

Special British and Australian Numbers in Preparation

15
PRINCETON, N. J.

The
SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

**This number contains the first
instalment of a Special Article on the
German Land Reform Movement, by
Dr. W. Schrameier; The German Land
Reform League and Party Politics, by
H. Freese; Single Tax Catechism, by
M. W. Norwalk; News Domestic and
Foreign.**

M A Y - J U N E , 1 9 1 2

VOLUME 12 x x x NUMBER 3

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

LAND REFORM IN GERMANY.....	<i>Dr. W. Schrameier</i>	1
THE GERMAN LAND REFORM LEAGUE AND PARTY POLITICS.,	<i>H. Freese</i>	12
THE ABOLITION OF POVERTY.....	<i>Gustave Buscher</i>	14
SINGLE TAX CATECHISM.....	<i>M. W. Norwalk</i>	17
AN AGE-OLD PROBLEM ADDRESS.....	<i>Frank G. Odell</i>	22
LAND HISTORY OF THE AMERICAN COLONIES, Continued—	<i>Thos. L. Brunk,</i>	
<i>M. D.</i>		25
PUBLISHER'S NOTES.....		37
DEATH OF EDWARD HOMER BAILEY.....		37
JEFFERSON DINNER OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.....		40
TWO LIBERATORS.....	<i>James F. Morton, Jr.</i>	41
NEWS DOMESTIC—	<i>Hon. L. F. C. Garvin, Henry Ware Allen, Chas. J. Ogle, A. D.</i>	
<i>Cridge, B. McGuinnis.</i>		41
COMMUNICATIONS.....		47
H. D. WAGNON.....		51
NEWS FOREIGN.....	<i>E. I. S. Harding, Dr. F. Kuhner</i>	52
THE OLD GUARD DINNER OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB....		53
BOOK NOTICES.....		56
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.....		58
EXTRACTS FROM OUR CONTEMPORARIES SHOWING THE REMARKABLE GROWTH OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT.....		60





THE LATE HOMER BAILEY
(See page 37)

THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW

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

LAND REFORM IN GERMANY.

(For the Review)

By DR. W. SCHRAMEIER.

I.

COMMENCEMENT OF THE MOVEMENT.

The German Land Reform Movement was started in 1898. It came into existence at the moment when the League adopted the programme published on the 20th of March of that year, and when the man who formulated this programme took charge of the leadership of the league. That man was A. Damaschke. In his person the movement became embodied. The importance of the movement to the public life of Germany is, in the first instance, due to his energy and enthusiasm.

This is not to say that prior to this time the ideas of land reform were unknown in Germany. The doctrines of the French physiocrats and of the great English political economists, Adam Smith, James Mill and John Stuart Mill had often found attention, and the conclusions therefrom for the taxing of land had been deduced by various eminent writers. In 1852 Karl Arnd of Frankfort-on-Main published his "Die Naturgemasse Steuer," in which principles concerning land taxation are formulated. "If it is not sacred rights," he urges, "but grounds of expediency, on which the state of possessing land is based, this must be subject to modification whenever demanded on grounds of expediency. It is everywhere the general purpose of the state to which that possession must accommodate itself." He aims at a natural taxation, i. e., a land taxation intended to take the place of indirect taxation. The genial Friedrich List, in his "Wirthschaftliche Reform des Konigreichs Ungarn," (Economic Reform of the Kingdom of Hungary) as early as 1845 pointed to the unearned increment on lands and declared, "If by constructing waterways, roads, and railways, the State often causes a twentyfold enhancement of land values, the State should, at future sales, take a tax of at least half the increment." A number of names may be quoted, Gossen, Samter and others, and in recent times particularly Professor Adolf Wagner, have all labored in the same direction. In glancing over the long list, not only in Germany, but in other coun-

tries as well, we may state that the problems of land taxation contain no postulates peculiar to any special times, or interesting one people more than another. The problems of the equal right to land runs through the history of almost every country; it has been the starting point for more than one revolutionary movement in the life of nations. Very small practical value, indeed, can result in research to discover who first established certain principles of land reform and demonstrated their necessity to the social order. It is not that one thinker or practician seems to have adopted it from the other: Wherever there is a conformity of postulates, it often rests on the fact that great economic or social truths have, under certain conditions, been at all times discovered and proclaimed.

HENRY GEORGE'S INFLUENCE ON THE PIONEERS OF THE MOVEMENT.

But the mere discovering and proclaiming of a truth does not make it productive. It must be reduced to life or be made the object of an effective propaganda for attaining this end. The truth of the French physiocrats, whose aims, of course, differ from those of modern land reformers, and the ingenious theories also of a Mill, of a List and others would have been buried and supplanted by others, if they had not become real postulates of the day brought home to the masses. Without any contradiction Henry George is, for this reason, called the father of land reform, regardless of the fact that this doctrine existed before him. It was the manner in which he brought home his ideas to the conscience of the people, his ardent eloquence, his buoyant and enthusiastic style, which secured for himself this unique position. And it is in close connection with Henry George doctrines that the land reform movement has spread in Germany, supported by leaders who are entirely devoted to the realization of these ideas, fostered by the enthusiasm which enraptured the masses and carried them forth to the spheres of the knowledge of right and truth.

In saying that the German movement is identified with the name of Damaschke, it must not be left unnoted that before him there were tendencies in this country to direct the land question into the current of political life. One of the earliest pioneers, A. Theod. Stamm, in the third edition of his book "Die Erlosung der darbenden Menschheit" (The Rescue of Starving Mankind), even claims, that he had sown the seed in Germany which had thereupon in America grown and developed its finest blossoms in Henry George, and says, "The Society for Promoting Humanism (Verein fur humanismus) started at Berlin by myself and kindred spirits in April 1874 stood firm against private ownership in land. The Society spread their programme by distributing thousands of pamphlets and numerous newspapers in America and abroad, and similar societies for land reform were formed in the United States. In the States the agitation was not confined to German circles, and as consequence of the initiated movement, the excellent book by Henry George, 'Progress and Poverty,' appeared. The principal results of the publication, 'Rescue of Starving Mankind,' and of the arguments as promulgated by the Society and

printed as early as 1870-71 are repeated here in the technical terms of the old school of political economy."

Henry George himself expressed his opinion on this statement and declared in the monthly *Deutsch Land*, Vol. 1, Page 69, "At the time when I was writing *Progress and Poverty* I had neither heard of Dr. Stamm nor of his book, nor of the Society for Promoting Humanism, nor of any other publication or efforts made in Germany, but I am perfectly willing to leave to Dr. Stamm the honor of having been in the field before me. When I spoke at Oxford, England, Mr. Marshall, professor of political economy at the University, declared that there was nothing in *Progress and Poverty* which was both new and true. I replied that I was perfectly willing to accept his characterization of my book, *for what ever is true, cannot be new*. And the fact that so many men arrived there independently, is certain proof to me that the conclusions I have drawn must, in their essentials, be true."

ERRORS AND MISTAKES.

There are several accounts concerning the first efforts of the German land reformers, two of which contain rather exhaustive material for the formation of an opinion, viz: Dr. Hans Wehberg on "A. Theod. Stamm und die Anfänge der deutschen Bodenbewegung" (A. Theod. Stamm and the beginnings of ~~German Land Reform~~) (1911), and A. Damaschke "Zur Geschichte der deutsch-~~German Land Reform~~" (1911), and A. Damaschke "Zur Geschichte der deutschen Bodenreformbewegung" (Papers relating to the History of the German Land Reform Movement). On reading the former it becomes plain why the movement in which able men like Michael Flürscheim, Theodor Hertzka, Dr. Wehberg, C. F. W. Van der Leeden and Heinrich Freese were concerned and from which emerged "Der Deutsche Bund für Bodenbesitzreform" (German League for Land Property Reform) in 1888, only succeeded to a semblance of life and eventually had to die out, because practical aims were wanting and activity was wasted on utopian schemes. The seat of the league was Baden-Baden, then Düsseldorf, and finally, since autumn 1890, Berlin. From that time until the spring of 1898 H. Freese was president. Hertzka went to Africa, there to realize his dream in Free Land; Flürscheim devoted his energies to the province of Sinoloa in Mexico; Franz Oppenheimer, later on, proposed a colonial corporation in Germany—all experiments failed by reason of the shortcomings of men, means and ideas. Stamm and Flürscheim were at feud with each other over the priority of their theories. It was only natural that with such quarreling the small sect which numbered never more than about 100 members eventually fell to pieces. Notwithstanding many a good intention the intrinsic, vital strength was wanting; over the accentuation of the "Pure Idea" which assumed different forms in the various minds, no practical results were achieved, which in politics can alone lend stability to an idea.

Dr. Wehberg is perfectly right in deploring, at the end of his publication, that the development of the German land reform idea has been checked by too many rivalries, both of a personal and a real nature. "Even at present such

want of concord still exists. Since a new programme has been submitted to the league, many members have become discontented. 'Flürsheim, also the founder of the league,' he continues, 'has declared that the League of German Land Reformers cannot be taken seriously, and the honorary member of the League, Freese, differs from the leaders in regard to the object of the league. But this," Wehberg winds up, "is characteristic of the history of the land reform movement, that during the times when enthusiastic pioneers of the movement tried to bring home to the masses the pure idea, all efforts failed, and that, on giving the League a programme, by which the old leaders were estranged, crowds of adherents joined the league."

THE PURE DOCTRINE.

The pure idea! What a check on progress it is that men, in position to foster it, cannot get over this. Countess Hatzfeld, La Salle's friend, once wrote in defence of that great democrat: "Men with nothing but honest sentiment who always take up the position of looking at future events from an ideal and vague point of view and base thereon their present actions, may otherwise be regarded as very worthy people indeed, but they are absolutely useless and quite unfit for actions which are to have a real influence on the course of events." And again she writes: "La Salle knew one thing more than these people. That is, that by a mere exclaiming of a word the object of one's desires is not obtained. Politics mean actual influence on events, and this influence only can be realized by the weighing and the utilization of the actual elements. Trying to argue these away is childish and of little use; they, nevertheless, make themselves felt with sufficient force."

Wehberg's account has been set right by the witnesses to whom he refers. H. Freese, who, to this day, is a member of the League, says "On looking through the early numbers of *Freiland*, our League's journal in those days, it will be found that the small association at the time developed great activity. It continued to win, in increasing measure, public acknowledgment and approval. Since the present Chairman took charge of the League, the number of adherents has, owing to his great personal activity, constantly grown and with it the influence of the League on legislation. The immediate postulates which the League has advocated since its formation are identical with those contained in the first programme of 1888 and 1890. The difference is that we have given another formulation to the theses established by Flursheim and placed at the beginning of the programme, and measures and methods on the hopelessness of which if generally applied, there was some doubt, have been replaced by others, on the practicability of which we are all agreed."

Flürsheim has also defined his position with regard to Progress and Poverty. With all the esteem he feels for Henry George, with whom he had personal intercourse, he has, in course of time, arrived at opinions differing from those of his master. In his late work, "Not aus Ueberfluss" (Distress from Abundance), a summary of his views of life, he proclaims that the advantage of nationalization of land over the Single Tax system lies not alone

in the field of principle but also in the field of expediency. "Whereas nationalization of land can be realized by means which commend themselves to the sense of justice and fairness of the average citizen, the Single Tax appeals to the instincts of robbery, and can never hope to convert a majority of the nation." He, of course does not agree with the objects of the League of Land Reformers, of which Damaschke accepted the Chairmanship only on condition that everything which looked like the postulate of nationalization of land with the ensuing leasehold system, should be suppressed in the programme. Flürscheim openly confesses in the *Bodenreform* of June 5th, 1911: "I wish to explicitly state my conviction, which I have always held, that without Damaschke our League, at the time would have ceased to exist. By practising the wisdom of moderation, he achieved what we all admire to-day and created an organization which seems destined to accomplish greater things. At the end of my life-work I feel pleasure in admitting this."

THEORY AND PRACTICE.

From among errors of many kinds the German League of Land Reformers has thus grown up. Before finding the path to practical work, the league had to wind its way through much tangled brushwood and waste tracts. How different Damaschke's account of the early movement reads! It does not lament the ideals temporarily laid aside with all the passionate disputes about them, but evolves, with ever increasing clearness, the points on which practical work may be begun. Here there is a spirited overcoming of all obstacles and obstructions. "As usual with the birth of each new movement, much sentimentality accompanied it in its earlier stages. The principal concern was, that the final aim be not marred. The programme proclamation embraced, of course, the social problem in its absolute entirety. Under these circumstances it was the great merit of Heinrich Freese's business acumen to have demonstrated by a concrete example, how the highest ideal can be reduced to practical experience and what blessings may be derived, directly and indirectly from a realization of land reform ideas. Much consideration has been devoted to the question of the condition of workmen in the building trade, as raised by Freese, and with great success. Among the artisans and workmen the land reformers were widely looked upon as disinterested, courageous champions of their rights. The proclaiming of a "pure" principle is a somewhat peculiar matter. In the long run people are not satisfied with a brilliant principle, merely: they want to see the steps leading to it, or at least the possibility of constructing the steps. Besides, the arrangement of lectures is one thing and the sober, often minute, but still unavoidable detail work, which cannot be separated from the building up of any organization, is another."

During the sterile discussion of the preceding years it had become plain to Damaschke that if the ideas of Henry George, the land reform apostle, were to gain a footing in Germany, and if they were to bring about a transformation of social life, it would be absolutely necessary to divest them of their abstract forms and mould them into practical shape. It was not in keeping with his

active nature to reason on the "pure doctrine;" with a firm grip he made the most of the smaller opportunities for activity, such as were prepared by Freese, R. Berg, and Dr. Oertmann. Thanks are due to him that the fantastic Debating Club developed into a League with attainable aims; that a disputing sect of visionaries outvying each other in the profitless discussion of humanitarian problems, was steadfastly turned into a buoyant league of devoted workers.

THE IMPORTANCE OF MODERATION.

Hic Rhodus, hic salta is the password. We are not living in Utopia. We demand what *can* be done at once in order to make useful in Germany the land reform teaching in its various branches. "We do not claim to possess the art of making the world perfect by one stroke," said Pohlman in 1904 in the journal *Bodenreform*; "just as little as we pretend to be able to do away with the inequality of men. But we do consider the removal of a serious anomaly in our economical evolution, i. e., the appropriation of ground rent by private capital, to be the preliminary of all modern reform. We do not believe, as orthodox Marxists do, in the possibility of regulating the whole economic organism like a machine. All we are trying to create are the necessary preliminaries for a sound social evolution, and for the rest leave sufficient elbow room for all individual effort. There is nothing to prevent our land reform friends joining in hygienic, pedagogic, unionist, or co-operative movements, but all are united in the conviction that to all these efforts the highest results will be denied until our land laws have been reformed."

Beyond a clear emphasizing of the object in view, there was required a certain limitation of the problems, the avoidance of all unnecessary burdens, the elimination of political party questions and religious disputes. Let us hear how Damaschke himself argues this point: "The decision," he said in 1906, "will always be hard if economic postulates are established as coercive deductions of land reform principles. I need only refer to the question of Free Trade or Protection, which before the last elections for the Reichstag were dominating issues in the public life of Germany. A number of friends demanded that our League should declare for Free Trade, and, no doubt, there were strong arguments for such a course. In this regard much effect was produced by references to Henry George's "Protection or Free Trade," a book which has contributed perhaps more than all other publications to defeat Chamberlain's campaign against Free Trade in England. Not only the English movement, but the majority of American land reformers as well are on the side of Free Trade, and likewise the entire, fast growing Danish league. Nevertheless, most of the German land reform leaders have adhered to the policy not to make this question a concern of the League. Not without a certain justification, the friends of protection claimed that the German peasantry were not in a position to compete with foreign industry.

Certainly, the German land reformers know that the aim of their teaching involves the abolition of protection. But why, they ask, unfold a question

which is not as yet ripe for final disposition, and which would alienate many friends of the movement, there being so very many problems permitting of the joint action of all? Let us turn, for instance, to Australia which, in land legislation, has attained a more advanced position than any other country. They are doing their best to restore the land to the people, but at the same time they hold fast to protection, going so far as to exclude foreigners, Chinese and Japanese, from touching their shores and from working among them. And I may refer to Henry George himself, who said in 1891: "The truth for which we stand has now made such progress in the minds of men, that it must go on conquering and to conquer. Far off Australia leads the van and has already taken the first step towards the Single Tax." Are we not justified in drawing the conclusion that Henry George himself did welcome their efforts in spite of many short-comings not in strict accordance with his ultimate demands, but dictated perhaps by state reasons?

HENRY GEORGE'S IMPORTANCE TO THE PRESENT GERMAN MOVEMENT.

Henry George's superior genius is the beginning of all modern land reform. With him the land reform movement, which has taken possession of all countries, begins, but it does not end with him. Henry George never dreamed of dogmatizing; he never laid down a system, which could straightway be applied to all conditions and under all circumstances. He restricted himself to his surroundings and therein perhaps lies a certain limitation of his teachings. A number of countries remained unfamiliar to him; he has never been in Germany and had never acquainted himself with German law. When writing his famous book, he had American conditions chiefly in mind; it is to these that nearly all his comparisons, considerations, reform proposals, and postulates refer. To lay them down as applicable to all times and all countries had evidently never been his intention; there can be little doubt that it is more in accordance with the spirit of his teaching that the forms in which his doctrine may be realized be allowed to develop organically and in full freedom. The method proposed by Henry George was "Single Tax," i. e., the taxation of land values apart from those values due to individual exertion. Single Tax seemed to him and his followers to be the most just and, in a social politic sense, the most valuable source of taxation, because it relieves capital and labor from all burden and abrogates the abuses of land, the most important factor in production. To reduce this maxim to practice, several ways are open. The essence of modern land reform rests on the recognition that the doctrine of its founder does not mean an ingenious theory for his adherents, but an *ethical postulate* which is to be reduced to life, and that against traditional resistance, against the fettering usages and neglect of centuries. The means used must be commensurate with circumstances; the application of this ethical postulate in the pastures of New Zealand or in the wheatfields of America may differ from its application in Scotland's hunting grounds, and on the virgin land of a young colony will not be the same as in the overlaid organism of a city like London or Berlin. The form in which Henry George has left the doctrine has nothing

rigid, and it is the German course which has contributed much to deepen and extend his ideas, both scientifically and practically.

LAND REFORM PROGRAMME.

Now, the German land reformers who, in overcoming existing abuses, proceed step by step, try to concentrate their efforts on objects which, at the time being, seem within reach in order to obtain higher aims on the shoulders of accomplished feats. At the same time they remain fully conscious that the smallest step can only be made by keeping the eyes steadily fixed on the ultimate goal. That goal lies in Henry George's principle of an organic reconciliation of social claims with individual freedom, by the means of a just taxation of land values. To Henry George the League of German land reformers owes its existence and its ethical object of life; on the other hand, this League gives the most effective diffusion to Henry George's teachings. There is scarcely any book on land reform which does not refer to his name; he is mentioned at nearly every meeting, and Damaschke, in his standard work on "Bodenreform" and in his History of Political Economy devotes whole chapters to him; Pohlman, Freese, and all other advocates of any consequence speak of him. The works of Henry George are brought into the market by the publishing office of *Bodenreform* and have for years been distributed free of charge. The fact that Henry George's name has become widely known in Germany and that he is in high esteem with the men of science here is, in a large measure, due to the indefatigable pioneer work of the German Land Reformers.

The aims of the German land reform movement are the same as those in other countries, where Henry George is looked upon as father of the movement. In Germany they were framed in April, 1898, by Damaschke as follows, viz:

"The League of German Land Reformers regard the land question as the most important part of the social problem. The object of the League is to ensure that the land, this fundamental factor in national existence, be placed under laws which shall promote its use for industrial and housing purposes, which shall prevent its abuse and which shall secure to the community, as far as possible, the increased value not due to the exertions of the individual owner."

With this programme the systematic activity of the League commenced and gradually spread through all branches of public life. Under this programme the League has been growing from small beginnings to the extensive organization which is now represented in nearly all parts of Germany, and which is an influential factor in public life.

In the very year, almost within the very month's time indeed of the re-organisation of the German League of Land Reformers, an event took place which, though having no connection with the League and quite independent thereof, has always been considered of no mean influence on the progress of our movement. I refer to the inception of the land ordinance of Kiaochow.

In studying the development of the League this event cannot be overlooked; this much is certain, that the League found more than one supporting point in this land ordinance which has been, and still is, of great influence on the direction in which the league is moving. If Henry George thus sums up the essence of his doctrine, "to secure equal rights to land to everyone and, thus, by way of taxation to prevent inflicting hardships on the masses," it was natural that in a young colony like Kiaochow the opportunity to apply this doctrine offered itself with great force to the thinking mind, thus avoiding many difficulties arising at neighbouring ports on the China coast, and the delivery of land from private speculation. Thus from the beginning the maxim was proclaimed, "Neither the Chinese landowner, nor the native cultivators of the soil, is entitled to the increased value of the land which has been exclusively brought about by the German Government, nor can it be tolerated that the first buyers after the occupation shall derive the whole benefit of a subsequent rise in values."

Regarding this system of land tenure in the German colony of Kiaochow I refer to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW for March-April, 1911, where I have given a full account of it. The matter has also been exhaustively dealt with in the "Jahrbuch der Bodenreform" (Annual for Land Reform) for 1911 (page 62), and, in connection therewith, the taxation ordinance for Kiaochow has been treated in the said annual for 1912 (page 168). I therefore confine myself to a short summary.

The guiding principle was first of all to reserve to the Colonial Government the monopoly of purchasing land. For the disposal of the purchased land it had to be considered whether the land required was for charitable purposes or for undertakings like railways, private dockyards, factories, missions, etc. In such cases the land was surrendered partly gratuitously, partly at a nominal charge. For housing the Chinese workmen a modified leasehold system was introduced. In all other cases of land transfers it was sold. In this connection the maxim was established that as far as the increase in value was not due to the exertions of the owner but had been caused by the development of general conditions, i. e., by the surroundings, by the increase of population, by expenses defrayed by government, it should not fall entirely to the individual owner, but that this unearned profit should, as far as possible, be appropriated by the community and the Government. The following provisions were adopted by the Colonial Government with the intention to attain this end: viz

- (1) Public Land Sales by Auction.
- (2) A Land Tax of 6% on the capital value, i. e. after deduction of all improvements.
- (3) The Direct and Indirect Increment Tax of $33\frac{1}{3}\%$ levied at every change of ownership or on owners of land not brought into the market periodically every 25 years. Discrimination is made whether the increment is due to expenditure of capital for improving the land, when no tax is leviable, or when the increment is traceable to causes of a general nature. The general

rule resulting therefrom is that every landowner receives, as rent uncurtailed by taxes, that amount which is in excess of that for the site unimproved. Finally the right of pre-emption for the Colonial Government, and the obligation to build coupled with increased land taxes on a sliding scale in case of non-building form part of the conditions of sale.

INFLUENCE OF THE KIAOCHOW LAND SYSTEM ON THE LAND REFORM MOVEMENT.

The said land ordinance of Kiaochow realized the land reformers' programme in a German Colony suddenly and unexpectedly at the very time when this programme was in course of promulgation by the League. It was quite natural that such legal condition concerning landed property did not long remain without its influence on the land reform movement in Germany. Here they saw a realization of the aims set forth in their programme; the means were simple and practical; above all, the land reformers could point to the fact that Government and Reichstag had vied with each other to give life to these reforms so vastly different from all existing systems of land taxation at home.

The Secretary of State for the Navy, Admiral von Tirpitz, in the beginning of 1899, assured us in a speech on the budget, that the purpose of the land ordinance was, in the first instance, to ensure cheap housing for the colonists and to facilitate settlement; financial intentions were the second consideration. The members of the Reichstag were not sparing in cheers, members of all parties proclaiming their approval of the action of the Government. Eugen Richter said:

"I find that the Colonial Government of Kiaochow deserves praise for the expedient manner in which they try to prevent a few private persons from being benefitted by the increment of their landed property caused by the action of the Government, and that they have devised ingenious measures to get a share of this increment by way of taxation."

In availing themselves of the example of Kiaochow to further their cause the land reformers could point out that what they proposed did actually exist already, and that it had been hailed as a commendable reform by the Reichstag.

The first energetic movement of the new league was directed against the fatal system of large land monopolies in other German Colonies. In a special pamphlet entitled "Kamerun oder Kiautschou" (The Cameroons or Kiaochow) published in the beginning of 1899, Damaschke placed a finger on the main sore of our colonial policy. He said: "The guiding principle may be reduced to the question, is the land in the colonies to be definitely and finally handed over to single groups of speculators, or is it, in any shape or form, to be reserved to the German people?"

"In rising emporiums of commerce like Kiaochow the principle underlying land reform will be carried into effect in a different manner than for instance in the Cameroons or Southwest Africa; that goes without saying; not the form, but the essence is of paramount importance." The initiative of Kiaochow has attained that much, that it has *opened the eyes of the people to the*

unsound conditions connected with the land monopolies in other colonies which have aroused general indignation.

Everything that men like H. von Wissmann and C. von Francois, have done in recognizing the practical necessity of land reform for the African colonies, and what they had failed to do against the opposing interests of the large capitalists, proved eventually to be logical, practicable and self-evident. For the first time in Germany, the colonial land question was, in full detail, treated in the first colonial congress which was held at Berlin in 1902. The referee at that time, von Bornhaupt, in his lecture on the land question in the colonies referred to Kiaochow as follows:

"The idea that the State has a just title to the increased rent of land and the wisdom of appropriating this rent by taxation without confiscation, has here been reduced to reality. So much can be said already that the system has been worked out in a unique manner and that it is felicitously made to suit the peculiar conditions of Kiaochow."

From that time the various colonial associations vied with each other in their manifestations favoring the introduction of the Kiaochow system in all other German colonies.

LAND REFORM AND THE COLONIES.

The League of German Land Reformers did not remain inactive. On the 1st of April 1899 they addressed a petition to the Chancellor praying that the principles underlying the land ordinance of Kiaochow be applied in the other colonies and protectorates. On the 24th of December 1904 they petitioned the Reichstag that a special Commission be appointed to examine the land question in Southwest Africa. An investigation was promised by the Government for the ensuing year.

The energetic agitation was carried far and was the means of acquainting many of the imminent dangers to our colonies. Even some of the Chambers of Commerce made a stand against existing colonial conditions. Thus the Chamber of Commerce for Bremen, on being asked to give its opinion, expressed itself as follows:

"Considering all things, we cannot recommend that the Government, by holding out privileges, should draw companies into the colonies, which, to judge by experiences, are inclined to accept such privileges, but contribute little towards the promotion and development of the colonies. The Government should dispose of crown land subject to the condition that it be utilized forthwith."

In the Annual of Land Reform, a German merchant, Vietor, of Bremen, adduces full statistical material to prove the enormous mistakes committed in connection with the granting of land monopolies to companies and criticizes the Government very severely for its blunders. He comes to the conclusion that the conduct of those companies runs counter to the interests of the German Empire and the German colonies. If this is clearly recognized, how can this untenable condition of things be abrogated? "Once the Government

has discovered that the land companies are a hindrance to the development of our colonies, an expedient must be found to put a stop to the grievance, such as has been adopted in Kiaochow."

And it may now be said that the repetition of mistakes made in the past in regard to the disposal of land in our colonies has been rendered impossible by the energetic agitation of the League of Land Reformers. Many colonies have carried through land taxation, for instance Southwest Africa since 1909. In the same year the ordinance for Togo was promulgated, according to which rights over ownerless land can only be acquired subject to the consent of the Colonial Governor.

(To be continued).

THE GERMAN LAND REFORM LEAGUE AND PARTY POLITICS.

(For the Review.)

By H. FREESE, Honorary President Bodenreform League.

(Translated by Grace Isabel Colbron)

The question of the attitude taken by the Land Reform League towards the various political parties is one that comes up constantly. To my mind it is a question which touches the very existence of the League and I would like to make my own position at least clear in the matter.

In the very beginnings of the League, in its prenatal days in fact, the question of its partisanship already demanded an answer. The matter came up in the very first Land Reform meeting in Berlin. This meeting took place some time about the middle of the 80's in the Brandenburg City Hall in Berlin. It was called by the Democratic Club, or at least organized by this association. This club itself had been founded by a group of former members of the Progressive Party when the party changed itself into the *Freisinnige* party. These members, dissatisfied by the change of affairs, made an association of their own which they called the Democratic Club. Several men who latter became prominent in the Land Reform movement, Herr von Helldorf-Baumersrode, Attorney Depner, the writers Hilderbrandt and Max Sebaldt, were present at the meeting. I regret exceedingly that I cannot in any way ascertain the exact date of this first Berlin Land Reform meeting. But I do know that during the course of it Mr. Michael Flürscheim, the founder and part owner of the Gaggenau Iron Works, made a speech on the Land Question which was so convincing that it won me completely to the movement. The discussion which followed this speech concerned itself with the question as to what attitude we should take towards the various political parties. Opinions differed widely among those present. The majority were members of the Democratic Club and seemed inclined to take the question

of Land Reform as a plank for their party platform. Herr von Helldorf-Baumersrode asserted that no success for the movement could be possible unless some established political party took it up. He was a Democrat by party affiliation although not a member of the club.

If the newly organized Democratic party had utilized the opportunity offered it, the question of partisanship for Land Reformers might have been decided once for all. Land Reform would become the economic creed of a new political party, the aim of which was to make a place for itself midway between the Social Democracy and the Liberals of Manchester inclinations. It would not have been easy to win this place, for, in South Germany at least, the South-German party filled the need completely. And in North Germany Eugen Richter's Freisinnige party was rapidly growing in power.

It was soon clear however, that the new born Democratic party was built up on no more sensible and economic foundation than were any of the older parties. Some of its influential members raised an energetic protest against so dangerous an innovation from traditional politics, notably the well-known Leipziz lawyer, Melos. So this matter fell through.

Friends had taken me to this meeting, but in spite of being an outsider I raised my voice against the combining of political and economic demands. I could hardly have done otherwise, as I was then a convinced member of the Freisinnige party. But Land Reform offered to me an economic programme which filled me with enthusiasm, and which dwarfed in my eyes all subjects of merely political conflict, such as tariff or free trade, direct or indirect taxation, gold or silver coinage, religious or non-religious schools and the like. Even the question of a constitutional or monarchical form of government, of a republic or a monarchy, seemed to me of very little importance compared with the question of ownership of the land. In my opinion, the land question could unite in enthusiastic work men of all political parties and I did not wish that it should be weakened by being attached to the destinies, to the mistakes and weaknesses of any existing political party.

It is often asked nowadays whether this conviction which came to me when I first saw the light is still as strong, still as justified. For my own part I can only say that it is. The first Land Reform Association for which at the above mentioned meeting I suggested the name "Land Reform," although I did not join it as a member, was short-lived. Then Flürscheim organized the "German League for Ownership Land Reform." After his experience in this first meeting Flürscheim did not make the mistake of attaching himself to the Democratic party and its utterly colorless existence. He kept his association free from all partisanship. Its first members were almost entirely of the extreme Left, among them a large number of convinced Social Democrats. As the movement grew, however, a number of members of the more conservative parties joined the Land Reformers and began a more or less effective propaganda in their own circles. A number of evangelical clergymen joined the association, something which was only possible as long as the League remained unpartisan.

In November 1892 the Social Democrats under the leadership of Dr. Leo Arons drew up a resolution disagreeing with my administration, and towards the end of the year 1893 they all withdrew from the League, as their resolution had not been adopted by the other members. Since then the Social Democrats have had nothing whatever to do with our work, but members of almost all the other parties have joined the League and have spread our doctrines among their own parties. This was possible only as long as we remained quite unpartisan, and untouched by the actual political conflict. Anyone who has ever been through the political battle knows that the fight is made not against the things our antagonists say as much as against the things they do not say. An association which remains neutral between the parties stands above them all. This, it seems to me, is the position the Land Reform League should take.

It is not an easy position to keep and it demands from the members of the League much tact, self-control and diplomacy. But I am happy to say that our members have thus far never shown any lack of these qualities and I believe that they will continue to show no lack of them in the future.

THE ABOLITION OF POVERTY BY THE RESTORATION OF EQUAL RIGHTS TO THE USE OF THE EARTH.

AN APPEAL TO THE WHITE SLAVES OF LANDLORDISM.

By GUSTAV BÜSCHER, of Zurich, Switzerland.

(Translated expressly for the Single Tax Review.)

CONCLUDING CHAPTER.

AN APPEAL TO THE READER.

One final word. You who have been won for the good cause, the cause of the emancipation of the whole human race, do not allow yourselves to be deceived by the hope that the prevailing injustice can be abolished by words without deeds. Words without deeds can never lead to victory. Words without deeds remain mere empty noise, "sound and fury signifying nothing."

Nor should you ever seek to win people for the good cause who do not firmly believe that Justice must necessarily result in the well-being of all. I have spoken of the advantages of recognizing the equal claim of all to the use of the earth, not to convince, but to give some insight into its meaning. He who thinks rightly must believe that a cause based upon Justice must necessarily bring salvation to mankind. Where this conviction is wanting, there all other persuasion will be futile.

Whatever may be said against the recognition and enforcement of the equal claim of all to the use of the earth, nothing can serve to transform wrong into right. True, we have wandered so far from the ways of truth and justice that to many this thought will seem strange. We have been so intimidated by the avarice, arrogance and insolence of the usurpers of our land that to many the abolition of their tribute-levying power may seem unimaginable. They think that before any step is taken threatening the continuance of the unrestricted private ownership of land these gentlemen must be compensated for any probable loss of power and income. According to their view it is not those who have so long been cheated of their rights as men, not those who in the treadmill of unrequited continuous toil have grown old and grey before their time, not the women who have to earn their living to work from early morn to late into the night, not the children who in their springtime have been converted into mill hands without enjoyment of the present or hope for the future, not those whose lives from the cradle to the grave have been made one long martyrdom, who should receive compensation. No! those only are to be compensated who by means of infamous and unjust property laws have been enabled, without doing a stroke of honest work, to levy tribute upon their fellows. Compensated in order that they should condescend graciously to renounce the power to appropriate to themselves that which by right belongs to others.

Compensation! our opponents are ill advised to say anything of compensation, for the word suggests restitution. Strict justice does not demand that the workers should be called upon to pay compensation before they are allowed to reap the fruits of their labor; but it does demand that restitution should be made by those who in the past have made use of unjust laws to take it from them. This is the clear, unmistakeable demand of justice, if justice is to be done to both rich and poor. Of such compensation little has yet been heard.

It would be opposed not only to our conception of justice; it would be morally poisonous and unwholesome to pay compensation to land-owners. For what are we to compensate them? Because they renounce the power of extorting tribute from us for the permission to live upon God's earth? Is not that preposterous? What can the masses gain if their oppressors are not to lose anything?

They also deceive themselves, or deceive others, who contend that the rights of mankind will be restored by gradual evolution, without a great, and possible bloody, struggle against the worst passions of human nature. That the world can be made better is no idle vision; but it is an idle vision to imagine that this is possible unless those who know the truth have the courage of their convictions, and are willing to stake life and fortune to promote them. They alone have rights who dare maintain them. A people who hide themselves like cowards, or who with dull apathy look on when it is a question of their highest possessions, have lost the right to call themselves a free people, however glorious the traditions of the doings of their more courageous ancestors.

You landless and disinherited, who are dispossessed of your rights to the use of the earth, have you the courage to demand a better fate? Will you continue for ever the white slaves of the privileged classes? Are your daughters fit for nothing better than to cook the food and black the boots of your exploiters? Are your sons born but to increase the unearned wealth of insatiable millionaires?

God helps those who help themselves. Do not allow yourselves to be deceived by those who tell you that the social problem is a very complicated one, which can only be understood by those who read learned books. It is not true! The social question is the question of what by right is our property. It is the question whether we shall spend our lives in helpless poverty and subjection, or in prosperity, happiness and freedom. It is a question we dare not leave to learned professors; it is our right and our duty to decide it for ourselves.

What a storm would break loose if all those who hate injustice were to follow the voice of their conscience, and no longer attempt to serve two masters! If all these would commence the struggle against the prevailing injustice with the fixed resolve to conquer or perish in the attempt! How the hypocrisy and lies and cowardice of our time would vanish; and the men of conscience and character come into their rights! How would every better tendency of human nature have a room to grow and develop! What proud independence and self-consciousness would animate the most humble of our people, if once the highest law in the land were to guarantee to each his equal right to the use of the earth!

Enough of words! For those who are weary of impotent talk, who feel themselves insulted by the empty teachings of learned Professors and omniscient editors, by the empty do-nothing of our politicians, I think I have said enough. For those who find themselves at home in the mire of existing conditions, these lines have not been written. Where there is no deep feeling for right and wrong, my words will remain in vain. But I find satisfaction in knowing that they will carry conviction to the hearts of all who love justice and would serve her.

The End.

Down, down and down and down
 With idler, slave and tyrant!
 He that will not live by toil
 Has no right on English soil—
 God's word's our warrant!

—KINGSLEY.

If we tax land values more and labor values less, then surely the idle man and the idle acre have a better chance to get together.

SINGLE TAX CATECHISM.

(For the Review.)

BY M. W. NORWALK.

QUES. 1 What is the Single Tax?

ANS. It is the name of a system for collecting revenue for the expenses of government—city, county, State and national, thereby—as its advocates claim—abolishing involuntary poverty and correcting most of the injustices humanity is suffering from. And while it is not a tax, it is collected the same as taxes are now collected.

QUES. 2 Why do you call it Single Tax?

ANS. Because it presupposes the abolition of all other taxes, on improvements in or on the land, buildings, personal property, income, inheritance, excise, tariff, etc., leaving the land rent only to be collected for needed revenues.

QUES. 3 Why should we abolish the tax on improvements such as houses, etc., when the owner is deriving an income from them?

ANS. For two reasons: (1) Because the producer of improvements, like the one that makes two blades of grass grow where there was only one, is a public benefactor and we ought not to fine him with a tax and thus discourage him. (2) Because no man has a just right to appropriate to himself the products of someone else, and as the government derives its just powers only from the consent of the governed, therefore the government has also no just right to appropriate to himself even the smallest part of the products of anyone's improvements by taxation or otherwise.

QUES. 4. Why not tax personal property?

ANS. Because no assessor can ascertain the amount without questioning the owner and, because in the end, it is only those who cannot or will not swear off, like the widow and orphans whose estate is known, and the very scrupulous who will pay the tax. It is therefore a tax on honesty.

QUES. 5. Why ought not a man who receives a large income or inheritance pay a tax?

ANS. If he derives his income from personal effort, from gifts or bequests, the government has no moral right to any part of it (see answer 2 to question 3); and if it is derived from a source where the government is justified in taxing it, then it will be collected by the Single Tax. Again when a man pays ground rent through the Single Tax, he already pays for all the benefits of government he enjoys.

QUES. 6. Will we not encourage inebriety if we will abolish the excise tax?

ANS. If the Government has a right, (which is a side issue in this inquiry) to prevent people from indulging to excess in any particular thing, then it has a right to prohibit the production or consumption of it, and if it

has a right to regulate it, then it may license the production or use of the article, charging a nominal fee to cover the cost of the licensing and regulating.

QUES. 7. Why abolish the Tariff.

ANS. (1) As a system of so-called protection to labor it is a farce and a lie, encouraging and building up monopolies and lowering the purchasing power of the people, as I have fully covered up the subject in a separate Catechism. (see July-August 1911 SINGLE TAX REVIEW). (2) The government has no moral right to tax or fine a man for buying, selling, or exchanging his products with whomsoever he pleases.

QUES. 8. How do you justify a tax on land values?

ANS. In several way: (1) In contradistinction to the price of articles produced by man, which is the cost of reproduction, since no one will pay for any article more than others are willing to reproduce it for, the price of land is governed entirely by the number of civilized people in its proximity, who are willing to give up a certain amount of their products for its possession. Therefore, the price of land being the product of the people it belongs to the whole people and should be taken for the maintainance of the people's Government. (2) Land values cannot be hidden from the assessor or sworn off, and there cannot therefore be any discrimination or favoritism in this tax. (3) In the price of land alone is reflected the quality and cost of good Government; the better schools, parks, streets, roads, fire and police protection, etc., the higher rises its price; therefore land values should be taken to defray the expense of government. (4) Everything produced from out of nature (land) where there is no special privilege, rightfully belongs to the producer or to him whom he willingly transfers his right; land (nature) not having been produced by any man cannot rightfully be owned by any man or set of men or even by the government itself. But, since civilization is impossible without exclusive possession of land, as no one will build or plant without being assured of such security in possession, the holder of the more valuable land ought to pay to everyone whom he excludes. But as this is impracticable, every one should pay the annual rental value of the land he possesses into the common treasury in the form of a tax, out of which fund Government should be maintained and the benefits of which all men should enjoy alike.

QUES. 9. Since you must have the vote of a majority of the people to adopt the Single Tax, then do you acknowledge that majorities have rights and can adopt any system of taxation?

ANS. No; majorities have rights only in things which belong to all the people, like the restoration of land values to the public treasury; but have no moral right to confiscate the smallest part of the wealth belonging to even the smallest minority.

QUES. 10. Is not land the wealth or part of the capital of the individual owner?

ANS. No; land is the passive factor in the production of wealth, labor being the active factor; capital is that part of the product which instead of being consumed is used to help in the production of more wealth.

QUES. 11. Since the owner of land has paid for it with his wealth, to produce which he had to work, are you not confiscating his just belongings when you take from him the rental values of the land he owns?

ANS. No; we are simply changing the system of taxation which was never presumed to be always the same, and what he loses as a land owner he gains as an owner of improvements and as a producer and consumer of wealth, which will not be taxed.

QUES. 12. Would not the Single Tax deprive the poor widow and orphans who may own vacant land of the only support they may have?

ANS. No; if land values belong in justice to the people, including all widows and orphans, then no particular widow or orphan has a right to appropriate these values. (2) Vacant land does not support any one, and if they wish to improve the land or work for someone who will, then the sooner the tax on industry is removed the easier it will be for them to make a living. (3) If the widow or orphans are crippled or sick, then they may be supported at the expense of the money collected from land values, to which they are equally entitled with the rest of humanity.

QUES. 13. Will not rent be increased to the tenant when the tax on land values is increased?

ANS. No; by increasing the tax on buildings you discourage the erection of buildings, and the competition between tenants raises the rent, but when you increase the tax on land it becomes unprofitable to hold land idle, and more and better buildings, now tax free, are erected to meet the demand. The rent is reduced to the lowest margin which competition between house owners will bring it to, and yet leave sufficient to encourage the building of more houses.

QUES. 14. Would not the price of articles produced from or on land be increased by the increase of the tax?

ANS. No; for by taking annually the rental value holders of productive land will be compelled to put it to the best use, and coming in competition with products of cheaper land and of land which pays no tax, no one will be able to corner the market, and products will be cheaper.

QUES. 15. Will not the price of labor be reduced if the prices of its products fall?

ANS. No; as no one will be able to hold for speculative purposes, millions of acres will be dropped by their present owners, much land will be free of taxes, and the price of labor will be that which it can produce individually or co-operatively on free land, plus that which the most ingenious employers, by competing among themselves, will be compelled to offer to induce labor to work for them instead of being its own boss.

QUES. 16. If you will take annually the full rental value land will have no selling price; how will you then ascertain this ground value?

ANS. By finding the difference of the income from any properly improved property in the vicinity and the income from any other investment allowing for superintendence and deterioration or taking the price people in

general are willing to pay annually for any part of a certain locality. We thus arrive at a clear idea of the rental value in the neighborhood.

QUES. 17. What do you mean when you speak of free land?

ANS. That land upon which with the expenditure of labor, skill and capital suited to it will not yield a margin above any other line of investment where the same amount is expended, or land of no special advantage, the like of which is plenty in the neighborhood for every one who may wish to take it. This is what political economists call "Natural Opportunities at the margin of cultivation;" such land has no rental value.

QUES. 18. Could not the people as a whole lose by a combination of capitalists to hold all the best land, and who, by using the best machinery could undersell and drive to the wall those who have little or no money to buy improved appliances?

ANS. No; if they should fence in all the best natural opportunities, whether they are going to work them or not, they would thus create an artificial scarcity; this would raise the annual rental value which they would have to pay into the public treasury; their funds would soon be exhausted and they would soon let go of the unused land. (2) If they should attempt to work the land they fenced in, they would have to call upon more working men, and tempt them away from their lucrative employment. The so-called capitalists would have to part with the greater share of the products of the improved machinery, and besides would have to meet the competition of the co-operative societies of workmen with combined capital and credit.

QUES. 19. What would you do with monopolies of public utilities; light, water supply, railroads, etc.?

ANS. We would first collect the full rental value of the franchise (which is no more than the exclusive right to the use of a long stretch of land for certain exclusive purposes) and if we should conclude that these services were enhancing the value of land the same as do parks, streets, etc., we would make these utilities public property, furnishing the service free and maintaining them from the land rent so increased.

QUES. 20. Why not have the people as a whole, through their government, own and operate all kinds of machinery and employ every citizen in a well organized industrial army?

ANS. Because, (1) It would be too stupendous and cumbersome an undertaking for any group of men to manage justly and economically. (2) It would require such a strong and all-prevailing discipline that individual initiative would be to a great extent destroyed; and (3) since the ownership by the people as a whole of the implements and machinery of general production will not increase the rental value of land, to which alone the common treasury is entitled, there would be no funds to procure the necessary machinery unless the producers are robbed (Ans. 2 to Ques. 3).

QUES. 21. What then are the proper functions of Government, and what are not?

ANS. For anything that cannot in its nature be produced or operated

by everyone in the community who has the means and inclination to do so a franchise is required; tunnels, lines of wires, pipes or rails, etc. must be used in, beneath or above the ground, and these services are proper subjects for governmental supervision, ownership and operation; all other kinds of service are properly subjects of private initiative and competition. If groups of persons mutually and voluntarily agree to produce or consume, render services or exchange in co-operation, then of course they can govern themselves accordingly.

QUES. 22. You must admit that all government service has to be paid for with products collected from the producers. Does it not follow that even under the Single Tax System you must rob the producer of part of his product to maintain the Government?

ANS. No; a man is only entitled to what he produces on and out of land the like of which anyone who wishes can obtain freely; but the surplus product that can be produced on better land, or those products which men are willing to part with for the privilege of possessing it, does not belong to the possessor, and should be divided between all privileged and non-privileged in the form of governmental benefits.

QUES. 23. How will the Single Tax abolish involuntary poverty?

ANS. Since all wealth is produced by labor from land, and since the Single Tax will bring about a condition where everyone who is willing to work may get free land below or at the margin of cultivation, and will enjoy all the benefits of civilized government without having to be taxed for it, directly or indirectly (as government will be maintained with the wealth collected from those using opportunities above the margin), then the slowest and most unskilled workmen will have not only that which he will produce on and from free natural opportunities, but also plus that which the most ingenious captains of industry and well organized co-operative societies with the best machinery, will have to offer him in competing for his services. (Ans. 15.)

QUES. 24. How will it correct most of the injustices humanity is suffering from?

ANS. As there will be no special privilege granted to anyone and all will enjoy equal rights, there will be no reason for class hatred, cheating or stealing, because with a few hours of work a day and with the increase of inventions brought into general use by free competition, everyone will enjoy the education, comfort and leisure which even the richest cannot dream of at present.

QUES. 25. How will the Single Tax stop strikes, lockouts, blacklists, and boycotts?

ANS. By eliminating the landowner's exactions and freeing industry from taxation, capital and labor, the natural allies in the production of wealth, will peacefully produce and divide among themselves the proceeds at the margin of cultivation, each one receiving his just share, since neither capital nor labor will engage in production otherwise, and thus equitable distribution will result.

QUES. 26. How do you justify profit to the employer of labor or to the middleman and merchant, or interest to capital?

ANS. The word profit has no meaning in political economy since every work performed is entered upon with the intention to profit. Interest paid for wealth used in the production of other wealth (Capital) is justified by the following reasons: Since it increases the efficiency of labor's work on nature it is entitled to a part of the increase. (2) Capital being the stored up energy of labor and land have the potentiality of increasing without further labor, as in cases of wines, etc. It must be given its share of the proceeds for the "interest" it takes in the enterprise, and (3) the participation of capital in the profits in which it is invested is wages paid to labor which produced it. As to the middleman, there is no middleman. Each worker in the long line of production is a producer, whether he makes the tools for plowing, or himself plows, sows, reaps, transfers, bakes, or keeps in store ready for the consumer, thus saving the latter's time and allowing him to work at his own vocation. Everyone who renders service in the ramification of production is a producer.

QUES. 27 Would the Single Tax perpetuate the present competitive system which is responsible for so much misery?

ANS. At the present time we have a one-sided competition where the landless and jobless employes are competing for work. The Single Tax will bring about competition between employers who will offer more and more to tempt the workmen to go to work for them.

QUES. 28. Will the Single Tax raise enough revenue for all necessary expenses of city, county, State and national governments?

ANS. Government becomes necessary only when civilized people settle in one place and then land has a price which increases with the increase of population, which latter in turn necessitates a more complicated and more expensive government. In other words, it is as if a Superior Wisdom has provided a fund for the maintenance of necessary government, both increasing and decreasing in the same ratio.

QUES. 29. State a concrete example?

ANS. At the present people would not like to live where there is not enough police protection and the more efficient the service, the higher the price of the land. But when the Single Tax is inaugurated, the government will cease to set the bad example of legalizing robbery of the citizen, giving flimsy excuses that it must have revenue, and everyone will be able to make a good living with comparatively a few hours of work. Crime will diminish or disappear and police service, jails and penitentiaries will be almost unnecessary; their maintenance will not enhance the price of land, consequently this fund will dwindle to almost nothing. The same is true of the maintenance of Armies and Navies when tariffs, which are silent warfare, are abolished and special privileges and concessions granted to no one, there will be no incentive for war; each nation will live in peace on its own land, developing its best traits and characteristics; every international question will be settled in the Parliament of nations. Armies and navies will be the horrible night-

mare of the past and there will be no fund in the price of land to maintain them.

QUES. 30. How will you bring about the adoption of the Single Tax?

ANS. By the gradual removal of taxes from personal property, imports, etc., and by increasing the tax on land values until no other tax is left and all land values are absorbed and expended for the benefit of the people.

QUES. 31. Why not adopt it at once?

ANS. (1) Because the people are not ready to grasp the whole truth of the Single Tax after they have been accustomed for centuries to tax industry. (2) While it is just to restore to the community the rental value of natural opportunities, nevertheless since the latter has so long acquiesced in the appropriation of these values by private individuals, it is fair to give warning and ample time to the present owners to adjust their affairs to the new conditions that are coming.

AN AGE-OLD PROBLEM.

**Extracts from an Address delivered at the Country Life Congress at Omaha,
January 11th, 1912, by Frank G. Odell, Secretary
Nebraska Rural Life Commission.**

There is a problem as old as human society; ingrown into the hereditary selfishness of men until it has been the bane of every civilization since time began. It is existent in every civilized country today, even in America. This problem is complex, for it touches every phase of human development; its prime factors are necessity, multiplied by greed, and their product is expressed in the literal statement:—"Pay Rent, or Get Off The Earth."

It may be well enough for those of altruistic trend to philosophize over the abstract principles of human brotherhood and declaim that "every man has a natural birthright to the soil;"—their altruism hunts a hiding place when the landlord comes round on the first of the month. Let us recognize the economic tendency of land toward monopolistic control. This may not be inherent in land itself; in fact, I should seriously combat such a statement. I am still, philosophically speaking, of the opinion that God made the earth with all its riches for men to enter into possession of in order that humanity might feed upon the fruits of their labors; but, most unfortunately for this philosophy, the world agrees not with such thinking, holding most stoutly to the practical opinion, very practically expressed in laws and possession, that while God may have been able to create a world, He did not fully understand the proper uses of it.

This tendency toward monopoly in land has been dominant in every age; it is manifestly predominant in human nature as expressed in our social development. If I read history aright it has been the crucial center of every

crises in human progress. If you will scan history again from this, from what may be a new angle of vision to some it will speedily be discovered that the social and economic evolution of the race, with all its sanguinary physical, and all its inspiring intellectual conflicts, has simply epitomized the efforts of struggling men who have striven to break down a wall of human selfishness and get their feet on the land, which, the poets say, "is their birth-right."

This in brief, is all there is in "the back-to-the-land" movement of today which stirs this country from ocean to ocean; it is all there has been in it in any age. I beg to differ most radically with that cult of agricultural leaders who contend that the great problem of our agriculture to day is simply one of more production, or—as they sometimes phrase it—of less cost of production, by those who are now on the land. There are some millions of homeless people in America while I am speaking to you who own your broad acres; any of these, all of these—if they possess any natural rights at all—have at least the right of opportunity to gain access to the land and to try for themselves the somewhat uncertain experiment of feeding themselves and those dependent on their labors.

But when they attempt to gain access to this land which you call their birth-right, there rises a mighty wall of insurmountable privilege which has crystallized in constitutions and statutes, protecting from time immemorial the right of the strongest to prey on the need of the weakest, and the "dead hand" of old-time privilege bars the once open gate of opportunity.

It will require a wiser man than any I have yet met to convince that which serves me in place of intellect that any amount of increased production by you who are now on the land will make it materially easier for these homeless ones to have the blessings of roof-tree and fireside for themselves,—unless there shall first be given to them the opportunity which you have enjoyed.

Somewhere in this vexatious human equation, we must begin to eliminate the unknown, but guessed at quantities which swallow up the profits of your toil at one end and the profits of those who feed upon your products at the other end. When this hoary criminal institution is run by the hounds of an enlightened public conscience to its last hiding place, it will be found crouching under the protecting mantle of constitutions and statutes, pleading its "divine right" to *monopoly in land* which should spell to every thinking man, *monopoly of opportunity*.

THE man holding an acre idle is performing no service to the community thereby.

WHAT do we want to see? Idle men, or idle acres? Why reward men for keeping land idle and punish men for using it?

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

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

CHAPTER IV.

The common conception of a "North and South" is that of two great sections of our common country, in one of which chattel slavery abounded. South of the "Mason and Dixon" line of demarkation there was "Slavery," while north of it was "freedom." As a prelude to the elimination of slavery a great civil strife ensued which deluged the land with blood. Great was the rejoicing when the terms were signed at Appomatox by which war and slavery were to cease and men were to return to peaceful industry.

The South was paralyzed, with her plantations and mills in ruins, while the North was busy investing her vast war fortunes in aggregations of land values in the form of subsidized railroads, building into the vast unoccupied West, and in promoting town sites over new States of unbounded resources. The losses of war made a ready market for the wheels of industry in the cities of the North, and wealth grew so rapidly that but a few years elapsed before immense land holdings were in the hands of those who stayed at home and profited by the opportunities of war.

But few men at the time realized that the war was but the evolutionary step from chattel to rent slavery. The North and South are now united because the plantation system of the South has practically extended over the whole North, making the interests of one the interests of the other. Land monopoly and the shifting of populations to increase values have been powerful incentives to peace and conciliation.

To trace causes leading up to this culmination let us now review the early history of the South and the early settlement of the North. Since reading the last chapter on the social and economic development of New England under the influence of her vastly more just division of land, we are impressed with the fact that when the "Yankee" settled in New York, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois and the North West he established in this new territory the same ideals of industry and thrift, and the same customs of land division as those practiced at the "Cradle of Liberty." In the trail of the streams of emigration westward from New England there was planted a vast domain of small farms that remained substantially the same up to the civil war. In most cases the owner of the farm tilled the soil himself. This period of about eighty years of settlement was one of unbroken thrift and social contentment. It is the only part of our national history that is devoid of labor troubles and those conditions of poverty and unemployment that have been such a constant blot upon our history since the war.

With this condition in the North before our minds, let us see in our colonial land-hunt what big game we will find in the wide stretches of territory

granted to the proprietors of the mother-colony of the South, and ultimately what dominating influence this "big game" had on the future destiny of the South.

There was nothing small in the plan deliberately adopted in founding Carolina. It was openly proclaimed by its originators that it was to be a vast Aristocracy modeled after the mother country in both government and land division. The plan was devised by eight noblemen who had been supporters of Charles II while hiding in France during the Cromwellian regime and were the leaders in restoring Charles II to the throne. As land was the only thing the King had to give them for their loyalty to his person, he issued the patent dated March 24, 1663, granting to them the province of Carolina.

The patent began with the usual declaration as to the motive of the grant, "that the grantees were incited by a laudable and pious design of propagating the Christian Religion and the enlargement of the English empire and dominion. "To carry out these pious and patriotic views, the grantees were given "all the territory or tract of ground called Carolina, situated, lying and being within our dominions of America extending north to 36 degrees or southern line of Virginia, west as far as the South Seas (meaning the Pacific Ocean), south as far as the border of Florida or 31 degrees north latitude. The territory with all that it contained, the grantees were to have, use, and enjoy, and in as ample a manner as any Bishop of Durham in our kingdom."

They were authorized to make any law "according to their best discretion of and with the advice, assent, and approbation of the freemen of the said Province or of their delegates, whom for the purpose of enacting laws the Lords Proprietors should from time to time assemble in such manner and form as to them should seem best."

To govern as a County Palatine meant that these Lords were to appoint one of their number to be virtually King who would have the same authority over this province as any one of the owners of the three Palatine counties of England—namely Chester, Durham, and Lancaster, each owned by a noble. They might pardon treasons, murders, and felonies; they were to appoint all judges and justices; and all writs of indictment ran in their name and not in the name of the King.

These Lords were authorized to establish ports of entry and to assess and impose customs on goods imported; to establish subsidies; to build forts, castles, cities, towns; to appoint governors, magistrates, sheriffs, and other officers, civil and military; to grant charters of incorporation; to erect markets and fairs; to hold Courts Baron; to make war and pursue their enemies; to exercise martial law in case of rebellion, tumult, or sedition.

They were granted full control over all churches and the power to license to build and found them. They were to have them dedicated and consecrated according to laws of the Church of England. They also had power to grant religious liberty to those who could not conform to the Church of England.

But with all this absolute power over State and church, "the feature for which this charter is best known, is that which declares that these Pro-

prietors shall have full power 'to give and confer titles of honor to persons born in or inhabiting Carolina.' "

On account of priority of another charter to this same territory, in 1665 a new charter was granted to clear up the faulty title. This new charter gave the same powers and privileges as the first but extended the limits 35 miles farther north and 140 miles south. Also the western extension was more carefully defined so as to include the present States of North and South Carolina, Tennessee, Georgia, Alabama, Mississippi, Arkansas, Louisiana, Texas, Oklahoma, New Mexico, Arizona, and the southern part of California. A region surely large enough for empire building; a region which has in great measure been peopled from the colony established under this charter and government by the political ideas emanating from Charlestown; a region it will be observed that is almost inclusive of all the Confederate States. In the second charter, authority was given to subdivide the province into counties, baronies, and colonies with separate and distinct jurisdictions, liberties, and privileges.

Full powers having been granted these eight Lords over such a large territory, it is interesting to know what sort of a government they proposed to establish. This was left to two men, Lord Ashley, who assumed the leading part of the Lords, and John Locke the philosopher. The result of their collaborations was the production of the famous "Fundamental Constitutions." This was an elaborate and extraordinary scheme for forming an aristocratic government in the wilds of America. In the opening paragraph was a most significant statement showing that these Lords proposed openly to keep the people under their heels. It reads, "that the government of the province may be made most agreeable to the Monarchy under which we live and of which this Province is a part, and that we may *avoid erecting a numerous democracy.*" They did not propose that the people should have a voice in the government.

After providing that the oldest Lord should be the Palatine or King really, and the seven chief offices to be held by the remaining Lords, they next proceeded to make their government "most agreeable to monarchy and to avoid erecting a numerous democracy" by devising an elaborate system of land division and a set of titles and marks of favor to be conferred upon those receiving large gifts of land. The reader will recognize that titles are of little value unless connected with large tracts of land to give them force and to command the deference of men.

Take away land from man and he becomes a slinking slave; give him an acre and he becomes a Lord. In every community the men who "run the town," "run" the elections, "run" the church, "run" all public improvements, select candidates, manage everything and everybody, are the same in a large majority of cases who control, simply because they are owners of land values. We bend the knee and respectfully bow to men with landed possessions even though they obtained it by gift or by cunning. No other kind of ownership appeals to us as having behind it the power to enforce obedience or

condescension. In all ages the music of the enchanting Siren that has lured men to seize and hold land has been found in these words: "Thou shalt have no need to work, for thou shalt have thereby command over the labor of men."

In the case of these eight Lords who "owned" from ocean to ocean, how fascinating must have been their project to their imagination. They could grasp the scepter and powers of Empire as the thousands of broad acres fell to their share in the greedy carving process they were at liberty to fasten upon this continent. How ignoble the motives that inspired these men as compared with the deep fraternal spirit in the hearts of those who founded the commonwealth of Massachusetts where every man was his own sovereign lord.

McCrady says, ("South Carolina under the Proprietary Government,") "The whole Province was to be divided into counties; each county into eight seigniories, eight baronies, and four precincts; each precinct into six colonies. Each seignior, barony, and colony should consist of 12,000 acres; the eight seigniories being the share of the eight Lords and the eight baronies the share of the nobility to be established." By this plan each county contained 480,000 acres or 750 square miles. Of this area the eight Lords were to have 96,000 acres in each county."

As their charter forbade them using the names of nobility in England, as Earl, Duke, Marquis, etc., they chose the title "Landgrave" from the German courts, and "Cacique" from the Indian Chiefs of America. There were to be as many Landgraves as counties and twice as many Caciques and no more. These were to constitute the hereditary nobility of the Province and by right of their dignity to be members of the provincial Parliament.

Each Landgrave was to have four baronies, or 48,000 acres, and each Cacique, two baronies, or 24,000 acres. These large blocks of land were to be fixed by heredity and never to be sold or broken up. This gave two-fifths of the land in a county to the Lords and nobility, leaving three-fifths to be sold to the common settlers who would furnish labor, add value to all these vast holdings, and make a home market for products. Without a population, all land schemes fail.

These Lords seemingly were afraid that even by leaving three-fifths on the market for sale would be risking too much in the hands of the common people. Therefore they provided that in each of the twenty-four colonies in each county, there was to be a "Manor" of not more than 12,000 acres nor less than 3,000 acres. The Lord of a Manor was to have all the powers, jurisdictions, and privileges over those on his Manor which a Landgrave or Cacique was to have over his barony. Thus by this sliding scale a Manor could be made as large as necessary to keep down "a numerous democracy." If the people were growing dangerously in power, the Lords could give away a Manor of such size in a colony as to reduce the settlers to submission to the Lord of the Manor, or "move on," which meant in those days to go into a wild country on the frontier filled with hostile natives.

It should be observed that the control of these landlords over labor was

as great as now, perhaps greater, for but few settlers dared to venture westward into a country of savages whose antipathy was increasing on account of the raids of the whites on their tribes and the capture and sale of their tribesmen into West Indian slavery. Labor was hemmed in; the ocean on the east, the Indian on the west, and a militia among them to enforce the will of the Lords and Nobles. When such is the case labor is entirely in the power of the landlords.

But the complete monopoly of land in this Province was not the only provision by which the nobility controlled labor and kept down democracy. It was provided that in every seignior, barony, and manor, all the "leet-men" (men living on these large tracts of lands as renters or laborers) shall be under the jurisdiction of the respective Lords of these plantations without appeal from him. This was a revival of the Leet-Court system on Manors in Feudal times in England. These gentry, however, went a step farther in welding chains to bind labor to the soil and throttle the voice of freedom. "No leet-man or woman should have the liberty to go off the land of his or her Lord and live anywhere else without leave obtained from said Lord under his hand and seal." The only crumb of inducement held out for one thus to place himself within the absolute control of his Lord, was that "upon marriage he was to have ten acres of land for life, paying the Lord therefor and not more than one-eighth part of all the yearly produce and growth of the said ten acres."

To protect their usurped power and hold struggling democracy at bay, we come to the old fortification within which land-monopolists have taken refuge since history began: it is the legislature, with all the artillery in the hands of the land caste. It is through this instrumentality that all efforts by the masses to dislodge them from their vast power, have been unavailing. With the machinery of legislation and the army in their hands, they are impregnable. In the case of this colony, there was to be a biennial Parliament to consist of the Lords or their deputies, the Landgraves and Caciques and one freeholder out of every precinct chosen by the people. It is evident that the representation of the common people would have but little influence in such a body when in a hopeless minority. This plan would give the nobility in each county a majority of seven of the representatives. It is the same misrepresentation today, especially in the U. S. Senate, that thwarts the will of the people. Nearly every Senator is the holder of large tracts of natural values which give him the same powers as these English Lords provided for themselves in their government of Carolina. Moreover, our present Senate has a greater majority representing the landed class than these Lords planned to have in the Parliament of this new Province.

United with pretext for the grandiloquent undertaking such a remarkable land and labor-enslaving scheme to conceal their ulterior designs, we come to their shameful travesty of the religious sentiment that filled the heart of every honest settler, by parading before the world their "laudable and pious intentions" of carrying the Gospel to the heathen savage. Great is the hypo-

crazy of the land-grabber! After making provisions for liberty of conscience and for the protection of the native Indian and to give him an opportunity to learn for himself the reasonableness of the Christian religion and the peaceableness and inoffensiveness of its professors by their good usage and persuasion—precepts which all European colonists habitually disregarded and atrociously violated—these Constitutions proceeded to enjoin that “every freeman of Carolina shall have absolute power and authority over his negro slave of what opinion or religion soever.” Also they gave authority to traders to carry all captive Indians to Bermuda, Bahama, and West Indies as slaves “to encourage the soldiers” there. They thus recognized the institution of chattel slavery as right and legal in advance of its introduction into the Province.

Such were the main provisions of this famous Constitution; but it is far easier to draft a constitution than to put it into practical operation. They seemed oblivious to the fact that their Charter expressly prescribed that laws could only be enacted “by and with the advice, assent and approbation of the freemen of said Province or of their delegates.” We are naturally interested in the question, would the people of this province ever consent to a form of government in which the rights secured to them by the Royal Charter were to be transferred to an Aristocracy over which they could have no control? We shall see.

While this body of laws was never adopted in full by the people, yet the divisions of the lands were actually made, and Landgraves and Caciques appointed, some few taking possession of their baronies. Some tracts of land in the lower part of South Carolina still, in part at least, bear the names given to them; such as the Colleton Barony, the Wadboo Barony, the Broughton Barony, etc. During the whole fifty years that these Lords owned Carolina, the attempt to force their system of thorough-going land-slavery and despotic rule upon the people was the constant source of contention, and was the final cause of the rebellion of the settlers and the restoration of the Province to the Crown. Their scheme even went so far as to provide for a Heraldry Court with powers to regulate fashions, games, and sports.

A commission sent out in 1667, failed to set the machinery of this elaborate and absurd system of government in motion. But it taught these avaricious Lords that some simpler temporary system must be adopted. This they proceeded to devise by a commission with their instructions to the Governor they selected. In 1669 another fleet set sail for Carolina, with Joseph West as Governor. His long list of instructions were to serve as the temporary laws of the colony. Only one vessel, the Carolina, reached the new shores. It had but 93 passengers. Of these 16 were masters, 63 were servants, and 13 were freemen with no servants. That made but 29 entitled to land.

On landing the instructions were opened and found to begin with the observation that as the number of people set down at Port Royal would be small, it would be impossible to put the grand model of government at once

into operation. At first there was to be a Council composed of five elected freemen and five deputies appointed by the Lords. These were to govern according to the instructions given to the Governor. They were enjoined to put into practice as much as they could of the Fundamental Constitutions. The first thing the Council was required to do was to hold an election and have twenty persons elected who, with the Council, were to be the temporary Parliament to make laws. But such laws were not to be in force till ratified by the Governor and three of the deputies named by the Lords. So much in fear were they of democracy.

Next there was a provision for the distribution of the land. All persons above the age of sixteen who settled there before March 25, 1670, were to be granted 150 acres for themselves and 150 acres more for every able man-servant they brought with them, and 100 acres more for every woman servant. 100 acres were to be given to every white servant who served out his time. For those arriving a year later, but 100 acres were to be given; and to those that came two years later, but 70 acres each. Thus we see even at the beginning that freemen who had indented servants, were to have from 300 to perhaps 750 or 1,000 acres, thus giving them an unequal advantage as land values rose compared with those who came after.

All this land given to the settlers was to be in the colonies of 12,000 acres each as provided in the Grand Model. They were to lay out the counties, preserving the proportion of 24 colonies of 12,000 acres each to eight seigniories and eight baronies. They were ordered to settle in towns, and it was provided that there should be one town laid out in each colony. This was the scattering system to locate the population so as to add the greatest value by their presence to the reserved baronies and seigniories for the nobility. To this day this same plan is practiced in making subdivisions in cities in which alternate lots are at first sold to add value to the remaining lots by the presence of improvements. This works a great injustice to the public at large and especially to the producer. Acre property is bought at \$300, cut into six lots per acre, and the next day is offered to the public at \$100 a lot provided alternate lots are taken. Even the cost of the homes to be erected must be such as will attract buyers for the rest of the lots. A year later a brass band advertises the sale of the "elegant" lots in the finest residential portion of the city. The late comers are invited to partake of the feast at from \$300 to \$400 per lot. You say this is right, is lawful, is good business. So was it right, lawful, and good business for those Lords of Charles II. to scatter the settlers of Carolina in such a way that their large tracts of land would draw rents at an earlier period and at a higher rate than if the population was let alone to settle in a natural way on the best lands near the coast and markets. Is this system not much like piracy or the taking of what does not belong to one? The first lot buyers not only pay two or three times the true value of the lots but by their improvements add more value to the remaining lots. This value however does not accrue to them but to the exploiter who does nothing to add value to the lots. And we are all at the mercy of this system. If you

want a lot for a home, "hold up your hands" while the lot owner takes your products for values he does not produce, but only controls. You earn, he takes, you work, he plays.

Rivers observes (Historical Sketches of South Carolina) that in dealing with the Indian in securing his deed for these great tracts of land "for the consideration of a valuable piece of cloth, matches, beads, and other goods and manufactures that the true 'true and absolute Lords' of the immense region of Carolina, with all its mines, quarries, and fisheries, whose object was declared to be the diffusion of the Christian religion among those who knew not God, must have appeared to the colonists as having abandoned their dignity and best policy for sordid calculations." Instead of the gospel, the Indians were offered only glass beads and worthless articles: and the needy colonists, who were struggling to maintain themselves were required to pay on the land that had been granted to them, ten per cent. interest by preparing cargoes of timber "at moderate rates" on the plea that their Lordships were already "so much out of purse" in settling them in the colony." The man that owns land can extort as he pleases. It is as true today as it was then.

The twenty-three temporary agrarian laws "were concerned," says McCrady, "entirely with the interests of the Lords and the nobility." Then these insatiable pets of the King said with grim irony, "Since the whole foundation of the government is settled upon the right and 'equal' distribution of land, the orderly taking of it is of great moment to the welfare of the Province."

To bring emigrants to their new Province fettered with the chains of greed, these "pious" Lords, as a shrewd bit of advertising, promised religious toleration, and then resorted to bribery to secure the services of influential men who would go out into the byways and drum up those who had been ground down by the same mill of injustice at home. To the freeman of Ireland, such as were referred to in a former chapter, they offered "the free exercise of their religion according to their own discipline," if they would come in sufficient numbers to form a town by themselves. To the four leaders who were to work up this Irish colony, 12,000 acres were to be given as soon as they reached Carolina.

To get the poor French Huguenots to come to Carolina and introduce silk culture and manufacture and also bring with them the olive and vine, they were offered religious freedom (it cost nothing); and Rene Petit and Jacob Grinard were granted 4,000 acres each to make the appeal to these hated people.

Then they used the same sort of beguiling reports of the great riches that even the released servants were accumulating, to spread broadcast over the mother country and excite the landless hords to emigrate to this Eldorado. The Lords' own secretary, Samuel Wilson, in a glittering report on the colony in 1682 said, "that servants who had served out their terms with their masters, had good stocks of cattle and servants of their own, had



H. D. WAGNON
(See page 51)

built houses and exercised their trades; many were worth several hundred pounds, lived in a plentiful condition, and their estates were increasing. Land near Oyster Town of about 100 houses, was selling at twenty shillings (about \$25 in present values) per acre, though pillaged of all its valuable timber." The claim was made in this report that an ox in Carolina could be raised at nearly as little expense as a hen in England. Wilson offered to each head of a family fifty acres, to every son or man-servant 50 acres more, and the same for each marriagable daughter or woman-servant. But notice the provision by which the Lords were to have a permanent income without work. "This land was to be to them and their heirs forever, with the reservation of a *penny an acre quit-rent* to the Lords Proprietors." This amounted to about \$5 on each 50 acres in present values. To others who preferred not to pay this rent, they offered land at the rate of 50 pounds, or about \$1,000 for 1,000 acres; a price as high as large tracts can be bought for today.

About this time the Popish Plot scare spread over England. It was alleged that the Catholics were about to burn London, massacre the inhabitants, kill the king, and restore the religion of Rome. These sagacious Lords at once seized the opportunity to secure a large influx of Protestant Dissenters from Somersetshire where they had been persecuted most. Two men, Axtell and Morton, were sent among the clergy of these people to add credence to the rumored plot and lead them to believe that if a Catholic King came to the throne they would be persecuted all the more. The result of this scare was that 500 of these good church people were moved to Carolina, and the two men who wheedled these innocent people into believing the rumor, were rewarded for their treachery in being made Landgraves and receiving 48,000 acres each. Morton was later made Governor. The land cost them nothing and the 500 families would pay them quit-rents forever. In another case a whole county of 750 square miles was given to 36 noblemen who were invited to form a settlement of laborers in Carolina on the quit-rent basis.

In former chapters I have shown that history is full of evidence that private ownership of land is the source of most of the serious political and social contentions, and the prime cause of civil wars. This colony was no exception to the rule. At first the Lord-made laws declared that lands should be held for the rent of a penny an acre, or "the value thereof in products." Upon these terms many had emigrated to Carolina. But in 1684 the arbitrary Lords made an ex-post-facto law declaring that "lands should be held only by indentures in which the words "or the value thereof" were to be stricken out, and a reservation added that the lands return to them on failure of paying the quit-rent in money. Since money was scarce, this excited much opposition; and the people requested that they be allowed to pay in the produce of their lands. To this the Lords who rule as Kings, now as well as then, replied, "We insist upon selling *our lands* in our own way."

Because of the power over men by the ownership of land, the people have seldom triumphed over the landlords permanently. A threatened revolt in Greece brought about a revoking of all mortgages by Solon. Con-

tentment and prosperity lasted over two hundred years. But after the age of Pericles, mortgages were again fastened upon the people and helotism flourished. Twice in Rome the people regained their lost rights in the public lands, but in about two hundred years these lands were again in the hands of a landed oligarchy and the peasantry were driven into the cities. In England the landholding class had so successfully manipulated the political wars that the landless man has been hardened into the belief that the land-gentry was part of the natural order. During the Elizabethan and Cromwellian wars the lands of three counties of Ireland were confiscated by the Lords of England, leaving in dire destitution thousands of the Celtic race. At this time America was being settled, and for fear that the indomitable Irish might again rebel they were allured to the new world by deceiving agents and the highly colored accounts concerning the fortunes to be made in America. In Virginia the people rebelled under Bacon against land tyranny, but their victory was short. Their leader died, and then their lands were confiscated to intrench the land monopolist more securely. And now the people in Carolina rebelled at the effort on the part of the Lords to force them to submit to the terms of their unjust Fundamental Constitutions and thus sign away their rights under the Charter.

Without going into the details of the events that led to the rebellion; of the dissolution of the Assembly by the Lords whenever it became too democratic; of the blocking of legislation to protect the colony from the attacks of the Spanish land grabbers; of vigorous efforts to collect the quit-rents from every acre whether under cultivation or not; of the forbidding of trade with the Indians that the Lords might have that monopoly; of the fining of clergymen a hundred pounds for preaching what the Governor considered seditious sermons,—it is enough to say that when the critical moment came, these alert people, after holding many secret meetings, formulated Articles of Association, had them read and signed by the whole militia, and proclaimed a new government and a new governor. The government was thus without bloodshed assumed by the people in 1719 in the name of the King. But this was only a change of landlords, as they were then under a Board of landholders forming the advisors of the King known as the Committee of Plantations and Trade. They had control over all the Royal Provinces.

The Lords, however, saw that they were beaten and appealed to the King to have *their* property restored to them. But the injustice of their rule had reached his ears, and being jealous of their growing power in holding such a vast domain under the protection of the English government, he turned to them a deaf ear; and in 1720 appointed a Royal Governor for ten years as a temporary arrangement till a settlement could be made with the Lords. Then came a long list of royal battles at law to determine the proper heirs and owners of Carolina. Following this came the attempt of the Lords to sell their rights to the Crown. Finally seven of the eight Lords accepted for their interests in Carolina £17,500 or about \$350,000. This of course was paid out of the taxes collected from the people in England. We are doing

the same thing today in buying back lands needed by the government. We appraise its value on the basis of what it is really worth at the present time and pay out of the public treasury the advanced value population has added to it. We tax ourselves to pay for values we ourselves create.

Lord Carteret would not sell his interest. So after several years he was allotted a tract embracing about what is now the northern half of North Carolina, on his releasing his interest in the rest of the territory. In his allotted territory he had no political power. Even when they have wronged the common people and robbed them of their earnings, men of influence are allotted special privileges, even now.

By Lords' sale of their interests to the King, the claims of the large landholders in Carolina were not forfeited. Twenty-five Landgraves and twelve Caciques had been appointed under the rule of the Lords. These alone owned 1,498,000 acres or 2,325 square miles, enough to make over three States the size of New Jersey and belonging to 37 men. As we have seen, these were not all the large holdings of land. Other large tracts were given to those who influenced bodies of people to settle in Carolina.

It would seem that the whole outcome of this premeditated effort to fasten upon this continent a hereditary nobility had come to an end. But were not the barony, seignior and manor planted here to remain even to the present time, and have we not today these same immense divisions of land which menace our liberties and command extortionate rents? Did not this system, with its feudal aspects, create in the minds of the settlers a desire to own large tracts of land that they too could live on rent and enjoy luxury and ease without work? Was not this the system that spread over the whole South and carried with it chattel slavery which was so profitable as long as the lands were cheap? Will not a careful study of the land ownership conditions in the South today reveal the fact that the land is largely owned by the planter who considers himself poor if he owns less than 1,000 acres? The plantation system of the South is a direct outcome of the first division of land under the eight Lords.

As McCrady says: "America was chiefly settled from three principal points: Virginia, Massachusetts, and Carolina. From these points have emanated the differing political thoughts of the country which have in the main, in parallel lines, accompanied the tide of emigration westward." "The division of land into great baronies, doubtless gave an aristocratic temper to the government of the colony which tendency was greatly increased by the prosperous implanting of the institution of African slavery."

Charleston, S. C., has been one of the great gateways for emigration into this country. Francis A. Walker, in the census of 1880, says: "From 1820 to 1860, South Carolina was a beehive from which swarms were continually going forth to populate newer cotton-growing States." The population in 1860 was 470,257, and at that time there were 193,389 white persons born in that State, living in other southern States. By 1870 more than a third of the native Carolinians, or about 243,000, were living in other States. These

emigrants born and raised under the barony and manor system in going west naturally sought to settle upon tracts equally as large as those of their fathers, that they too might emulate the dignity and position of gentlemen. With manors, or plantations as they are now termed, scattered from Carolina to Texas, it can readily be seen why the whole South developed as a unit into an aristocracy, and why land and chattel slavery became a deep-rooted institution.

Comparing the early history of these southern people with that of New England, whose land systems were so unlike, we can readily perceive why a North and a South were the inevitable sequence. Moreover, their histories show that the one opened the door to peace, happiness, and plenty for all, while the other opened wide the gate that led to political storms, seditions, civil war, and poverty. The one was constructive of all that is just to both the individual and to government, the other was destructive to liberty and to all the virtues of man. The one lasted 150 years, or until its democratic institutions were attracting the attention of the world and exciting the jealousies of the nobility of the home government who attempted to extinguish its fires of freedom by declaring it a royal province and placing the land under the tyrannical rule of Andros; while the other lasted but fifty years, or till civil strife tore it assunder.

Does not this history point out the guide-post directing us to the city of refuge? Can we as a nation endure long with the same amassing of the natural resources into baronies all over this nation and thus compelling a large majority of us to pay rent? Is not unhappiness which follows the footsteps of so many wayfarers to this western world due to the same conditions we have found in the early history of Carolina?

(To be continued).

THE man out of work is not helped by the acre out of use.

THE unorganized men and the idle acres regulate the wages of any country.

THE market value of the exclusive possession and use of natural resources is the natural source of public revenue, for it is only taking that which is its own and which if properly conserved would be more than sufficient to meet all reasonable expenditures on the part of government.

PREACHERS decry the increasing lack of faith in a future life of joy and comfort, but if they would set about bringing a sample of it on this earth now, people would have more confidence in their prophesies concerning the hereafter.—The Piedmont (W. Va.) *Herald*.

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.

MAY-JUNE, 1912

PUBLISHER'S NOTES.

The following notice is for every one of our readers. Copies of the Vancouver, Edmonton or German Numbers may now be had at ten cents a copy mailed free to any addresses. There is no better propaganda pamphlets than these numbers to place in the hands of the inquiring reader. Send in your orders. They are records of things accomplished.

MANY of our subscribers have not responded to the notices sent out soliciting renewal of their subscriptions. We want your help.

Look out for the Special British Number which will appear in the Autumn of the year. The Special New Zealand Number as well as another for the Five Australias is in preparation. These will be the last authentic documents respecting the advance made in these countries.

WE bring to a close in this issue the splendid work of Gustave Bûscher on *The Abolition of Poverty*. It is a masterpiece and should be printed in pamphlet form for general distribution. The spirit that animates it is the spirit that conquers. Not a line but breathes the intense uncompromising tone of the agitator and propagandist. Every Single Taxer should ap-

proach the truth for which we stand in this way. The other side will offer all the necessary compromises. These will come faster because of our own uncompromising attitude. But where it is *we* who offer compromises, the invitation will be for weaker and more timid and hesitating expedients from the political powers. We must not adopt toward them the policy of conciliation. In proportion to the vigor and extremity of our demands will be the value of such compromises as we will be asked to accept. Let us make no mistake about this.

DEATH OF EDWARD HOMER BAILEY

(See frontispiece.)

Edward Homer Bailey, whom Single Taxers have long known as the associate editor of the *Johnstown Democrat*, of Johnstown, Pa., died April 26, following an illness of several months.

Mr. Bailey was born in Indiana in 1858, and his early education was limited to four years in the public schools. He entered the newspaper profession and served on a number of papers as compositor. Later he occupied the position as editor of several newspapers successively until associated with his brother, Warren Worth Bailey, he assumed the publication of the *Johnstown Democrat* in 1893.

This most practical and useful training served him in lieu of a college education as a writer, and how admirable was his capacity in this line those who have read "How to Get Rich Without Working," which is one of the most vigorous and convincing pamphlets called out by the Single Tax movement, will willingly testify. In his death the cause sustains a loss that will leave a gap in the ranks.

We could fill many pages of the *REVIEW* with newspaper notices of the dead journalist, but no more eloquent and beautiful tribute has been called forth than the oration delivered at the funeral by Herbert S. Bigelow which we offer in full:

"If a man die shall he live again?" This is the question—the eternal question—he is asking. Oh, he has listened to the sound

of the sea, he has beheld the majesty of the hills, he has stood beneath the stars, and all these have forced upon him this age-long question: "If a man die shall he live again?" He may try to forget the good and he may say: "I will eat, drink and be merry," but it is only for a little while, then the question comes back again. The chasm opens before him. The gloom presents itself. He gropes about for a hand, but he finds none. Alone he came, alone he must go. And if he takes his journey from this world without the belief that we see but a little part of it, that the great universe of reality is still hidden, that the things of the spirit are the things that are lasting, it is well. For the things of the flesh are the things that perish, and not the things of the soul. If he came through life without this capacity he is indeed pitiable. The materialist will tell us that all there is to life is a certain organization—dancing atoms—and when this ceases to act all life goes. They tell me that the love of my child, the light of his eyes, the impulse that sends words of love to his lips, these are many dancing atoms that will never dance this way again. The mother's sacrifice, the poet's song, the prophet's words—dancing atoms are they all, if the materialist is right, and our dreams are but the phantoms of an endless night.

Surely we should turn in an hour like this from that philosophy to appropriate to ourselves the faith of Him who said: "I am the resurrection and the life."

I believe that man is a god. Life is gradual awakening. Death is the glorious dawn.

Once I stood on the shores of the Pacific, at the harbor of the Golden Gate, looking out on those western waters at the sun sinking in the west across the sea. There was a path of gold. Now and then a ship would cross the path, its sails glinting in the light of the sun. And then the sun sank and the gold faded away and the winds arose and the waves began to beat upon the shadowy coves. Then like a rush of mighty waters a question swept my soul. "Who is it," I began to ask myself, "that rocks these mighty waters? Whose spirit is it that holds this world's domain above the ocean's roll?" And greater mystery still,

I said, "Who is it that rules that I can contemplate these things till I seem to become a part of the spirit that moves on the face of the deep and on the world above?"

And then I answered my own question with the faith that I had learned from childhood; with the faith that all the teachers of men have taught; with the faith that has never died, that never will die from the world, and I said to myself this: "Just as the dewdrop falls into this ocean, not to lose itself, but to become a part of the sea, and part of the universal life, and to feel in its bosom the thrill of the ocean, with power to bear the commerce of the world and wear away the rocks, so the soul of a man is a drop that falls into the great sea of God's love, not to lose itself, but to become a part of the universe's life, to become filled with a sense of the infinite. I would bring this word of comfort to those who sit in grief this afternoon, and to the rest of us I would bring a word to remind us of the life that has been lived, and to suggest that our thought this afternoon would be not the grief-stricken thought of the life that has been lost, but rather triumph and gratitude for the life that has been lived, essentially—profoundly—religious.

Precisely what did this life present as an example to men? We know this: that this man did not eat and drink and gather gold, but his was a life of enthusiasm. This man was not a mere encumberer of the earth, but there glowed in his heart a great truth to which he gave his life like an apostle of God. Why, the life of some men is a living death. Their career seems to be like one prolonged funeral service. They are dying day by day. They never really live. Nor can a man until he feels in his heart that there is something greater than himself for which he must live—not until he gets some truth, some cause that he loves more than his very life—not until then does he understand the meaning of life. And this was the virtue of our friend. He had an open mind. He had a tender heart. And one day there came along a man who taught him a truth. And our friend says that it was because of blindness to that truth that there is so much of injustice and poverty in the world. And then

it became his mission in life not to make money, not to win fame, but to teach that truth. Why, one or two such men as he in this community have manifestly, to one like myself who comes as a visitor, created a distinctive atmosphere here of intelligence and sympathy. What a monument he has left himself—a monument of brothers and sisters who knew him and whose minds have been opened and whose hearts have been touched by the gospel of justice and love that he preached! What a fearful thing it is for us men and women to consider chiefly our own needs day by day, to feel no deep concern for the world's suffering, to have no real part in the great world's struggle, to have no real kinship with the prophets, but to be just so much dead human material, eating and sleeping and gathering gold and waiting to die! But thank God there are always a few such as our friend to speak to those who have ears to hear, to plead with those who have hearts to feel, to call us away from that life of living death up into the plane of companionship with the prophets, with those men and women who seek the important truths of their time, who feel the wrongs of their day and who know that the very best they can get out of life is that they should be a part of the real living forces of their own generation, making for religiousness and for the kingdom of God upon earth.

Ah, my friends, men and women are full of the memories of him. Let us teach ourselves that we shall no longer go through life indifferent to the words of the prophets, calloused to the suffering of our fellows, but that more searchingly than ever before, for his sake and for our own, we will ask ourselves, "What is truth?" And we will pray, "Teach us to know the truth, that the truth may make us free." Oh, let it not in any port be said by the wave billows that some light failed on a certain stormy night to shine brightly at the harbor head. Let seamen, by whatever coast they come, call out to each other as they pass by, "Trim the lamps! Let rays ever burn high! There are no lights to spare! There are no lights to spare!"

TAXES upon goods are taxes upon labor.

DEATH OF MICHAEL FLURSCHEIM.

The news of the death of Michael Flurschein in Berlin on April 24 comes to us almost as a personal loss. For we at once recall, not what seemed to us his irritating lapses from clear thinking which made him a protectionist and advocate of land nationalization, but the delightfully sweet and gentle tone of many communications to the REVIEW which disarmed hostility and made us wish that the views he held were the possession of some less rare and lovable personality.

Yet spite of all his curious reasoning which led him to discard truths which to us seem so obvious, it may be gratefully acknowledged that the German movement for the restoration of man's equal rights to the earth—which is now finally directed into a far different channel than Mr. Flurschein would have chosen, owes much to his early teachings. From the consideration of the paramount importance of the land question to all other questions he, at all events, never wavered. His "Clue to the Economic Labyrinth"—a characteristic title, for it was owing to a peculiar intellectual bent that he could not see the forest for the trees—a volume of over 500 pages, contains much that is valuable though much, too, that is curiously self-revealing as to his limitations.

Now is not the time, however, to indicate these intellectual shortcomings. It is enough to say that after long years of untiring and unselfish service to what he deemed the truth a most sweet and gracious spirit has passed from among us. Let us give to his memory something of the great and patient love he gave the world.

THE more land speculators get the less land workers get.

THE more shoddy in the coat the more "protection to wool."

A TAX on improvements on land is a fine on all the virtues.

JEFFERSON DINNER OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.

A splendidly successful dinner in celebration of the birthday of Thomas Jefferson—the club's twenty-sixth celebration of this event so momentous in the history of democracy—was given at Kalill's, this city, on the night of April 13th. There were close to three hundred present.

Miss Grace Isabel Colbron acted as toastmaster, and made announcements of coming meetings under the auspices of the Club. She also read the following telegram from Mr. Fels to Mayor Newton Baker, of Cleveland:

Hon. NEWTON BAKER, Mayor,

"Papers announce Committee to-day deciding nature of memorial to Tom L. Johnson. In Tom's name, were he alive, and for those believing as he did in equal opportunity and economic freedom, I protest against other monument than the use of memorial funds to bring about the Single Tax and consequently destruction of special privilege. If this only appropriate course be taken, I agree to double the amount of subscriptions up to \$100,000.

Tom. L. Johnson worked for a great principle. To further that principle is the only memorial worth while.—JOSEPH FELLS.

Miss Colbron then introduced as the first speaker of the evening George L. Rusby, who gave a most interesting address, illustrating his points by charts printed upon canvass. He stated that Belgium had 600 inhabitants to the square mile, the United States 27, and Canada only 2. Yet in every one of these countries the same condition of overcrowding prevails. If Mr. Ryan (who was then aiding Mr. Rusby in exhibiting the charts) owned all the land of any country, that country would be overcrowded. Mr. Rusby exhibited one chart on which were painted the economic definitions given in *Progress and Poverty*, and said that if Henry George had done nothing but formulate these definitions he would have immortalized himself.

Rev. Harris R. Cooley gave one of the best addresses ever heard at a Single Tax dinner. It was a revelation of the intellectual and moral strength of the man selected

by Tom Johnson as his Commissioner of Charities, and showed how wisely the great mayor of Cleveland had chosen. Speaking of a certain congested section of this metropolis, he said that if all the inhabitants of the world were crowded into the State of Delaware there would be less congestion than in this one metropolitan district. He quoted some striking lines from Locksley Hall, and said "These are not the words of a social agitator, but the poet laureate of England." Mr. Cooley told of the work in Cleveland under the new ideals that had been inaugurated in that city by its late mayor and the men whom with splendid prescience he had surrounded himself. The address was enlivened by many touches of real humor, and was a talk to be long remembered by those who heard it.

Hon. William H. Berry, once State treasurer and one of the radical leaders in Pennsylvania, in the course of a speech vigorously delivered, said "There is not a title to a single piece of land that is not written in the life-blood of humanity. Either that, or legal cajollery has been the means of denying to the masses of men their equal rights to the use of the earth. The Single Tax as proclaimed by Henry George provides a remedy. The Single Tax is scientific. If any one denies this it is because he does not know anything about it. It is not necessary to say this to those here assembled. You know more about the Single Tax than I do. In looking in your faces I recognize those from whom I have learned nearly all I know about it."

Charles Frederick Adams, the concluding speaker, took occasion to defend the lawyers from the half-humorous attack of Mr. Berry, and mentioned the names of many eminent Single Taxers of the legal profession who have done splendid service to-day and in the past for the cause we have at heart.

The dinner ended at about eleven o'clock, and the committee of arrangements of the Manhattan Single Tax Club are to be congratulated on another very successful affair. These dinners, of which this is the third, have been notable for the fact that at least fifty per cent. of those present were not Single Taxers. Many of them for the first time heard the gospel of economic re-

form strongly presented by two of the speakers, Messrs Rusby and Cooley, and met the men who for a generation have upheld the banner of the cause that is nearing its triumph. Too much praise cannot be given the committee and the hustling, persistent and self-effacing president of the Club, Mr. John T. McRoy.

TWO LIBERATORS.

(For the Review.)

There rose a man with a mighty heart,
 In the days when they shackled men;
 And the bondsman's fetters were riven
 apart,
 By a stroke of his noble pen.
 And a hundred millions bless his name;
 And though empires pass away,
 The years shall add to his crown of fame,
 Till the hour of the world's decay.
 But a subtler bondage the freeman feels;
 For a lash in the despot's hand
 Is the parchment crime that so foully steals
 The right to the people's land.
 But one has dared for the truth to plead,
 And for freedom to live and die;
 He has torn the veil from the face of greed,
 And has branded the ancient lie.
 And in days of triumph to come, I ween,
 When the tale is told again,
 By Lincoln's side shall the form be seen
 Of the man who stood for men.

—JAMES F. MORTON, Jr.

Our readers and friends of the cause everywhere are asked to bear in mind that we are greatly in need of help for the REVIEW. Send in your orders and contributions, and bear in mind that we still have thousands of copies of the Vancouver and Edmonton numbers and it is not too late to distribute them. We will make special offers to any one taking these in one thousand lots.

THE more land sells for the less working-men and women get for themselves.

NEWS—DOMESTIC.

RHODE ISLAND.

A brief statement of the salient features of the Rhode Island "Tax Act of 1912," will be of some interest to the readers of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

It was enacted after three years of consideration and modification by a commission appointed to prepare it.

The law provides for a State Tax Commission of three members, which is composed of two Republicans and one Democrat. That portion of the State taxes which has heretofore been paid into the State treasury by the cities and towns has been lessened, by reducing the rate from 18 mills to 9 mills. The Chairman of the Tax Commission is desirous of removing entirely this State tax upon municipalities, and then, he says, the objection to local option in taxation will be removed. Hereafter taxable property is to be listed by the towns and cities in four separate columns, to wit: Land, buildings and other improvements, tangible personalty, intangible personalty. The rate upon intangible personal property is fixed by law at the low rate of four-tenths of one per cent.

Many of the influential business men who favor local option in taxation said this year, Let us wait to see how the new law works before making another change. Nevertheless, the following bill was introduced:

It is enacted by the General Assembly as follows:

Section 1. Towns and cities may exempt from taxation buildings and other improvements, or tangible personal property, or both; Provided, the same be voted at a legal meeting of the electors of the town, or at a legal meeting of the city council; and, provided, further, that any exemption so made shall continue for a period of ten years and until otherwise voted.

Section 2. When any town or city shall exempt any class of property from taxation, as provided in the preceding section, said town or city may assess its ratable per centum of its ratable value: Provided

intangible personal property shall be taxed at four-tenths of one per centum of its assessed valuation.

Section 3. This act shall take effect immediately.—LUCIUS F. C. GARVIN, Lonsdale, R. I.

WICHITA, KANSAS.

CHARLES FREDERICK ADAMS' WORK IN THAT CITY.

Single Taxers and others in Wichita recently enjoyed a visit from Mr. Charles Frederick Adams.

He spoke first to some two hundred men comprising the Bible Class at St. Paul's Church. The next evening he spoke under the auspices of the Equal Suffrage Association, most interestingly and effectively presenting the democracy of equal suffrage. His third evening here was marked by a splendid address of nearly three hours rapid delivery, full of telling points and graphic illustrations, including a statement of Single Tax experience thus far enjoyed by certain municipalities and a general statement of the progress of the reform. Mr. Adams' lecture was followed by answers to numerous questions and evidently with satisfaction to his hearers.

Mr. Adams' lectures were in sharp contrast to those made under the auspices of local socialists which took place at about the same time. Comparisons are of course odious, but are useful and in this case particularly so as illustrating the high intellectual order of the men who speak for the Single Tax, and the absence of study or keen analysis on the part of those who speak for the socialists.

I attended two of the socialist's meetings and they were absolutely void of any useful suggestion or definite programme, excepting the good showing that was made for results that were not in themselves socialism; namely, the economy of public ownership of public utilities, which has been a part of the Single Tax programme from the first.

A week before Mr. Adams' visit, Wichita was favored by the presence of Mr. and Mrs. Raymond Robins of Chicago. While it is true that Mr. Robins spoke

only under the auspices of Men and Religion Forward Movement and Mrs. Robins spoke only under the auspices of the Equal Suffrage people, nevertheless they both made effectual pleas for the very best and highest form of democracy. That after all is what the Single Tax means. As a matter of fact, Mr. Robins made a profound impression upon the minds of the thousands of men he addressed during the week and created a decided sentiment toward the Single Tax although not using the name. It is perhaps natural that the writer wished that it might have been possible for Mr. Robins to have supplemented his splendid preparatory work by simply letting his hearers know that in his opinion the Single Tax was the way out of so much that interferes with true Christian life so far as society is concerned.

Mr. Adams' visit, like the previous visit of Mr. John C. White, has been of great good in bringing to the surface interest in the Single Tax. In my twenty-five years' experience in propaganda work, there has never been a time when the proposition is so quickly accepted as at present. There is evidence that the preliminary work has been done well and effectually. If put to a vote, I am sure the Single Tax proposition would carry, and that we therefore have good reason to expect victories in Missouri and Oregon this Fall.—HENRY WARE ALLEN.

PROGRESSIVE EFFORTS IN MARYLAND.

Advocates of Direct Legislation and tax reform have had a busy time here this year. The legislature favorably reported our Initiative and Referendum bill out of Committee and a canvas showed a majority of supporters in the House. The sentiment however was not strong enough to withstand the opposition of the floor leaders and the measure lost by six votes on its second reading.

A constitutional amendment permitting classification of property for taxation was put through the House but was unfortunately held up in committee of senate.

Joseph Fels recently stimulated Single Tax interest in Baltimore by addressing

the City Council, the real estate exchange and several other bodies; and Charles Frederick Adams, of the Henry George Lecture Association, spent several days here last week, getting in some most effective work.

Mr. Adams addressed the Political Economy Class at the John Hopkins University. He also spoke before the Advertising Club and the Real Estate Exchange on "Commission Form of Government"; and before the Builders Exchange, the Baltimore Chapter, American Banking Institute, and the Federation of Labor on "Rational Tax Reform."

Everywhere he met with responsive audiences, and caused an eager demand for literature including the sale of a number of George's works.

The visits of such men are an inspiration to the Single Taxers and have a wide educational effect upon the community.—
CHAS. J. OGLEB, Baltimore, Md.

OREGON.

The situation in Oregon is beginning to warm up in good shape for an educational campaign on Single Tax principles.

Backed by one of the banking houses of the Standard Oil and one of the big land grabbing families a very active campaign against the Single Tax is being carried on by Charles H. Shields, a grain agent and lawyer of Seattle, whose financial backers in business have been this same "Standard Oiled" bank. He wins the first round with the adoption of a ridiculous and illogically worded set of resolutions against the Single Tax by the Oregon State Grange. He is flooding the State with a yellow-backed novel full of silly and contradictory bugaboo statements, skillfully worded so as to catch the prejudices of the people. An amendment repealing county home rule taxation and forever forbidding the Single Tax is being actively circulated. The opponents are compelling the question to be discussed and they are badly frightened

and thoroughly unprincipled and unscrupulous.

The Grange was "bamboozled" by two country lawyers and the Seattle lawyer, all agents for big landed interests, who got together on a resolution committee and put through in the last hours some of the queerest economic matter ever concocted. Among other resolutions this precious gang put over was one declaring that in order to permit the vast water power of the State to be used in industry it should not be taxed!

The Oregon Grange allows to lawyers, real estate speculators, and professional men the right of membership, and around the cities and town they have quietly worked their way in the last few years to places of power and vantage. Many of the Grangers around Portland have become wealthy in recent years through the enormous development of the city, and they dread any change in taxation. The country Granger is uninformed, his prejudices against the Single Tax excited and his ignorance intensified when possible. Against this steady and deliberate campaign of misrepresentation and absurdity the Single Taxers have not been able to organize thoroughly, relying from necessity on literature that could not be accompanied with personal explanation very much.

The graduated Single Tax amendment is receiving signatures rapidly and will soon be ready for filing. It provides for a graduated tax on land values over \$10,000 belonging to any one person; for taxation of water power, corporation franchises, and for the separate listing of improvements. A man having \$100,000 in land values assessed to him would pay a special tax in addition to regular local revenues of \$1,150. On all over that sum at the rate of \$30 per \$1,000. All improvements and personal property are exempt from taxation, except by vote of people of county.

This measure meets with approval from every man who is not a big speculative holder, or is not so color-blind

and rabid against the principles of the Single Tax as to be incapable of reasoning on any thing connected with the term.

The great weakness of the opposition to the idea of land value taxation is that they have to defend the present system. This they are endeavoring to get around by proposing through the State tax commission four measures, one of which will exempt a limited amount of household furniture, and perhaps tools and machinery.

When the opponents of the Single Tax get to submitting exemption measures we have only to keep up the fight to get them to enlarge the exemptions. A few years ago the proposal to exempt household furniture and farm machinery was opposed as an insidious scheme to slip in Single Tax. Now it is being considered as a splendid thing to head it off with. And thus we move.—

ALFRED D. CRIDGE, Portland, Oregon.

THE MOVEMENT IN PITTSBURG.

The purpose of this communication is to lend encouragement to Single Taxers in other localities who may be inclined to feel discouraged at times over the results they are accomplishing. Pittsburg is a peculiar city for propaganda work of this kind. There are, to be sure, just as clear minded and progressive citizens in Pittsburg as can be found in any other city. The fact that this industrial center is regarded as reactionary in political and economic matters is not due to any inherent fault in its human equipment. Pittsburg is receiving a constant stream of boys and girls from the country, and they are made of the same material as the boys and girls that help make up the population of other cities. Moreover, this city has just as many big and public spirited men as can be found in any American city of like size. This has been proven on several occasions when disasters such as the Johnstown Flood and the San Francisco Earthquake have visited other cities. At such times Pittsburg is always to the front with the most substantial kinds of

aid. Charitable institutions, too, fare as well if not better here than in most cities. All this goes to show that the human material of Pittsburg in the rough is much the same as in other places, and that if the surface is scratched the individuals will be found to be about the same as they are elsewhere.

Why is it then that Pittsburg, which moves so fast industrially, is so slow to advance politically? Why is it that we see economic advantages only after they are tried by others? My answer is—Pittsburg newspapers. It is my firm conviction that in no city of the United States are the newspapers so completely and abjectly under the domination of the great corporations. Reporters complain that they are not allowed to tell the truth on matters that are in the least unfavorable to the Interests. They are taught that corporations are sacred and must not be criticized adversely, lest "business" be disturbed. And unrelenting are these corporations in their punishment of a local newspaper that gives the least indication of insurgency. For example, only a few months ago the newspapers began to complain bitterly about the street car service. The Street Car Company gave their "orders" and every paper hushed up at once, except one. That newspaper, however, discovered in a few days that the Street Car Company would not carry its papers. The case was carried into court where it was decided that the Street Car Company was not a "common carrier," and therefore could not be compelled to carry the papers in question. The newspaper then bought automobiles and delivered its own papers, but after several months trial this proved too expensive, so it decided to cease its attacks on the Street Car Company, and as a result their papers are again hauled on street cars. It might also be interesting to know that since then not a word of complaint has appeared in any of our newspapers about our intolerable street car service.

Of course this same condition exists to a certain degree in every city, but the point I wish to make is that in no other city are the columns of the newspapers so thoroughly antagonistic to fundamental economic

ideas as they are in Pittsburgh. They do, to be sure, deal with economic subjects morning and evening, but in the most superficial kind of way, always very careful never to go to the meat. This kind of news poured into the readers' minds daily could have but one effect, and that is to produce a crop of superficial economic thinkers.

In such a community with the columns of the newspapers closed to Single Tax ideas, missionary work does not offer a rosy path. But, in spite of all such obstacles Single Tax has, and is, making progress in the "Smoky City." It is now my purpose to tell how this is being done. On account of the press being antagonistic, it was necessary to reach the people through other channels. The Boards of Trade, Chamber of Commerce, and other civic organizations seemed to offer the best alternative avenue. The few original Single Taxers, ever filled with enthusiasm in their cause, set out to induce every such club and organization in the city to listen to Single Tax orators of national reputation. After no little effort they persuaded a few of these organizations to engage such men as John Z. White, Henry George Jr., Chas. Frederick Adams, Herbert S. Bigelow, and Peter Witt, of the Henry George Lecture Association. Some of these men were secured for a week at a time and thereby reached several hundred of the most representative citizens on each visit. At first these speakers were admitted to the civic organizations not because the members had any faith in what the lecturers advocated, but simply because they preached something new, and for this reason would entertain and relieve the monotony of the regular programmes. But when these men address an audience of fairly rational beings they rarely leave without compelling them to think. They do more than amuse; they instruct and somehow leave a desire with their audiences to be heard again. This of course renders the next engagement easier to arrange. Nearly every civic organization has heard several of these men and the results have been effective in placing the entering wedge for a more general education on the subject of taxation.

But it requires more than a week of

campaigning now and then to further a great cause. It is necessary that the battle be continuous, without the slightest disposition to recede. Just this very thing is being done by a local band of young workers and orators who never fail to expound the Single Tax theory on the slightest provocation. Sometimes it is in the men's clubs, in the Y. M. C. A. meetings, in the Bible classes; at other times on the street corner or the political platform. These young men believe in Single Tax as they do in a great religion. There are about 40 of them and their number is growing. Some day, not far off, if not already, they will exert a potent influence in the economic affairs of the city. Even now results of their incessant campaigning augmented by the help of men with national reputations, are being felt. They never fail to impress their ideas on the city officials and men of influence whenever the opportunity permits, and they even force the subject when perhaps the etiquette of the occasion does not require it. The constant hammering of their arguments has produced returns. It could first be discerned in the public reports of the city officials, although few if any of them realized that they were leaning toward the Single Tax. The mayor, who has all along been regarded as a reactionary, succeeded, because of his political influence in the State, in getting a most salutary law on taxation through the last legislature. Previous to that time Real Estate in Pittsburgh and all second class cities in the State, was classed for the purpose of local taxes as "Built up," on which a full assessment was levied: "Rural," on which an assessment of $\frac{3}{4}$ its value was made, and "Agricultural," which was assessed at $\frac{1}{2}$ its value. Because of the Single Tax ideas which had been so persistently urged upon the mayor, he saw the injustice of such an iniquitous system of taxation and how serious a block it was to the progress of Pittsburgh. The new law abolishes this classification and provides that all real estate in cities of the second class be assessed at its full value. This has caused a howl from the vacant land holders, but it can be observed already that they are more desirous to dispose of

Some of their vacant lots. The Mayor also succeeded in having the last Legislature enact a law exempting machinery from local taxation in cities of the second class. These two laws increasing the taxes on vacant land and exempting machinery, is a promising step toward the Single Tax plan, and is convincing proof that the campaign in Pittsburgh is bearing fruit. In addition to this the Keystone party, the most dangerous rival of the great Republican machine in the State, had a plank in its platform last fall providing that assessments on all improvements in cities of the second class for local purposes be reduced 10% annually for five years, and that a corresponding increase be made on land value assessments. This afforded the Single Tax spellbinder a splendid opportunity to explain the advantages of his reform at every political gathering, whether it was on the street corner, in the school house, or the public hall. The Pittsburgh Civic Commission, a non-partisan organization, has since approved a plan for a gradual decrease of assessments on improvements and a corresponding increase on land values, until the assessment on land equals twice that on improvements.

All this campaign of education is being done by members of the Single Tax Association. This organization is growing gradually and systematically. Each ward has a Chairman, whose principal duty is to locate an active Single Taxer in every voting precinct of his ward. If no such man can be found the Chairman sets about to explain the Single Tax to some open minded voter in such precinct. When he is "converted" he is assigned to propagate the doctrine in his precinct. The ward chairmen meet weekly and report new converts or any Single Taxers "discovered" in their wards. These names with addresses are recorded on a large sheet showing every ward and voting precinct in the city. This force, distributed so systematically through the city, produces a powerful working machine; a force that is active continually and easily mobilized whenever needed for any concentrated effort. It will therefore be seen that the doctrine can be spread in a great city, even when

the press refuses its aid. All that is needed are a few young men who are imbued with the great truth revealed by this system of taxation. I say young men, because I believe they preach more earnestly and with greater vigor and convictions than older men. I heard a great political leader say not long ago, "Give me 40 young men of the right kind of stuff and I can sweep the Political Boss out of any city in the United States." We have that many young men in Pittsburgh who are Single Taxers, and what is more they are made of the right stuff. They are fighting with all the intensity of soldiers in a just cause and they will never halt until Pittsburgh has been converted to Single Tax, for they are imbued with the spirit revealed by Henry George in these words:

"The truth that I have tried to make clear will not find easy acceptance. If that could be, it would never have been obscured. But it will find friends—those who will toil for it; suffer for it: if need be, die for it. This is the power of Truth."

—BERNARD B. MCGUINNIS.

HIGH PRAISE OF HERBERT BIGELOW FROM W. J. BRYAN.

President Bigelow is not under any misapprehension as to the responsibilities of leadership. When in recognition of his long fight for the initiative and referendum, he was made President of the Ohio constitutional convention, he did not deem it his duty to quit fighting.

On the contrary, he fights the harder. He takes the floor whenever necessary to carry out the policies which gave him the Presidency. He leads, and this leadership will be a tower of strength to the progressive cause.

If Ohio were urging him for the presidential nomination, the Democratic Party might think it wise to turn to that State for leadership. Bigelow would make not only a strong candidate, but an admirable executive.—The *Commoner*.

THE more charity the longer deferred is justice.

COMMUNICATIONS.

TAXING WHAT WONT BE THERE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. Bolton Hall's article in the Jan.-Feb. number again directs attention to the question of valuation. It was Henry George who first pointed out that a percentage of rent might be left to landowners. But that was clearly on the understanding that the land owner performed a useful function in exchange. The whole paragraph is as follows, from Chap. 2 Book 8, Progress and Poverty:

"Nor to take rent for public uses is it necessary that the State should bother with the letting of lands, and assume the chances of favoritism, collusion, and corruption that might involve. It is not necessary that any new machinery should be created. The machinery already exists. Instead of extending it all we have to do is to simplify and reduce it. By leaving to landowners a percentage of rent, which would probably be less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through State agency, and by making use of this existing machinery, we may, without jar or shock, assert the common right to land by taking rent for public uses."

Whether the tax is on the rent or on the capital value of land is a detail. The same trouble about the apparent disappearance of the capital value when a tax is imposed, would arise about the disappearance of the rent, so far as the private land rent receiver was concerned, if part, or the whole of the rent were appropriated for public uses.

So far as I am concerned, and I think it is the view of Single Taxers generally, the great thing is to have revenue raised from land values. If the Government of a country prefers imposing a tax on land rent, well and good, or if it prefers the capital value by all means let it go ahead.

In Australia the imposition of the tax on the capital value is general. It has not been imposed on the rent in a single instance even in cases where land is leased from the Crown the rent is capitalized for assessment purposes. At the same time a number of Single Taxers think it will

eventually be a tax on the annual rent rather than on the capital value.

Shortly after rating on unimproved values was generally adopted in N. S. W. I drew attention to the question of valuation. I pointed out that steps would have to be taken to meet the difficulty mentioned by Mr. Hall. If the capital value of land is to be the basis of taxation then in addition to excluding the value of improvements in or on the land the effect of the tax must also be excluded.

The need of the taxing body is the true value upon which to levy the tax. If the fair average value of a piece of land is \$1,000 when there is no land value tax, and the owner is appropriating the rent, clearly it cannot be less when the State or municipality shares the rent with the landowner. The value is there just the same, but the owner could only capitalize and sell the proportion of value from which he draws rent.

If the tax is 3%, then the selling value so far as the owner is concerned is \$400, but the real taxable value is still \$1,000. Exclude the effect of the tax just as you would exclude the value of improvements in making the assessment and no trouble will arise over using the capital value.

Eventually, as the tax increases, it may be found more convenient to eliminate capital values and use the rental value basis. I don't think it would be wise to even attempt such a change at present. The rental value, which in this country has been assessed on land and improvements taken together, under the old system of rating has such a bad reputation that caution is necessary.

Returning to Mr. Hall's example. Suppose the \$1,000 block was taxed 3% and the selling value automatically fell to \$400, then the assessors to get their \$30 revenue might make the tax $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ on \$400, and yet that $7\frac{1}{2}\%$ would not further lessen the selling value of the land, that is the selling value of the proportion still owned by the landowner.

Or suppose 4% is imposed and the selling value of the remaining proportion of the landowner would be \$200. That would give \$40 revenue. In order to continue receiving \$40 the rate of the tax on the

\$200 valuation would be 20%. The simpler plan would be to keep the valuation at \$1,000 by capitalizing the rate of the tax at 5%.—A. G. HUIE, Sydney, New South Wales, Australia.

WHERE ARE THE NINE?

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

And Jesus answering said, "Were there not ten cleansed? but where are the nine?"
—BIBLE.

The story of the ten lepers, relieved of a loathsome disease and the return of but one of them to give thanks to God for his deliverance, is a story that might be repeated many times in the history of world reform.

Human society has ever been afflicted with the leprosy of unjust conditions. From history's pages we can learn of the lives and preachments of various saviors and reformers, who have been successful in cleansing the minds of some of their hearers, but have they not also asked, where are the nine? when confronted by the very few who return to give thanks and service. Where the "one" has returned giving thanks and proffering service, have not the "nine" generally been forgetful of the benefits received, and gone back to the pest holes of selfish desire or easy beds of indifference? They cease to care for their uncleansed brothers and sisters, who sit in darkness and amid the dangers of infection.

For 30 years there has been preached a doctrine of salvation for society. A remedy has been offered which will absolutely cure the leprous growths from which society suffers.

This remedy is a simple easy one like the remedy given by the ancient prophet to the man of war, and, like it again, at first rejected because of its simplicity.

Our diseased society merely wants a bath in the waters of justice and equal opportunity, but how often has the appeal been answered by saying, are not the laws which repress vice and give unlimited chance for the display of almsgiving much better than your remedy, that would disturb the equanimity of our contented

privileged classes, and that would place on the pedestal of honor the true dignity of Labor.

Since this remedy has been given to the world hundreds of thousands of people have heard of its simplicity and practicability. Tens of thousands throughout the world have heard, understood, and believed in its efficacy, but how many of them have returned to give thanks and to glorify the cause of Justice by praying, striving, and doing, for the establishment of God's Kingdom on Earth?

Is it not evident that the "one" who did return to give thanks had, as it were, a vision of a Heaven on earth? Did he not reason that if this Great Physician could cure him of his uncleanness, He could also cure others, and he would devote his life to bringing others to the great Healer.

This is the spirit which should animate the Single Taxer. The knowledge of the Single Tax has relieved him from the blind diseased state in which he formerly stumbled, while deliriously calling on the false Gods of repression and expediency, then why should he not now, cleansed and pure, devote his life to bringing his brothers into the presence and understanding of the only plan that will heal and bless society?

Let us look over the world to-day. We can see the wage worker working hand in hand with the millionaire employer. We can see the Christian, the Jew, and the unbeliever, coming together in a close bond of friendship for the holy cause of freedom and opportunity. These are the few, who have returned after their deliverance to glorify God by preaching His Fatherhood, and the possibility of the brotherhood of man.

But where are the nine? If you tell me that these few are the only converts made by the earnest labor of consecrated souls who for 30 years have labored for the Single Tax, I cannot believe it. I feel sure that behind the scenes of the World's stage, sealed in the cozy corners of contented homes, in the pulpit, the political arena, the commercial bodies, in the Young Men's societies, there are many whose minds have been "cleansed" They have just as much reason for returning and for giving thanks

(perhaps more) than the one who did return in thankfulness and the desire to serve, but desire for wealth and advancement, with a fear of being called a crank or visionary, often deters them from exhibiting a sense of gratitude, but more often they refuse to give thanks and service because they profess to believe that this reform is for the future, and while all men have a right to life, liberty, land, and the pursuit of happiness, the time is not ripe for any display of force or self sacrifice. To all such followers of the example set by the "nine," let me say they are mistaken. Already, in various parts of the world, land value taxation is being discussed, and it only requires "a pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether," to manufacture a sentiment that will make the heretofore muddled brains of the politician and statesman become clarified, and they will hasten to uphold or denounce our remedy. It matters little which of these two positions they may take; indifference is what we should fear.

Again I ask, "Where are the nine?" If there be any within reach of this appeal, let me implore them to throw away the graceless ingratitude of the nine "lepers," stop deluding yourselves that peace can be maintained, while deadly implacable war is the enforced attitude of the great forces engaged in production. Discard the cold indifference and the false idea of security and come back with the song of thanksgiving, and with the resolve to bring your friends, your shopmates, your brothers and sisters into the great healing atmosphere of the economic gospel whose light has been revealed to you.

This work may become hard and exacting, you may often feel discouraged at the ignorance or indifference of the mentally diseased creatures you seek to benefit, but I can promise that from all this you will be able to rise with a renewed assurance in the goodness and greatness of God or Nature, and a firmer belief in the higher nature of man, and with abiding faith in the lasting ties of brotherhood—when just conditions are established.

This belief and hope will make you glory in the work. No matter how much you do for the advancement of our glorious

cause, the only sighs you will utter will be sighs of regret that you were not able to do more, and when that day comes, which must come to us all, the "glazing eye," may not hide from you the vision of an embryo world, where want and poverty are fast disappearing, where peace and happiness have taken up their residence, where the "lepers," children of unjust conditions, are replaced by strong, healthy men, born of independence and opportunity, in a society safe from the winds and storms of Anarchy, and founded on the enduring rock of Justice.—OLIVER Mc-KNIGHT.

LABOR PAYS FOR ALL.

If money is bookkeeping then it never can pay for anything in the true sense, but labor pays for everything. If labor pays for everything it pays as it goes along, the labor of the present, never the labor of the future. It then follows that all taxes are self-paying. By this I do not mean that bridges, roads and public buildings build themselves, that armies, navies, policemen and judges feed and clothe themselves, or that taxes are not a burden. Taxes, being paid by labor, are a burden or a blessing exactly in the proportion that labor is a burden or a blessing. But the fiscal system, the system of finance and taxation, in proportion as it is good or bad, civilized or barbaric, scientific or crude and chaotic, has very much to do with making taxes a burden or a blessing.

With the institution of the right system of finance and the right system of taxation, there exists the potentiality of practically abolishing poverty, and producing in the life time of one generation, a value in wealth and improvements greater than the value of all the gold and silver mined.—From a lecture by WM. B. Du Bois, of Bayonne, N. J., on Money, reported in the Bayonne Times.

MR. P. A. PARKER, Single Taxer of Volanta, Alabama, has been appointed tax commissioner by the Governor for Baldwin County.

FROM AN ENGLISH SINGLE TAXER.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

In the January-February number of the REVIEW, pp., 58, 59, 60, Mr. Bolton Hall argues for taxing rental value of land rather than capital or selling value, and sets out a table which seems to show the absurdity of levying land value taxation upon an assessment of selling values of land. What we are coming to understand in this country is that as we push on with land value taxation we shall have to get the taxable amount of land value in any year by taking the selling value of the land in that year and adding to that the capitalized amount of the tax on land value in the preceding year, or, if we take the true annual value of land as our basis, we shall have to do what amounts to the same thing, deduce the true annual value of the land from the selling value (5% of it) and add the amount of the tax in the preceding year. After all, selling value of land is the one criterion which we can arrive at with accuracy.

To show the working of this method Mr. Bolton Hall's table may be amended thus—(rate of interest 5%, i. e., land sells at 20 year's purchase.)

	Hypothetical rental value	Per cent of tax on taxable amount	Amount of tax	Net return to owner(?=rental value)	Selling price	Taxable Amount
1st year.....	\$50	none	none	\$50	\$1000	\$1000
2nd "	50	3%	\$30	20	400	400+600
3rd "	50	4%	40	10	200	200+800
4th "	50	5%	50	0	0	\$1000

The actual selling price of land is in practice a much more ascertainable quantity than the theoretical "economic rent" (one has left out of account in this statement the effect of land value taxation in destroying the speculative element in land values and thus lowering the selling price of land much more than is suggested above.)—PERCY MCDUGALL, Manchester, Eng.

Do away with every tax on labor or its product. Then we will have prosperity.—Joseph Fels.

HOW MANY SINGLE TAXERS AGREE WITH MR. GATES?

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The fundamental principle of socialism is collective ownership of all of the means of production, both the land and the machinery. The fundamental principle of the Single Tax is common ownership of land. The Single Taxer believes that common ownership of land will produce a "regenerated capitalism?" Will it?

The Single Taxer says to the socialist; "You let me own all the land, and you take all the machinery, and in the course of time, I will own both the land, and the machinery. This proposition is susceptible of several variations. For instance; "Let the people own collectively all of the tools and machinery, while private individuals retain the ownership of the land, and in the course of time private individuals will own both the land and the machinery. In other words socialism constructed on the laws, that is by socializing the machinery, without socializing the land, would have a tendency to revert back to capitalism. Indeed it would not be socialism at all, but simply a sort of collective capitalism.

This proposition is susceptible of still

another variation. For instance, let the people own collectively all the land, and the private capitalist own all the machinery, and then, in the course of time, the people will own collectively both the land and the machinery. In other words, socialism in its fullness, "collective ownership of all of the means of production, both the land and the machinery," "To whomsoever the soil at any time belongs, to him belong the fruits thereof?" As the land goes, so goes all of the rest of the means of production.

The Single Tax route is the grand highway which socialism must travel in order

to attain its goal.—EDWARD GATES, Chicago, Ill.

natural opportunities are not monopolized, the rate is high.—A. FREELAND.

FROM A. FREELAND.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. Bolton Hall's objection to the principle of confining the Single Tax to the selling price of land seems sound.

Even in the United Kingdom, where the land is commonly measured in terms of its annual rent, there is danger of abandonment of that correct policy for the more precarious one of taxation of selling price.

Mr. Hall's position in regard to the effect of Single Tax on interest also seems to be well taken.

Today scarcely any man is so poor that he cannot command the primary tools—axe, saw, hammer, spade, shovel, fork, rake, etc.—practically the only tools used by his great-grandfather.

Surely under Single Tax almost anyone could command the ordinary implements of husbandry and horses and other needed stock, vehicles, etc.; also some of the other improved tools, etc.

In the larger business enterprises wouldn't it be perfectly natural for labor to co-operate and thus command the entire product—those possessing and exercising executive ability receiving the larger returns due to capacity for management?

If these propositions are correct, wouldn't the time come when many would be able and willing to lend and few would care to borrow—as is somewhat the case in New Zealand?

Then wouldn't the commercial rate of interest fall—as in New Zealand?

Wouldn't the returns due to the use of capital, as distinguished from the returns to toolless labor, (what we might call economic rent) be merged in the wages or income of labor?

This would in no way affect the economic rent of land. That would still be regulated by the "law of rent," as formulated by Ricardo.

Henry George drew his inference of higher interest rate under Single Tax from the fact that in new countries, where

H. D. WAGNON.

(See portrait.)

Hamilton D. Wagon was born near Salem, Oregon, in 1854. His parents came from Indiana the year before. As his name indicates his ancestors were German, originally settling in Virginia. He is a man above the usual height, of powerful frame and benevolent countenance. When quite a young man he worked in saw mills and on the farms of Oregon and knows all the old families up and down the State.

He went to California about 1874 and tried mining and prospecting, settling in San Francisco about 1876. Here he became interested in two things, insurance as a means of earning a living, and the land question from coming in contact with Henry George, and in those two things he has been interested ever since.

The Wagon family consists of H. D., Sr., and wife, H. H., Jr., and Miss Mabel. Both his children are Single Taxers and he says that both his grandchildren shall enjoy its blessings. He came back to Oregon in 1892 and has traveled all over the State in connection with his business, and as a promotor of manufacturing and other enterprises. Coming in contact with the professional and commercial classes his work has been peculiarly effective, for he never hesitates to avow his principles, and in the course of business transactions to point out a happy incident or adorn a local instance with a Single Tax application.

Anywhere in Oregon that the people of a town see a tall strong man with a big black hat coming down the street and shaking hands with the citizens they say, "here comes Single Tax Wagon. There must have been a fire around here, or else there is a Single Tax meeting to be pulled off." He has repeatedly gone to a hotel register and

written no name but "Single Taxer, Portland, Oregon" and everybody would know that "Wagnon is in town again."

In 1907 he was elected president of the Oregon Tax Reform League, rustled the money to finance the placing of a partial Single Tax measure on the ballot and for the literary campaign that was made. The measure was not adopted, but where the campaign was made by a few men and women able to make it the vote was large.

At present he is the Single Tax Independent candidate for assessor for Multnomah county (Portland) and his name was written on the democratic primary ballot often enough to give him the nomination of the party by a clear majority. He is not making a campaign for the office but the principle, and if elected it will be the spontaneous act of the people. There is no bluff, bluster, or display about the campaign, and the usual political "leg-pulling" is absent.

In the present campaign for the graduated Single Tax now opening up so hotly he is a very powerful factor, and his counsel is sought and heeded. A thousand more Wagnons are needed in Oregon.

AKRON, OHIO.

The Akron Single Tax League is not a new organization, but it has of late greatly increased its membership, and is attracting attention by its propaganda work. The president of the League is Albert C. Hollaway, a prominent attorney, and Wm. F. Potting is secretary. The league meets every alternate Tuesday in the Arcade Block, and it has lately established a Friday luncheon at the Windsor Hotel and we expect to secure a good speaker for a short address. The two affairs already held were very successful in point of attendance and interest.

Judge Samuel G. Rogers delivered the first address and Judge Charles R. Grant editor of the *Times* the second. At the evening meeting last month, Mr. Hosea Paul of Cleveland, delivered his address

on "Taxation and Social Progress." Mr. Paul was a farmer resident of Akron and was able to point out the benefit that the Single Tax would be to a growing city like Akron, especially in putting a stop to wild and riotous land speculation, which almost inevitably uses up all the spare cash of a community and finally brings about a panic. Such inflated values also prevent the normal and regular development of the city and drive people out into the suburbs ahead of street cars, sewers, etc.

NEWS—FOREIGN.

QUEENSLAND.

Our State is in the throes of as near to a general strike as it is possible to get. In the phrases of the strikers, "trade is paralyzed and the whole sea-board of Queensland from Cape York to Tweed heads is held up." All this because the Autocrat who rules the Brisbane Tram system (and who happens to be a Yankee) has issued a mandate that his employees must not wear Union Badges—all the rest is sympathy with them. I shall not be surprised to hear that the men have gone back to work on Monday without their badges, though they put up a splendid fight, and their cause is righteous. I hope it will teach them that *general strikes* are impossible—that freedom is not that way—that the only hope of a strike is when it is supported by those working; then the strikers may in some cases win a victory. The Queensland *Worker*, the organ of the Labor Party, is printing "Adam Blacks letters to his Son."—E. I. S. HARDING, Charters Towers, Queensland.

GERMANY—EISENACH.

Dr. F. Kuhner writes the *REVIEW* from Eisenach:

"The Thuringia branch of the German Bodenreform League is leading in number of members as well as in number of sections. In the two years since it sprang into existence an immense deal of work has been done. The leaders went up and down the mountainous country, holding conferences

and spreading Single Tax ideas where no word of them had ever been heard before. The greatest part of this work is due to the unrelenting energy of Mr. R. Diener, Gotha. You will grasp the whole difficulty of our propaganda if you consider that it takes more time to go from Eisenach to Rudolstadt or Coburg than to go to Berlin or Munich, and that nearly all our smaller towns are living in the proverbial ignorance of provincial towns as far as social problems are concerned. Let it be added, that a great many of the members are women, some of them leading the van, e. g., Miss Dr. Selma von Lengefeld in Weimar, who has done splendid service in speaking on "Women and Landreform," in different towns. Dr. Liebetrau, the lord mayor of Gotha, too, is a staunch landreformer and has largely promoted our principles by securing considerable tracts of land for his community."

THE MOVEMENT IN CHINA

Sun Yat Sen, the head of the new Chinese republic, is credited with saying he will "immediately start a propaganda for government control of railroads, mines, and similar industries, also for the Single Tax system, the short ballot and free trade." The "best government under the sun," as we call it, is getting some valuable hints from newer governments than itself, China, Australia, British Columbia and not the least from its own far western Oregon.—Chas. Hardon, in (Concord) *New Hampshire Patriot*.

THE German Emperor will be blessed by generations unborn for having made the first applications of Henry George's theory regarding land tenure. In Kiao Chow the Government has distinctly set its face against speculation in land.—The Children of the Nations, by Poultney Bigelow. To this work translated into German is attributed much of the progress made in that Empire in the taxation of the "un-earned increment."

THE "OLD GUARD" DINNER OF THE MANHATTAN SINGLE TAX CLUB.

The largest attendance at a Single Tax dinner in perhaps ten if not in twenty years signalized the Old Guard Dinner of the Manhattan Single Tax Club on Saturday, May 11. There were 343 men and women present, and many of those who had taken part in the great battles of 1886 and 1897 were there to listen to the war stories of the veterans of these campaigns.

Louis F. Post, the well beloved, told of the old days, reviewed the history of the movement, dwelt upon its present status, and told many apt and clever stories in his own inimitable way.

Henry George, Jr., spoke interestingly of his father's life, and Whidden Graham in a humorous way good naturedly lectured Single Taxers on their short comings in the past.

Sylvester Malone spoke of McGlynn and the Anti-Poverty Society. Dr. E. E. Bowen, who acted as toastmaster, performed her task acceptably, and the dinner was voted a great success by all who attended.

This meeting closed the series of dinners for the winter and spring season, and the club is to be congratulated upon the efficient and able administration of its president, John T. McRoy. Much has been done during the past year and hundreds of new members have joined the Club for active work.

The open air meetings under the general captaincy of Mrs. George Lloyd have now begun and it is the intention to hold from twenty to fifty meetings a week. Volunteers are wanted for this work, and those wishing to help are urged to write Mrs. Lloyd for assignments. Address her at club headquarters, 47 W. 42nd Street.

THE more prices advance for lots the less the chance for workingmen to get homes of their own.

IF any man comes to Oregon we now fine him more for building a home than for stealing a hog.

THE LAND VALUE TAX.

PORTION OF AN ADDRESS DELIVERED AT
KANSAS CITY, MO., BEFORE THE REAL
ESTATE BOARD BY A. A. WHIPPLE OF THE
WHIPPLE MCMILLAN REALTY CO.

Land speculation has absorbed, and is still absorbing, our available capital to such an extent that it is almost impossible to secure any capital for the most worthy and promising manufacturing enterprise.

Within the past two years, nearly seven million dollars have been paid for property along the Belt Line, and with the exception of that received by factories, which were by it displaced, as far as I know, not one dollar has been invested in any kind of a manufacturing enterprise. Can you imagine what the effect would have been if this seven million dollars had been devoted to manufacturing?

Those of you who were here at the time the Kingan Packing Co., Schwarzchild & Sulsberger and Swift & Co., established their packing plants here know what then happened. A great growth of the city then began.

Taxes are now assessed upon Adam Smith's visionary theory of "payment in proportion to ability to pay." This is as though you were to be charged \$50 for a suit of clothes worth but \$25, because you were able to pay \$50 for it and they talk about it being done upon an equal basis in proportion to wealth. What is the effect? Taxes are laid on land, on improvements, on all kinds of personal property, upon the capital of the banks, on the stocks of merchants, on the raw material and the finished product of manufacturers. Various and sundry licenses are charged; the farmer and the market gardener are held up for bringing farm and garden products to town, and the huckster must contribute to the city's revenue before he can peddle "oranges and bananas" upon the street.

What is the result? Although the law explicitly provides that land, improvements, and personal property, shall be assessed at their full value, land is assessed at about 25 per cent., improvements at about 40 per cent. and personal property, when truthfully returned, at 100 per cent.,

but generally at from nothing up to 20 per cent. If our real estate notes were assessed according to law they would pay a tax of 2.95 per cent; which means that a six per cent. mortgage would then yield less than a government bond. Our banks, instead of contributing \$187,000 would contribute some \$550,000 to \$600,000. This is the only civilized country in the world which imposes a tax upon personal property.

A personal property tax is bad, very bad. First, because it leads to perjury and fraud; secondly, because it rests principally upon consumption; thirdly, because, like a rolling snowball, it increases in size as it passes from manufacturer and from dealer to dealer, each adding his profit until unloaded upon the consumer, who is oblivious to the amount he pays. For instance, when you buy a pair of shoes you unconsciously return to the retailer in one big amount the personal taxes previously paid upon them by the farmer, the packer, the tanner, the manufacturer, the jobber and the retailer, plus a little profit to each. Nearly everything you and your family wear and eat pays a multiple tax in the same manner. Is it any wonder that the cost of living is high?

A SUGGESTION FOR THE SOCIAL SERVICE COMMISSION.

"Back to the land" has been the remedy from time immemorial for congestion of population. It is palliative if not remedial. For the most part these movements towards the land in the past have expressed themselves through emigration from one nation or continent to another. In America land colonies have been formed in various parts of the nation with varying degrees of success, while some have been failures.

The opening up of the new lands in the arid West through the operation of the Reclamation law, signed by Roosevelt, and under which for construction work over \$67,000,000 have thus far been expended, has been a remarkable and most praiseworthy undertaking, indirectly affording relief to the congestion of our population.

There is, however, a weakness in this

Reclamation law, as it now stands, in that its beneficiaries are almost entirely those who are from the middle classes of society (such as have at least \$1000 or \$2000 in hand before going on to the new land). No provision is made for the unfortunate persons who really have the most need of help, but who do not possess as much money as is now required. The vast sums of money which have been spent in reclamation projects must be returned to the government by the beneficiaries.

ENLARGEMENT OF RECLAMATION.

It is now proposed to extend the reclamation service (now limited to *arid* lands) to *swamp* and *overflow* lands, which are mainly found along the Mississippi River and its tributaries. Three bills have been introduced in Congress to accomplish this purpose. One of them was several years ago by ex-Senator Flint, of California, one by Senator Newlands, of Nevada, and one last June by Congressman Dupre, of Louisiana. So far as one can see by the reading of these bills their beneficiaries must be, as now, above the poverty line.

At the Reclamation Congress held in Chicago last December an organization was formed for the purpose of securing governmental aid in reclaiming swamp and overflow lands of which there are over 20,000,000 acres. "This means" says one writer, "something like \$4,000,000,000 in real estate plucked from the river. The water power, the sanitary redemption, the town sites—the value of all these should bring the whole to five billions."

HAS NOT THE CHURCH AN OPPORTUNITY HERE?

The organization which was formed in Chicago to push swamp reclamation was mostly composed of railroad officials and real estate dealers who are naturally looking for dividends. It would seem that right here is an opportunity presented for the church to show her love for the poor men of our cities by advocating that the law ere it pass, to reclaim the swamp and overflow lands, shall contain provisions whereby the very poor of *our own* citizens, if worthy, shall be the first beneficiaries of the act.

One can see no reason why our general government can not do as well by our poor as did New Zealand a few years ago for its unfortunates. It will be remembered that that island had tramps and beggars for a time, but now they have none, because of their successful colonization and land laws, which took their poor from their cities, advancing them transportation, buildings, etc., and started them at work upon small farms.

If this seems a reasonable scheme let me suggest that the reader write favoring the idea to his congressman, or to Hon. Joseph T. Robinson, chairman of the House Committee on the Public Lands, or Henry George, Jr., of the same committee.—JAMES P. CADMAN in the *Baptist Standard*, Chicago, Ill.

NATIONAL SYMPTOM OF UNREST.

Indeed, it would be unjust to English conditions to account for this uprising solely upon the ground of the grievances which merely gave occasion for it. It cannot be understood apart from the very prevalent unrest among the world's manual wage-workers to which it gave a local, yet national expression. Whatever the immediate occasions for this unrest may be in different lands, however the local situation and grievances may differ, whithersoever the movements of this unrest may tend under differing political and economic conditions, it has a common origin and a common goal. This world-wide unrest has its origin in the world-wide spread of aspirations which increase the wants of the people. Its common goal is a larger share in the product of the common toil and larger control of the conditions under which the working people live and labor. The dominant motive and aim of their struggle is for a higher standard of living and better working conditions. By a strangely common impulse, yet without international organization, or even an understanding between any of them—except the socialist minorities—the ranks of the industrial peoples of Spain and Italy, Belgium and Holland, Germany and France, England and the Scandinavian countries, Australia,

New Zealand, and America, and even of the poor peasants of Russia are seething with discontent, and with a fixed determination to share more largely the increasing wealth of the world and the better conditions of human life which they think they are producing. For this they have enlisted in a war without discharge. If all signs fail not, the twentieth century comes in with a people's movement more widely revolutionary than that with which the eighteenth century went out. Its second decade is freighted with greater portents than even in the year 1848.—England's Revolutionary Strike. Address before the City Club of Chicago, by Prof. GRAHAM TAYLOR.

THE EDMONTON WAY.

The city of Edmonton, the capital of the province of Alberta in western Canada, is the latest important accession to the Single Tax ranks. To be sure the city did not have far to go to get there. For some time it has been raising local revenues by a tax on land values, together with a tax on business as the only additional form of taxation. Now the latter tax has been abolished and the city has for all local purposes the unadulterated Single Tax in operation.

For some time the Hudson Bay company held a large area of vacant land in the center of the city. But as industry became exempt the tax bill for this land increased. This continued until this year the company has been requested to pay \$225,000. It has concluded that the expense of holding is too great and so is subdividing the tract into lots and getting rid of them as quickly as possible to persons who want to make use of them. This is but one more example of a constantly increasing list which shows what the Single Tax will do.

Besides raising all public revenue from land values, Edmonton owns all public utilities. Street railways, telephones, gas, electric light and water plants are all under municipal ownership and control. The city seems to have more progressive policies at work than any other in the western hemisphere, if not in the world.—Johnstown, (Pa.) *Democrat*.

BOOK NOTICES.

A PRETENTIOUS BOOK.

Man's Birthright, by Ritter Brown, (12 mo, 307 pages, gilt top, price \$1.50, Desmond Fitzgerald, N. Y. City) is a pretentious treatment of the economic problem. The world is to be reconstructed by means of income taxes, limitation of land ownership and regulation on regulation—Pelion upon Ossa.

How little qualification the author brings to his task is shown by the reasons he gives for rejecting the Single Tax. He tells us that the individual or corporation could continue to hold thousands of acres so long as the Single Tax or rent demanded by the government was paid. So they *could*, but not even the foolish *would*. And he tells us "And naturally the tax exacted by the State from those who rented the forests and the mines would be added to the price of wood and minerals; so that the consumer would virtually pay not only the price of the wood and minerals, but the tax demanded by the State as well. The public would derive no benefit from such a change." If the consumer would have to pay this there would of course be no benefit. But if the author were fitted for his task he would know they *would not*.

Mr. Brown says: "Taxation should not assume the nature of a penalty placed upon human industry." But he urges as a recommendation for the income tax that "A man would pay taxes only on what he annually earns." But how a tax can be levied upon earnings and not upon human energy he does not tell us.

He states nothing quite correctly. For example he says: "The Malthusian theory that there is not enough land area on the surface of the earth for the nourishment of its inhabitants is given by most economists, etc." Not even the foolish Malthus taught this.

Try again, Mr. Ritter Brown. Or on second thought, *don't*. The world is already too full of printed words without thought.—J. D. M.

ARE you a subscriber to the SINGLE TAX REVIEW? If not, why not?

LA REVUE DE L'IMPORT UNIQUE.

The January, February and March numbers of this excellent Single Tax monthly, edited in Paris by M. Georges Darien, continue the able propaganda and the thought-compelling discussions which have characterized it from its beginning in July, 1911. With the February number M. Darien takes up the first of his promised articles on "A General Idea of a National History of the French Revolution," the basis for his work being found in his quotation from Toqueville's introduction to "l'Ancien Regime et la Revolution," as follows: "What have been the permanent results of this strange and terrible Revolution? Precisely, what did it destroy, what did it create?" "These are the questions," says our author, "which I in my turn purpose answering." And in a note specially addressed to British and American readers of the *Revue* he points out that such a work as this may not appear uncalled for at this time, when in Great Britain the proposal for a tax on land values is being met by the Tory opposition by a counter proposal for peasant proprietorship, and when in America high dignitaries of the Church of Rome, holding a brief for monopoly in general, are including in their denunciations of socialism the principles of Henry George.

"Have not," M. Darien asks, "the upholders of the glories of the French Revolution made one of the greatest mistakes in all history? Have not they been giving their support to an imposture, to a lie? Has the Revolution produced one single result corresponding with the optimistic visions indulged in by the men of 1789? Are not the eloquent phrases of that time mere empty mouthings, full of sound and fury, signifying nothing?" Such is the thesis which M. Darien hopes to prove. And at the very beginning he quotes with entire approval the following words taken from Henry George's "Progress and Poverty": "One of the things most to be regretted about the French Revolution is that it overwhelmed the ideas of the Economists, just as they were gaining strength among the thinking classes and were apparently about to influence fiscal

legislation." M. Darien's contribution, original and startling, to a rational History of the French Revolution is his promise to show that the Revolution was made and made exclusively for the very purpose of overwhelming, of annihilating the ideas of the Physiocrats, of killing them and burying them beyond the hope of resurrection. Now by what implacable, crafty minds was this undertaking conceived, and by whose diabolical ingenuity was it accomplished! M. Darien's answer is given positively and unequivocally: the Jesuits, the Jesuits are responsible for this and for other woes unnumbered which have followed their footsteps since the foundation of their Society in 1534. From the time when they conceived and were responsible for the Massacre of St. Bartholomew and the Revocation of the Edict of Nantes down to the present day they have represented and constituted an idea in arms against another idea, viz., the idea of authority and monopoly against the idea which stands for liberty and war on privilege. "We shall see," writes M. Darien, "how the atrocities they have organized have been possible I have written this study to show that very thing."

* * *

Another article in the March number of the *Revue* casts light upon a subject about which many people are misinformed. How often does one hear it said that France is preeminently the land of happy farmers, of independent husbandmen, of the "*morcellement*," where every family is rich in its way, etc. Now this is a pretty picture and would be important if true. But what are the facts? The giving of the land to the peasant at the time of the Revolution was a delusion. Today the peasants possess less than one-twelfth of French soil. Out of 49,000,000 hectares they occupy 4,000,000 hectares. Do they own their land? Nominally, yes. In reality, practically all of the peasant proprietors of France are head and ears in debt to mortgages. In France the Credit Foncier is a great institution, flourishing like a green bay tree. And in France, as elsewhere, the man dependent on his

labor for his livelihood is crushed between the upper and the lower millstone.

* * *

According to another article in the *Revue* the Bourse is the slave-market of France. It functions from one end of the year to the other and the quantity of its merchandise is unlimited. It traffics in land values and in the public debt, the value of which is maintained by the ceaseless tributes of labor which are exacted to uphold securities. The whole structure of credit rests, in the last analysis, upon capitalized land values. The Credit Foncier represents the "system." It is a bank whose business consists in making loans on the security of land mortgages. Its capital is \$50,000,000 and it handles mortgages to the extent of \$1,000,000,000. It receives money from investors, big and little. It makes loans to the hapless "owners" of the little farms of France, who, borrowing the money, tie themselves up thenceforth forever. The idea prevails in France, writes M. Darien, that this institution is founded on a rock, that it will continue for all time. A couple of months ago the Credit Foncier advertised the issue of 50,000 shares of new stock, and the public subscribed for them twenty times over. But M. Darien ventures to point out that the entire scheme is a dangerous one. Let but the idea get abroad in France that the system of private ownership in land is attackable, that it rests upon unstable foundations, that a tax levied upon land values would invalidate the security of the enormous load of pledges carried by the bank, and what happened to the "system" of John Law, what happened later on to the *assignats*, will happen again.

A USEFUL BOOK.

The Laws of Psychology Made Plain might be the sub-title of "Your Mind and How to Use It," a useful little work of 224 pages written by William Walker Atkinson and published by the Elizabeth Towne Company, Holyoke, Mass. We know of no book that could serve as a substitute for this tool of the artisan of

mental all-work. It is admirable in its simplicity. It is one of the books which should be in the library of every trained literary worker. We cannot recommend it too highly.

AN article on Canadian Problems and Politics in the April *Westminster Review* by one of our contributors, W. A. Douglass, recalls the best traditions of that magazine in the days when Bentham and the two Mills contributed to its splendid pages.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS.

UNDER the title "At 94 She Gives Her Talent to the Single Tax Cause," the St. Louis *Post Dispatch* gives an account of Mrs. Susan Look Avery. When questioned this venerable daughter in Israel replied: "I should say the greatest questions before the world to-day are Single Tax, woman suffrage and free trade the world over."

THE Houston, Texas *Chronicle* tells of an organization of an industrial union among the farmers of Texas, calling itself "The Renters Union of America, State Division No. 1." After detailing very truly present conditions it sets forth in its constitution the first step to the remedy as follows:

That the officials of our organization prepare and present to the citizens of our State for signature a blank petition demanding of the legislature which convenes in January, 1913, to submit to the people a constitutional amendment authorizing a tax on land values to the limit, and use and occupancy to be the sole title to land.

HEADQUARTERS for the Oregon campaign opened at 225 Worchester Bldg., Portland.

IN the April number of the *Common Cause* Bolton Hall discusses sanely the socialistic treatment of the economic problem. The remainder of this magazine is for the most part filled with intemperate attacks on socialism that ought to make many socialists of those not already such.

THE *Single Tax Broacher* is an effective four page propaganda paper "issued occasionally" and compiled by H. D. Wagnon, W. G. Eggleston and Alfred D. Cridge, and designed for use in the Oregon campaign. It is full of interesting and attractive matter.

ONE of the REVIEW's correspondents, Andrew V. Hogan, of Chicago writes us under date April 23 regarding an address of Benjamin Fay Mills, the evangelist, delivered in that city on "The Gospel According to Henry George," Mr. Hogan says; "It was an intellectual treat. I have heard not a few Single Tax speeches, but I am sure Henry George himself could not have spoken more fervently. He remarked that he was far more interested in the elections on the Single Tax to be held in Missouri and Oregon than he is in who is to be the next president. This remark evoked a storm of applause."

408316 is the number of pieces of literature sent out from 1903 to 1912 by E. B. Swinney of the Single Tax Information Bureau. It is impossible to estimate the value of this splendid service to the cause.

WE regret the illness of A. Wangemann of Chicago who is confined to his bed from overwork. Our readers who know of his unselfish work for the cause will wish him a speedy recovery.

WILLIAM WOOD, Jr., a pupil at the Ossining, N. Y. High School in a declamation contest on May 4, won the first prize, a gold medal, his subject being the Invocation to Liberty from Progress and Poverty. The local paper paid young Mr. Wood this high compliment:

"Every sentence of that vigorous protest against the prevailing economic conditions which make the few prosperous and the many miserable in full rounded tones reached the ears of every one in the assembly hall and fortified by easy and graceful gestures and entire composure won unstinted applause."

A. M. HIMES, for many years a worker for the cause in Oregon, is at present

suffering from a mild attack of paralysis. Mr. Himes is a veteran of the Civil war. He has the reputation of being the greatest initiative signature hustler in Portland, and it is hoped that he will soon be in condition to resume his activity.

WHILE some of the Granges of Oregon have adopted resolutions against the Single Tax, the first convention of Tenant Farmers in Texas has adopted resolutions demanding the taxation of land values "up to the limit." The farmers of Alberta and Saskatchewan who are not tenants but own their fields, are a unit for the abolition of tariff taxes and the substitution of land values taxes, while in these States the farmers are exempt from local and State taxes on improvements and live stock, machinery, vehicles and warehouses.

It is strange to see the cowardice of men applied to public questions. They know a thing is right and practical and coming yet they halt and quibble and deny the truth. They did these things in the time when Jesus, the Galileean, was crucified and they are doing it yet.—Portland (Oregon) *Labor Press*.

SOME men hang on to the car of progress at the rear and pull back when it is going uphill for all they are worth. When it arrives in spite of them they coolly climb in and claim to have been the original workers, hustlers and pullers of the vehicle.—Portland (Oregon) *Labor Press*.

STOP crushing business with taxes.—Joseph Fels.

It is a greater fine in Oregon to build a chicken house than to rob one.

THE man who works pays all taxes, whether he owns his tools or his land or not.

PROGRESSIVE Seattle this spring voted down the Single Tax by an overwhelming majority; but that proposition is bound to come up again in Seattle.—*Saturday Evening Post*.

EXTRACTS FROM OUR CONTEMPORARIES SHOWING THE REMARKABLE GROWTH OF PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

FREE LAND MAKES HIGH WAGES.

The cause of "scarcity of labor" in all new countries is free lands. Free lands, or cheap lands, in any country will make labor "scarce." That is, it will make jobs more plenty than men. This is a bad thing for exploiters; what a fine thing it is for the "natives," whether they be Kaffirs, Britons, or Americans! The land system of any people seems about as closely related to the wages thereof, as Henry George declared it to be.—Seattle (Wash.) *Star*.

WHAT THE MISSOURI AMENDMENT WILL DO.

The proposed amendment to the Missouri constitution to impose all the taxes upon the value of all unimproved lands and upon franchises is the acme of simplicity. This is certainly worth mentioning in the consideration of a subject that is and always has been obscured by evasion, dishonesty, unavoidable complications in enforcement, impossibility of uniformity. In fact, if the amendment in Missouri passes practically all the sources of dishonesty, incompetence, puzzling and unfair assessments and levies will be eliminated.—St. Joseph (Mo.) *Gazette*.

SPREAD OF SINGLE TAX IN CANADA.

Tax reform has taken a decided hold on the public opinion of the Dominion of Canada, and the fact that the wave in favor of looking to land rather than to improvements or business enterprise as a source of municipal revenue is from west to east, is not contributing in any visible way toward the impairment of its strength and influence. Ontario, indeed, hastens to admit that it is lagging behind the Pacific and prairie provinces in this particular, but in the same breath it gives the

assurance that from this time on it will be found in the very van of the movement. A luncheon given in honor of Joseph Fels in Toronto a few days ago assisted very materially in bringing the issue to the front in that city. Mr. Fels had considerable to say along tariff lines that was not altogether acceptable to some of his entertainers, but when he switched from open advocacy of free trade to indorsement of the Henry George system of taxation he struck a chord agreeable to all sides.

The reason for this is not difficult to find. The thinking people of Toronto have been watching closely the progress of the Single Tax movement in the West. They have seen it develop from a theory to a condition in Vancouver and Victoria. They have seen the system put to the actual test of practical operation as a municipal revenue producer, and despite every prediction of fiasco and disaster, they have seen it tested in communities of differing interests; they have seen it applied to the growing cities of the great wheat area, and they have found it operating as well in Edmonton, Regina, Calgary and Winnipeg as in the older and more settled municipalities of Victoria.

It is estimated that land values in the city of Toronto have increased, through unearned increment, for many years at the rate of over \$10,000,000 per annum. That is to say, through the growth of the city in population and business the owners of land, without turning a hand, have been enriched annually to the amount stated. Even those who are not quite ready to go to the entire length of Single Tax are coming to see and believe, in Toronto as elsewhere, that land, which obtains its value from the toil, industry and enterprise of the people, and not through any effort on the part of the mere landholder, landowner, or land speculator, should be made to bear a much larger proportion of the cost of municipal government than it does now.

It is clear, at all events, that Toronto and Ontario are at present in a receptive mood with regard to this question. If the movement there shall escape entanglement with the isms that have served to embarrass and impede it in many parts of the United States, there is every reason to

believe that the time is not far distant when the chief city of the province will try out the idea to the extent possible under existing national taxation laws. The importance of a successful demonstration of the system in a city like Toronto, not only with relation to its bearing on Canada, or even on the United States also, but on the world at large, is beyond present measurement.—*Christian Science Monitor* (Boston).

LEENHOUTS and Guthrie, architects, announce the removal of their offices from 102 Wisconsin Street to 424 Jefferson Street, Milwaukee.

THE report of the last annual meeting of the Fels Fund has been received and is a full statement of the proceedings. It is an inspiring report. Our readers who have not seen this report are urged to send for a copy. Address The Fels Fund Commission, Cincinnati, Ohio.

MR. Joseph Fels improved his opportunity on the Mauretania by getting up a Single Tax meeting in the dining saloon on the Saturday before they reached England. It was attended by three quarters of the first class passengers. The chairman of the meeting was Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, secretary of the Treasury under President McKinley.

A. C. PLEYDELL has been appointed by Governor Wilson of New Jersey as one of the commission to investigate taxation and assessment and report thereon. Another member of this commission is Thomas B. Uscher, whom some of our older readers will recall as active in tax reform work years ago in New Jersey.

We must blaze the road to Freedom,
Ours the right to lead the way!
Ours to sow seed for the future,
Ours to usher in the day!

—WILL ATKINSON.

Free Trade for the Million!

Are you against the tariff? Are you against indirect taxation? Do you want to take a telling part in the coming Presidential campaign?

Then send five cents and get two well-printed copies of Henry George's famous book, "Protection or Free Trade." They will be in sealed franked envelopes (no postage required), ready for your addressing and mailing to persons you believe will read and think.

Send \$1. and get 40 copies of this work.

Get your individual friends and, better still, your organization, to contribute toward a circulation fund. Raise as much money as you can and circulate as many copies as possible in your neighborhood. Get as wide a circulation for the book in your State as you can and as soon as possible. As to this you can give an added aid by asking your own Congressman to send the book out under his own Congressional frank.

Send your order and money at once to

The Fels Fund Commission

CINCINNATI, OHIO