,603.00 in 1910 to \$96,313,540.00 in 1912, and yet over 3,000 people pay less taxes this year, which shows how unequal the assessments were before I was elected to office. Our rate of taxation for 1911 was \$1.70 on the hundred dollars of valuation, and for 1912 it is \$1.50 on the hundred dollars of valuation.—J. J. PASTORIZA.

RHODE ISLAND.

By unanimous vote of the legislature an amendment to the State constitution providing for a constitutional convention in 1915, has been proposed and doubtless will be adopted by the people in 1914.

Meanwhile a commission to draft a new constitution, or to secure the old one, has been appointed by the governor, and is to report to the convention in 1915. That commission has held one public hearing.

At that hearing I presented five sections, which were intended to be No. 1 in five different articles of the new constitution.

The provision for revenue was third in the list and worded as follows:

OF STATE REVENUES.

PAR. 3. No tax shall ever be levied in this State. The revenue of the State, and all its sub-divisions, shall be derived solely from a just assessment of land values.

No doubt the commission, which is a good one although, of course, not ultra-progressive, considered my recommendations rather radical.

Nevertheless, that section or its equivalent should be in every constitution in the United States.—LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN.

THE taxation of land values will enable men to employ themselves on the land who want to do so.

ORIGIN AND HISTORY OF THE
WOMEN'S NATIONAL SINGLE
TAX LEAGUE.

Although its work has never been confined to promotion of the more especial object of its organization, but has always embraced as far as practicable whatever activities seemed to make for civic righteousness, The Women's National Single Tax League had its origin in the desire to interest the women of the land, particularly those of Club affiliations, in the philosophy of Henry George.

While attending a convention of the Federation of Women's Clubs at Denver in 1898, a Single Tax woman of Washington, D. C., listened to delegates discussing almost every subject of importance, except the very one which she naturally regarded as the most important of all, the Single Tax. On her return to Washington, she called attention of the Single Tax women of that city, who were then members of a club composed of both men and women, to the lack of Single Tax interest and influence among the federated women's clubs, as evidenced by what she had observed at Denver. It was thereupon decided to organize The Women's Single Tax Club of Washington, with a view to its affiliation with the local federation of women's clubs. The Club was accordingly organized, in October, 1898, and in due season made application for admission to the Federation of Women's Clubs of the District of Columbia, but was rejected on the ground that it was a political club.

Thereafter, at a meeting of the Club held in August, 1899, a committee was appointed to draft and send out a circular letter inviting Single Tax women of the United States and Canada to a conference in Washington, to consider the advisability of forming a national organization of Single Tax women. The conference was held February 8th, 1900, and was attended by representatives from Connecticut, New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Ohio, and the District of Columbia. After a session of two days, at which Miss Bessie A. Dwyer presided and Miss Gertrude Colles acted as secretary, The Women's National Single Tax League was organized,

with Mrs. John S. Crosby, president, Miss Bessie A. Dwyer, vice president; Miss Coline B. Currie, recording secretary; Miss Helena Mitchell, corresponding secretary; and Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe, treasurer. Mrs. Crosby continued to be president until 1906, when she was succeeded by Mrs. Minnie R. Ryan, of Brooklyn, who was succeeded in 1909 by Miss Charlotte O. Schetter, of Orange, New Jersey. Mrs. Crosby was again chosen in 1911, and also in 1912, when the name of the organization was changed to The Women's National Single Tax Committee.

The league had no meeting in 1901, but since then has held a convention for three days in each year, as follows: 1902, New York City; 1903, New Haven; 1904, St. Louis; 1905, Philadelphia; 1906 and 1907, Brooklyn; 1908, Orange, New Jersey; 1909, Arden, Delaware; 1910, New York City; 1911 and 1912, Washington, D. C.

In addition to the work at these conventions, which have been well attended not only by delegates but by the general public, and which have been addressed by many men and women of note, the League has distributed Single Tax literature, furnished lecturers to associations desiring to hear them, given such encouragement as it could in support of Single Tax periodicals, promoted the formation of women's Single Tax clubs, and helped to secure for them and the cause they represent that recognition which they are now generally accorded by the various Federations of Women's Clubs throughout the country.

OFFICIAL BOARD OF THE WOMEN'S
NATIONAL SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

(See frontispiece.)

MRS. JOHN S. CROSBY.

Bertie Mellen (Mrs. John Sherwin) Crosby, president of the League, was one of the organizers and for several years president of the Woman's Henry George League of New York city, and has been for seven terms president of the Woman's

Democratic Club of the City of New York, of which she was the founder. She was the first president, after its incorporation, of the Woman's Peace Circle, is first vice-president of the Harmony Club, and a member of the New Yorkers, Minerva, the Women's Press Club and the Equal Suffrage League. She was one of the organizers and first vice-presidents of the New York City Federation of Women's Clubs, and is now one of its vice-presidents; is a director of the Woman's Auxiliary to the Rescue Work of the Salvation Army, and chairman of its executive board, chairman of the Women's Jefferson Monument Fund Committee, and president of the recently formed Woman's National Democratic League.

Mrs. Crosby was the first president of the Women's National Single Tax League, holding the office for six consecutive terms, during which time she visited different cities in the interest of the League and assisted in organizing women's Single Tax clubs in Philadelphia, Cincinnati and St. Louis. After an interval of four years she was, in 1911, again made president, and was reelected in 1912. She has the faculty of doing a great deal of efficient club work without neglecting her domestic duties.

MRS. JENNIE L. MUNROE.

This lady, who is vice-chairman of the Women's National League, was born at Winchester, Va., in 1848. She was married at Lake City, Florida, shortly after the Civil war, and on the death of her husband she made her home in Washington, D. C., where she has been employed in the Interior Department for thirty years. She is the mother of two sons and grandmother of two boys and one girl.

At the age of fifty when the picture was taken which appears on another page, she had just graduated from the Washington College of Law.

It was about 1888 that her attention was called to the Single Tax and the writings of Henry George by that well known Single Taxer, Paul F. Bowen, and from that time to the present she has been an indefatigable worker for the cause and is

known wherever the movement has disciples.

JENNIE A. ROGERS.

Miss Jennie A. Rogers, the Treasurer of the League, was born at Delhi, Indiana. Her parents came from England.

Miss Rogers is a decendent of Richard Burbadge, the playwright and friend of Shakespeare, and a grand-daughter of Jonathan Rogers who during the Corn Law agitation had to flee to Warwick to escape arrest for writing songs that offended the privileged interests of his day. Thus it will be seen that there runs the rebel blood in the present generation of the Rogers family which impels them to stand in opposition to oppression and social injustice in their own day.

In 1886 the Rogers family came to Brooklyn, and it was not long before they all became interested in the doctrines of Henry George, including Mr. and Mrs. Rogers, Walter B. Rogers, Musical Director of the Victor Company, Mrs. Minnie Rogers Ryan, twice president of the Women's National Single Tax League, and Miss Jennie herself. The sudden death of Henry George was such a shock to Mr. Rogers, who was in poor health, that he followed his leader a few days later.

Soon after Miss Rogers became a Single Taxer she took up the teaching of the Kindergarten system because she believed public education largely to blame for the indifference to social injustice. As a noted priest has said: "Give me a child until it is seven years old and I have no fear for its future." Later she gave up the Kindergarten for the Playground which offered a much larger field for teaching children their rights as individuals and their relation to the community. Children come into the Playground on equal terms and under few restrictions, and the use of public and private opportunities brings into discussion the fundamental principles which govern the larger social order. Miss Rogers neglects no opportunity in preparing the youthful minds of which she is teacher, to act intelligently when the great truth of the Single Tax is presented.

DR. MARY D. HUSSEY.

Dr. Hussey, secretary of the League, was born in New York City, but has spent most of her life in East Orange, N. J. where she now lives with her father.

Devoted to out-door sports and gardening as a child she still gives much time to the latter. For a number of years she conducted a chapter of the Agassiz Association for nature study.

Began her work for woman suffrage in 1869, when she circulated a petition for Lucy Stone.

Organized the State Association in 1890 and has worked longer for the cause in New Jersey than any one else.

Attended club meetings from the time the Woman's Club of Orange was started in 1872, and has helped to organize many other clubs.

Studied medicine at the college of the New York Infirmary, which her mother helped Dr. Elizabeth Blackwell to start, and graduated from it in 1877; but has not practiced.

Aided her mother in the work of the American Purity Alliance from the time it was organized in 1876.

Graduated from the law school of N. Y. University in 1898. The Women Lawyers' Club of New York grew from a meeting called at her home the next year.

In 1900 she organized the New Jersey Legal Aid Society for which she has since done much work.

"Progress and Poverty" obtained from a library in 1894 converted her to the Single Tax before she knew any one who believed in it. But she soon joined Miss Sarah M. Gay, of Staten Island and Miss Alice and Miss Julia A. Kellogg, of Orange, in the Single Tax Propaganda Association, and later attended a class, led by Prof. L. E. Wilmarth, to study Henry George's book.

She was one of the founders of the Women's National Single Tax League and one of its officers until it became the Women's National Single Tax Committee of which she is secretary.

She is president of the Woman's Single Tax Club of Orange and a member of the

advisory committee of the Fels Fund Commission.

CONVENTION OF THE WOMEN'S
NATIONAL SINGLE TAX
LEAGUE.

The eleventh annual convention of the Women's National Single Tax League opened in Washington, D. C., on Monday, May 27, at the New Ebbitt, where all of the sessions were held with the exception of the Library meeting Monday evening. The Monday morning session was mainly devoted to routine business and reports from clubs, the only address being that of H. Martin Williams, reading clerk of the House of Representatives, who pointed out the dangers arising from land monopoly in this country where a few railroads, fifty-five alien corporations and individuals, and ninety-eight American corporations and individuals own one-sixth of the area of the country.

At the afternoon session Mr. Jackson H. Ralston, speaking of "The Immediate Future," noted the progress being made in Oregon and Missouri, and declared that all that was needed in the dozen States having the initiative and referendum was an earnest group of Single Taxers ready to force the issue. Miss Ada Rhodes, describing "The Result of the English Miners' Strike," declared that even the most conservative English papers now advocate national ownership of the mines as the only permanent remedy. Mr. Herbert J. Browne gave an account of "An Unspoiled People," as he considered the inhabitants of an island near Cuba to be, with no labor problem, no greed nor graft, no land monopoly and only brotherly kindness.

At the evening meeting at the Public Library, Miss Grace Isabel Colbron of New York City, spoke on "Child Welfare and Economic Justice," showing how child labor laws alone will not solve the problem; that it is not caused by parental greed nor entirely by the greed of the mill owner, who is himself the victim of land monopoly. Miss M. Elma Dame, a settlement worker in New York City, spoke on the futility of

settlement work, charity work, and welfare work in the face of economic injustice which breeds misery faster than it can be cured. Hon. Henry George, Jr. of New York gave an address on "Taxation in the District" showing the inequalities of the present system which lays the heaviest burdens upon the poor while allowing the wealthy to escape, and under which every expenditure made by the Federal Government to the city only serves to render it the harder for her citizens to live.

The sessions were resumed at the Ebbitt House on Tuesday morning, and were opened by a talk by Mr. Charles R. Adair on "The Makers and the Takers" in which he pointed out how every improvement in transportation or methods of production benefited in the end, not the inventor nor the laborer, but the landowner. Mrs. Mariette L. Johnson of Alabama, speaking on "Education and Economics," described the methods employed in the Organic School and the Single Tax colony at Fairhope, where the teachers study children rather than lessons, and the students are given books in the earlier years of their training; the aim of the school being to develop the child mentally, physically, and spiritually, into a well-rounded character. Such a school has been carried on for five years at Fairhope with a marked degree of success, and a similar experiment is to be made in Arden this summer.

Rev. Chas. Everest Granger, of Gunton Presbyterian Church, spoke on "The Church and Social Service," declaring that while the pulpit should not be used either for sensationalism or for airing one's own personal political views, still the church had no right to remain silent on the great moral issues of the day, and that those who opposed the preaching of the social message did so either from fear that their own business interests would be injured, or through failure to understand that it was merely the old gospel rightly interpreted.

There was no afternoon session, but at 6:30 the annual banquet was held at the New Ebbitt. The president, Mrs. John S. Crosby, presided, and five-minute toasts were offered as follows: Dr. Mary D. Hussey, "Immediate Effects of the Single

Tax"; Mr. Frederick L. Siddons, "The Female of the Species"; Miss Amy Mali Hicks, "What is Speculative Value?"; Mr. Herbert J. Browne, "The Wise Farmer and the Fool Mule"; Miss Jennie A. Rogers, "The Innate Love of Freedom"; Hon. David J. Lewis, of Maryland, "The Transfer of the Small Shipment, 'Parcels Post'"; Miss Charlotte O. Schetter by request gave a brief extemporaneous talk, congratulating and encouraging the members of the League on their good work; Hon. Henry George, Jr., "The Way Out," and Miss Grace Isabel Colbron concluded the programme by reciting an original Single Tax poem, "Our Message."

The closing session of the convention was held on Wednesday morning, the most important business before the meeting being the change in the form of organization from a league into a national committee with chairman, vice-chairman, secretary and treasurer, and women representatives from mixed clubs as well as from women's clubs. It is hoped that the new, compact organization may be a better working force and reach a larger number of societies. After considerable discussion as to the advantages of the new form of organization, a constitution was adopted and officers were elected as follows: chairman, Mrs. J. S. Crosby of New York; vice-chairman, Mrs. Jennie L. Munroe of Washington, D. C.; secretary, Dr. Mary D. Hussey of East Orange, N. J.; treasurer, Miss Jennie A. Rogers of Brooklyn.

On Wednesday afternoon a reception was tendered the delegates by Mrs. Henry George, Jr., at her home, 1931 Baltimore street, and on Thursday, a Decoration Day picnic was held at the Riverdale home of H. Martin Williams and his niece, Mrs. Agnes Lane; a basket dinner was eaten in the grove at five o'clock, after which the invited guests, who included the Washington club, the League delegates, and the Riverdale neighbors, assembled on the broad piazza and listened to speeches by Miss Grace Colbron, Mr. Wm. D. Mackenzie, Mr. Herbert J. Browne, Mr. C. B. Hemingway, Mrs. Mariette L. Johnson, and Mr. Williams. Refreshments of ice-cream and cake closed the program for the evening, and the merry party enjoyed a

moonlight trolley ride back to the city.

On the Sunday morning preceding the convention, Miss Charlotte O. Schetter of Orange, N. J., addressed the People's Church on "The Truth Shall Make Us Free," and in the evening, Miss Grace Colbron addressed the Socialist Local on "The New Morality."

Further particulars concerning the new form of organization may be obtained from the national secretary, Dr. Mary D. Hussey, 142 North Arlington Avenue, Orange, N. J.—GERTRUDE E. MACKENZIE.

FROM DR. KUEHNER.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I was much pleased to receive your beautiful German Number. It is a precious token of the universal power of a great and leading idea all over the world, binding together nations and removing what impedes the way of mutual understanding.

I beg to say a word about the editorial remarks that you appended to my article. I did not mean to say that "Every right becomes such by use." I meant that every right is only such when put into practice, while as long as it is dormant it is powerless. A man who puts his landed property to the highest possible use even though he does not pay any land tax at all, is a producer and working socially by adding to the wealth of the community. If every landlord used his land to the fullest possible use a great many of our hopes would be realized.

I agree with the last of your remarks regarding building restrictions, such as those upon jerry buildings and slum quarters by the police (Baupolizei). With the Single Tax bringing a heaven upon earth and a new race of humanity, there will be no necessity for even the smallest police restrictions. But they can hardly be dispensed with under present conditions.

Dr. F. KUEHNER.

President Thuringia Branch of the Bund der Bodenreform.

"Land is the mother, and labor is the father, of all wealth."—SIR WM. PETTY.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.

MR. EDMUND NORTON is making an extended lecture trip through California. He reports a very greatly increased interest among the people of the State in the subject of taxation.

MR. JOSEPH FELS, irrespective of what else he has done and is doing, has announced that he is prepared to put up another \$25,000 for the Missouri campaign, matching contributions to that special fund dollar for dollar, provided only that \$15,000 is raised from other sources.

HERBERT S. BIGELOW has started a Tent School for voters in Cincinnati with the object of educating the citizens in the provisions of the new constitution.

THE Progressive Republicans of Washington have nominated W. H. Kaufman for State Land Commissioner. Mr Kaufman had the honor of bringing to a successful culmination his agitation for Direct Legislation in South Dakota in the Spring of 1892. This was the first State to adopt this system, and Mr. Kaufman may therefore be said to be the Father of Direct Legislation in America. He is, of course, a Single Taxer.

THE Fayette (Ohio) *Review* in its issue of June 27 has an admirable statement of Single Tax.

JAMES FORMAN, Assessment Commissioner of Toronto, says in the columns of *The Toronto Star*, "I believe that sooner or latter Toronto's assessment system will have to be revised so as to place a higher assessment on land values."

W. E. WHITE, Single Taxer, is candidate for Democratic nomination for County Assessor for Jackson County, Mo.

THE Daily *Herald* of Adelaide, So. Australia, opens its columns to Single

Taxers, and the efficient writers of the League avail themselves of the opportunity.

THE dominion of Canada is one of the most interesting battle grounds for the Single Tax, and the *Square Deal*, published at 50 cents a year at 75 Yonge Street, Toronto, gives full accounts of what is being done. The paper is ably edited and readers of the REVIEW should send in their subscriptions.

R. T. SNEDICKER, of Kansas City, Mo., addresses an open letter to Theodore Roosevelt through the columns of the *Gazette Globe*, taking as a text the ex-president's statement in his Osawatomie speech that "equal opportunities, equal chances to get a living are the burning issues of the hour." Mr. Snedicker asks Mr. Roosevelt how the establishment of the "equal opportunities" is to be brought about.

THE Women's Single Tax Club, of Washington, D. C., have arranged for public meetings each month next winter at the Public Library. They have also voted to join the Federation of Women's Clubs, and the suffrage league which Prof. Thos. E. Will is organizing to fight for District suffrage and representation in Congress.

WITH the signature of 30,000 Missouri voters attached, the Initiative petition for the Single Tax amendment to the Missouri Constitution was filed with Secretary of State of Missouri on the 1st. This places the amendment in position to be voted on at the State election in November next.

How much the growth of Single Tax sentiment in Seattle is due to Frank S. Southard who passed away a few months ago, and of whose death no adequate notice has appeared in these columns, many of the workers in that city will cheerfully testify. Mr. Southard became interested in the Single Tax in the early eighties when he was entering college. In 1890 he came to Seattle and in associa-

tion with a few others organized the Single Tax and Propaganda League. How the movement has grown since then!

NEWS NOTES.—FOREIGN.

THE Annual Report of the Single Tax League of South Australia, of which E. J. Craigie is secretary, presents an inspiring account of the work for the past year. It tells of the visit of Edward Mc Hugh and the arrangements made to have him lecture in the towns and cities of South Australia. He will deliver the commemoration address at the Henry George Social on August 29. To Mr. Joseph Fels it pays a well deserved tribute for his generous financial help.

Progress, organ of the Single Taxers of Victoria, which is published at Melbourne continues to give interesting accounts of the work in that State.

RECENT elections in England have included three notable victories for our movement in the triumphs of E. G. Hemmerde, Sydney Arnold, and R. L. Outhwaite, who will represent the land value cause in Parliament. Messrs Hemmerde and Outhwaite are known to Single Taxers the world over.

THE TRUTH SHALL MAKE US FREE.

PART OF AN ADDRESS BY MISS CHARLOTTE O. SCHETTER AT THE WOMEN'S SINGLE TAX CONVENTION, WASHINGTON, D. C.

The ancient moralists agree with Christian teaching in regard to the adaptation of Truth to Life. Epictetus said: "The great law of life is to act conformably to nature," and he taught that "Wisdom consisteth in the right use of appearances." While he believed in one God, he said, that to prove the existence of a divine Creator it would be necessary to know what happened to every one and everything everywhere. (A rather large order on Truth!)

When Christ said: "The Truth shall make you free," did he not mean that when we have trust and understanding we would have the order of the universe and would act from love, i. e., freely, not from fear, not contrary to law, but fulfilling the law?

The word law has an obnoxious sound to many ears accustomed to associate it with the decrees of men, which may be faulty and directly opposite to natural law. When we perceive natural laws to be modes of action, not dead, but living realities, when we are thrilled by recognizing the wonder and beauty of some physical law, we understand Kepler's joyful exclamation on making his marvelous discoveries, "O, God, I do think Thy thoughts after Thee." A mere knowledge of un-co-ordinated facts is of little use until some genius discovers an orderly mode underlying the facts from which he deduces a law. When this law is backed up by sufficient evidence it is called scientific, for science is the apprehension in men's minds of the modes of action in nature. Until the law is known we cannot utilize the facts.

The last century records the most remarkable scientific advances ever known. These were not mere improvements on what had gone before, but wholly new departures. The use of steam and electricity revolutionized locomotion and methods of illumination, while the electric telegraph and telephone transformed human habits of life. As Mr. A. R. Wallace points out in "The Wonderful Century," there had been no change in the principle for thousands of years in methods of heating, lighting, locomotion and communication. The Romans travelled over their fine roads in Britain faster than it was possible for the modern Englishman to do up to within a hundred years ago. The Roman lamps, though more beautiful in design, differed not in principle from the lights used by the rude savages of earlier ages. From the dawn of history, when boats with oars and with sails were used up to the time when the glorious clipper ships were superseded by steam vessels, no new principle was introduced in navigation. The invention of productive and labor saving machinery has kept

pace in this wonderful century's progress.

In social science alone man seems to have lagged far behind his other achievements, as was brought tragically to our consciousness in the recent "Titanic" disaster. Natural Science as so far developed could have averted the danger, had not social ignorance and greed and mismanagement sped the mighty ship upon its doom.

The profound changes in human thought and human life effected during the last century have not been consummated by the adoption of scientific social laws.

Steady progress has been made since the Reformation in the matter of enfranchisement and in liberty of thought and speech, all tending to the recognition of equal human rights; yet this principle has not been extended to the domain of economic rights. Surely, in the matter of property there must be a natural law as simple as is the formula of Newton's great discovery of the law of gravitation.

Though new powers have been added to man by each step forward in knowledge and social organization, underlying the minute sub-division of labor and the intricate mechanism of production and exchange, the same basic laws which governed the production and distribution of wealth operates today as in the time of Moses.

To trace these laws to their source, refuting in so doing the superstitious creeds of the schools, to evolve a method of human action in harmony with these laws in our highly complex state of society required the mind and heart of a great genius. Such a man, with the greatest mind America produced in the last century, if not in history, was Henry George. He evolved order out of mental chaos and gave a solution for our economic ills which is bound to be recognized as scientific in the fullest sense of the word.

THE person who is a freetrader, if every other country adopts freetrade, is like the man, who, because his neighbors have measles, thinks, to keep well he has to catch them.—W. W. L. in the *Standard*, Sydney, N. S. Wales.