

know how Henry George treated that definition when speaking of the term wealth. So let us take our cue from Mr. George, and just see what the terms "private property," "public property" and "common property" really mean.

When we are buying property or goods, we are not buying mere material things such as soil, wood, stone or iron, made up into certain forms. We are buying utilities or material services. Some special forms of matter that have been "moved, combined or separated, or in other ways modified" so as to admit of the natural power they possess being directed to the advantage of man. The function of goods can consist in nothing else than in a giving off, or rendering up, or putting forth—or to use the terminology of physical science—the passing of energy into the satisfaction of a concrete want. We value and desire and possess goods only on account of the utility or usefulness that are expected from them, and the material itself from which they are made form only the bodily shell. It is the utility of a thing that we buy and sell, and not the mere labor-form, and the market value of a utility is the social estimate of the services which the good will render. It is not mere physical matter we desire, it is utility, or material services. Utility is the basis of value. physical property is merely the form—the bodily shell, as it were.

So when we speak of the value of a thing, we mean its utility or usefulness, and this is real property. The real meaning of property then, is the material services which the goods possess, or which fit them to satisfy human desires. These utilities are the completed goods ready for the consumer, and they have embodied in them certain material services which are contributed from three different sources, namely—(1) Services rendered by the individual (those of them that work). (2) Services rendered by Society through government; and—(3) Services rendered by nature. These three factors co-operate in producing commodities or utilities, and no one of them can produce anything in modern society that will satisfy human desires without the assistance of one or both of the others. And it is a law of nature that each of those whose services are required in forming utilities should receive their just share of the joint product and in proportion to the services rendered. Nature demands that every atom which it contributes shall be returned to it. And it is also a law of nature that each of the other factors should receive theirs. That share of the product that remains with the individual is his own private property, and that share which is retained by the State is public property, and the services rendered by nature in the form of matter and natural forces, such as gravity, cohesion, resistance, sunshine, air and moisture—the whole combined into unity—is *common* property. Common to both

society and to the individual, freely rendered. Common to all and special to none. These natural forces cannot possibly be individually and exclusively owned, because nature is unity and not divisible. Land cannot therefore be individually owned because it is common to all and not special to any. No one can fence in a piece of land and say "this part of nature is special to me—exclusively mine from the zenith to the center of the earth." Where is the dividing line? If the planet Mars should cross the boundary line it would come within his title-deed. A part of material nature cannot be separated from the whole, being as "one in the many and the many in one." Nature cannot be individualized. But the rent of land is the product of society; and balances the value of the services which society renders.

The product that is embodied in rent is public property, and no person can rightfully claim even a fraction of it. Private property, on the other hand, is the product of the individual. Farm improvements, houses and implements, consumption goods, in fact whatever he has produced and received by rendering his services, are his own private property. When, however, certain persons claim portions of the land as their "private property" and demand a share of the product for the use of it, they are receiving products for which they have rendered no services. And to say that it is just to allow these men a share of the product as payment for the services rendered by nature, is to recognize them as creators of nature. Those products received by the landlords are taken from the laborers. Society, through government, demands and must receive its share of the product, and if that share does not come in a natural way, it must come some other way.

As to a title as private owner of land, it is not necessary for one to have a title as private owner in order to secure ownership in the improvements. All that is necessary is a title to the improvements and this will include the warranty of possession in whatever form they may exist in space. And this is all one is entitled to providing he renders to society full payment for value received.

H. N. McDONALD.

Toronto, Canada.

PROPERTY IN LAND.

LETTER FROM JOHN Z. WHITE.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

The question has been asked me, what Mr. George meant when he said: "If private property in land be just, then is the remedy I propose a false one; if, on the contrary, private property in land be unjust, then is this remedy the true one."

In the same line of thought, on page 384, he said: "as nature gives only to labor.

the exertion of labor in production is the only title to exclusive possession."

Again on the same page: "When non-producers can claim as rent a portion of the wealth created by producers, the right of the producers to the fruits of their labor is to that extent denied."

On page 401, he said: "Neither on the ground of equity or expediency is there anything to deter us from making land common property by confiscating rent."

On page 326, he said, in italics: "*We must make land common property.*"

On page 403, he says: "I do not propose either to purchase or to confiscate private property in land."

On the same page, again in italics, he said: "*It is not necessary to confiscate land; it is only necessary to confiscate rent.*"

In his preface to the fourth edition of *Progress and Poverty*, dated New York, 1880, Mr. George said: "What I have most endeavored to do is to establish general principles, trusting in my readers to carry further their application where this is needed." In the same, he said, "It has been impossible to treat with the fullness they deserve many of the questions raised."

Many quotations to like effect may be made, but as if to end the matter, he said, on page 403: "By leaving to land owners a percentage of rent which would probably be much less than the cost and loss involved in attempting to rent lands through State agency, and by making use of this existing machinery, we say, without shock or jar, assert the common right to land by taking rent for public uses."

And further on same page, he said, speaking of land owners: "Let them continue to call it *their* land."

Finally, page 404, he said: "In form, the ownership of land would remain just as now. * * For rent being taken by the State in taxes, land, no matter in whose name it stood, or in what parcels it was held, would be really common property."

These quotations seem to be a sufficient answer to the question asked. "In form the ownership of land would remain just as now." In essence landlordism would be a thing of the past, for the essence of landlordism is the legal power privately to appropriate rent.

Those who refuse to perceive the difference between form and essence, will not be able to defend Mr. George against the charge of flat contradiction—even more than one. He said repeatedly that he would take rent in taxation. He also said he would leave land owners a percentage of rent. He repeatedly declared private property in land to be unjust. He also said, "Let them continue to call it *their* land," and "In form the ownership of land would remain just as now."

If, however, we accept his work as an endeavor "to establish general principles," and also prove worthy of the trust he placed in his readers; that is, to perceive the valid-

ity of those principles and "to carry further their application where this is needed," we will have no difficulty in arriving at the conclusion that by the words "private property in land" Mr. George meant the legal power privately to appropriate rent. Also, that by the words "common property in land," he meant the public appropriation of rent.

The words "private property in land" have two meanings. One meaning is, the legal power privately to appropriate rent. The other meaning is, the legal power exclusively to possess land in perpetuity.

The first power is the essence of landlordism. It was attacked by all the force George possessed. The second power is landownership, and this George did not attack, but on the contrary said, if his plan were adopted, would "continue just as now."

Land ownership is the legal power exclusively to possess land in perpetuity. In the absence of a wise use of the power of taxation landlordism inevitably will be incidental to landownership.

An individual may possess land in perpetuity without resulting harm to any one; but the private appropriation of rent is surely accompanied by injustice.

The value of land has nothing to do with the validity of its title. If a man holds title to a parcel of land of no value, he is nevertheless a landowner.

In the sense that George used the words I believe in "common property in land" in what seems to me to be a technically accurate use of the words. I believe in private ownership of land. Ownership comes before rent appropriation. If the legal power exclusively to possess in perpetuity is landownership, George did not endeavor to abolish private property in land. If the legal power privately to appropriate rent is landlordism, George did attempt its overthrow—and his attempt is proving to be successful.

If, then, we alter the wording of the question in accordance with Mr. George's continually expressed thought, we may state its meaning thus: "If the private appropriation of land rent is just, then is our cause unjust."

JOHN Z. WHITE.

FROM JAMES W. BUCKLIN.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

The interesting discussion of the question of "Private Property in Land" in the columns of the *Review* arises, I believe, not mainly from differences in principle, nor even from differences in policy, but from different uses or meanings of the term "Private Property in Land." Until the meaning of the words used are clearly defined and agreed upon, a continuance of the discussion may be productive of harm rather than of good.

A clear, definite meaning of the term "land" in both its legal and popular sense, is, at present, very difficult, owing to the use of the term "real estate." So long as land and improvements are classed together in legal and popular phrases, so long will it be difficult for the general public to get a clear meaning of the term "Private Property in Land." Single Taxers, however, ought not to be confused thereby.

So too, the words "Property in Land," as generally used, includes exclusive possession, or rather the right of exclusive possession, which right of possession may justly be either public or private.

Property in land may, and frequently does exist, however, entirely independent of the question of possession. One person may have the legal or equitable possession or right of possession, and an entirely different person may be the legal owner thereof. True the legal right of ownership and the right of possession are frequently, perhaps generally, vested in one and the same person, but they are nevertheless distinct and separate rights. It is perhaps owing to the fact that these two distinct and separate rights are generally vested together, that property in land is often carelessly assumed to mean either or both of these rights. To avoid confusion, however, in the discussion of questions of the rightfulness of private property in land, all questions of possession, or the right of possession, must be excluded, leaving at issue only the question of ownership or the right of ownership. What then does the term "Private Property in Land" mean? Not the right to own the improvements or the personal property on a piece of land, for such rights frequently belong to tenants or to other owners of personal property or improvements. Nor does property in land consist in possession or the right to the possession thereof, the right to the exclusive possession being frequently vested in tenants, employees and others. In such cases the tenant, employee or other person having the right of exclusive possession, would have both the equitable and legal right to exclude even the owner of the fee therefrom. No one denies the rightfulness of private possession.

I conclude, therefore, that "Private Property in Land," as the term is generally used, and as used by Henry George, does not involve the question of who owns the personal property or improvements thereon, nor a question of who has the possession or the right of possession thereof, but who owns the rent. *The essence of private property in land is in the ownership of the rent, all questions of possession being merely secondary.* When this fact of the real nature of private property in land is clearly realized, then many of the apparent differences of your correspondents are harmonized, or their inaccuracies made apparent.

If it be true that private property in land really consists in the private appropriation

of rent, and that no question of possession or the right of possession is involved, then all Single Taxers must admit, as Henry George alleged, that private property in land is unjust; for the rent of land is clearly a public, not a private creation.

A question of policy, however, remains. Now, as always, "honesty is the best policy." If private property in land is unjust, and private possession just, we should on proper occasion so declare. By denying the justice of private property in land I believe fundamental forces may be aroused. Still as the term "Private Property in Land" is so commonly misused, as above explained, our opponents and others who do not carefully discriminate, are liable to be misled. In denouncing private property in land we should therefore use proper discretion and explanation.

We need not hope, however, to avoid the bitter opposition of ignorance and greed by the politic use of terms. In Colorado, for illustration, we made the fight as a tax reform. The bitterness and strenuousness of the opposition to our Constitutional Amendment in that state, seemed utterly inexplicable to many of the Socialists and others, but to those who had considered the matter, nothing else was expected. Whether the Single Tax be urged as a tax reform, a labor reform or a land reform, it must meet and ultimately overcome, bitter opposition.

I am not one of those who believe our cause will be materially advanced by any one policy rather than another. It has been demonstrated that the public mind of the American people is not yet prepared to adopt any part of the strictly Single Tax programme except perhaps the municipal ownership of municipal utilities, and even on that question public opinion is not fixed or stable. Nor is it the Single Tax principle that owners of such franchises and rights of way are to be compensated therefor. The majority of the people want private property in land and other graft to continue, in the hopes that some day they may themselves participate in the spoils. When another great industrial depression shall spread over our land, when millions of men are idle and little children are hungry, then perhaps a majority of the people will realize that for them there can be no advantage in graft; that while the few can rob the many, the masses cannot successfully rob the few; that justice and not graft can alone solve the problem. Until that time comes, the work of education along democratic lines is the only real road of Single Tax progress. Different conditions will doubtless call for a vast variety of policies on sundry occasions and places. The occasion will generally develop the right policy. But the Georgian philosophy being the science of the natural laws governing all economic relations, it follows that no economic question can arise upon which light cannot be thrown by the well informed Georgian. In the present state of our organization, we must leave to

individual workers all questions of policy, except in so far as it misrepresents fundamental principles. For that reason I believe that Mayors Johnson and Dunn, Congressman Baker, Louis F. Post, the *Single Tax Review*, the leaders of the Fairhope Colony, C. B. Fillebrown, and many others are each and all pursuing the best policy under the circumstances. A Single Tax doer, not a Single Tax issuer, produces results. I always regret, however, to hear anyone, especially a Single Taxer, allege that private property in land is just, for I think such a declaration is simply a misuse of words.

JAMES W. BUCKLIN.

Los Angeles, Cal.

DEATH OF HAMLIN RUSSELL.

The late Hamlin Russell was born in Philadelphia in 1852. During his varied career he has been employed in many capacities, but chiefly as a newspaper man. He was Railroad Editor of the *Cincinnati Inquirer* for three years; five years Railroad and Financial Editor of the *St. Louis Republican*, and for twelve years reporter and correspondent—at different times—on the *Philadelphia Inquirer*; Council Bluffs, Iowa *Nonpareil*; Minneapolis, Minnesota, *Tribune*; Grand Forks, North Dakota, *Plain Dealer*; El Paso, Texas, *Times*, and other Western papers. He was the only newspaper correspondent who accompanied General George Crook on his memorable campaign (1883) against the Apache Indians, Chief Geronimo and his band from Willcox, Arizona, to a remote point in the Sierra Madre Mountains in Mexico. The expedition consisted of ten officers, fifty cavalrymen and two hundred Apache Scouts.

Since 1896 he was in the employment of The Whitehead and Hoag Company, Newark, New Jersey, where his great executive ability and business resources were much appreciated and will long be missed.

For sometime before his death he suffered from a painful illness, which he battled with a fortitude that was heroic and characteristic.

By the death of Mr. Russell the Single Tax has lost one of its ablest and most devoted advocates. He was converted in St. Louis in 1884 and since that time has been a missionary of the Gospel of Henry George. In a letter to *National Single Taxer*, in 1897, he says: "I was all fight right from the start," and it can be truly said he was "all fight right to the end." Over twenty years of reading, study and investigation only deepened and strengthened his conviction.

He was a man of great individuality, of quick perception and gifted with a wonderful memory. He had traveled all over the States and seen life in a vast variety of phases. His reading was wide and deep. In character he was the soul of hospitality,

absolutely devoid of false pride and affectation and possessed of a sense of humor that was delightful. His conversation was instructive, racy and interesting. His Pastor, who knew him intimately for nine years truly said that "he had a genius for friendship."

J. KELLY.

DEATH OF CLARENCE A. MILLER.

The death of Clarence A. Miller, the well known attorney and Single Tax advocate, of Los Angeles, Cal., is felt as a grievous loss to the host of personal friends and also to those who knew of his worth as a public spirited citizen. His sterling integrity and his habit of doing what he believed to be right regardless of consequences stamped him as an unusual man.

From an acquaintance with Mr. Miller, extending over twelve years, I never ceased to be impressed by his love of justice, which nothing could swerve or alter. As an exponent of our principles it is doubtful if he had a superior. His public expositions of the Henry George doctrine always convinced any clouded hearer, though the latter might be slow in letting it be made public.

Another of our captains is gone. But we should redouble our efforts to hasten the day when justice as he plead for it through the Single Tax shall prevail throughout the country and the world.

RALPH HOYT.

DEATH OF JOB REED.

Job Reed who died last month at Lethbridge, Alberta, N. W. T., at the age of sixty-five, was born in Somersetshire, Eng. He was left an orphan at an early age, and was compelled to make his own way. He passed through the strenuous days of the Corn Laws, and observed with eager interest the campaign that ended in their repeal.

In spite of being compelled to make his own way, he studied much, and later taught school in England for several years and followed the profession of a tutor for a short time on his arrival in America.

In 1882 he went to Canada and made his home in Lethbridge, and settled down to the occupation of a farmer. It was not until 1897 that he read "Progress and Poverty" and became a Single Taxer, since which time he has been an ardent champion of the doctrine. His death removes another of the devoted disciples whose most eager hope was for the triumph of the movement to which the future civilization must look for its saving principle.

The Socialist says that the government boss would be better than the individual boss, regardless of the fact that the root of the evil consists in the necessity for working for any boss.

The Standard, Sydney, Aus.

TOUR OF JOHN Z. WHITE.

John Z. White spoke at St. Louis, Mo., on April 6. It was a very well attended meeting at which the Single Tax was nearly unanimous. Some little opposition developed but nothing of a serious character.

On April 7, at Cleveland, Ohio, Mr. White gave the last lecture of a course including Ernest Howard Crosby, J. W. Bengough and Rev. Herbert Bigelow. There was quite a lively time after the talk, developed mostly from questions by gentlemen of seeming socialistic inclinations. Ephraim is wedded to his idols.

A like course was conducted at Detroit, Mich., the last appointment occurring on April 9. A very good audience assembled, and much interest was manifested. Detroit is developing great public spirit. This is largely owing to the persistent work of Messrs. Ingram and Howarth, two thoroughly capable and successful business men, who nevertheless clearly perceive the tendency of our times.

The next evening was given to a visit to Ferris Institute at Big Rapids, Mich. Mr. Ferris, the president of the educational center, is an energetic and capable man; was candidate for governor of the state on the democratic ticket. He is one of the strong determined men who intend to rescue our land from the debasing grasp of monopoly—and he knows how. The large hall of the institute was filled, and the postulates of the Single Tax position were presented to keenly attentive minds.

The institute at Valparaiso, Ind., was visited, and although a lecture on Burns had been advertised, so many desired to hear about the Single Tax, that the authorities decided to change the subject. The audience was a large one and seemed to enjoy what is sometimes thought to be a dry argument. Everyone seemed to be well pleased with the alteration of the programme. The popular schools are gradually becoming good ground for good crops of independent thinkers, and this is but a prelude for independent action. When the history of our time shall be written lovers of freedom will say, God bless the schoolmasters. Let us hope that some high class professors will be included.

Small meetings were held at the Fine Arts building in Chicago, at Palos Park, Ill., and at Mansfield, Wis. A short talk was also made at the high school at Mansfield. The principal gave some very interesting figures showing the enormous concentration of wealth.

On the third of May, John Z. White spoke at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, on "Sources of Municipal Corruption." Some of those present seemed disappointed because the Single Tax was not

made more prominent. However, as the cause rather than the cure was the subject advertised, it is thought best to confine this address to the inevitableness of monopoly in human society; and to the fact that this advantage will surely inure to individual advantage if not in some way publicly administered. If the value of monopoly be allowed to go to private pockets, individuals will struggle for its possession—and in the struggle will violate both human and divine law. This habit, being once found, will continue until there is nothing so holy that it will not be sacrificed for commercial reward.

The Normal School was visited and the pupils seemed to enjoy and appreciate the talk on "political economy." The subject sounds heavy and uninviting, and is so as presented by most of its professors. It is not so of itself, however. It is known as the dismal science, and pupils seem to wonder why a man deliberately chooses this matter as a topic on which to discourse. In reality political economy is full of promise, of joy and peace. Its professors have given it a black eye which it in no way deserves. Ricardo, for instance says: "A tax on rent would discourage cultivation, because it would be a tax on the profits of the landlord." If the poor landlord could not get a fair profit from his land, of course he would not permit its use. Ricardo did not tell us where the owner would get the coin to placate the tax gatherer, but little matters of that sort don't worry the professors.

On May 4th, a half hour was given to "Burns" before the English high school. The school is large and seemed more interested in a (as generally understood) literary character than would reasonably be anticipated. The real force of Burns' character is shown in his grasp of political and religious fundamentals. His teachings in these respects have been allowed to become all but forgotten.

In the evening a non-partisan caucus was held in the Cumberland town hall. The purpose of the caucus was to make self-government more real and evident, and of course, in like degree, less vague and unsubstantial. To this end it was proposed to name candidates for the United States Senate. Mr. White was invited to speak. He complimented the meeting on its object, and expressed the hope that such organizations would continue until local self-government became the fully established custom throughout our whole country. The tendency to discuss, and the seeming determination to control, public monopolies—now in private hands—was referred to, and the audience then demanded an explanation of the Single Tax doctrines. As a result the talk became an extended discourse. The caucus closed with a hearty note of applause to the speakers.

The class in political economy at Brown University was visited. A bright lot of young fellows, who were in no way adverse to hearing accepted notions opposed. The law of diminishing returns was "treated" by the speaker, as a "psychological" affirmation of the worn out Malthusian doctrine. According to this "law" a given amount of labor (or "dose" of capital) applied to a given parcel of land will produce given wealth. Double the labor (or the "dose") and the product may be more than doubled. But if this doubling be continued a point must be reached when there will be a less product per laborer (or "per dose"). We ask is there not an increase up to a certain point? If so, may we not call it the law of increasing returns? Why is the ultimate decrease, rather than the present increase, emphasized? Why is it not made clear to the boys that there are not people enough in the world to treat more than a very small portion of land to the aforesaid "doses?" Why do not our professors explain to the boys that it is possible to give each human being in all the world two feet by six feet of surface and yet bury them all in the State of Rhode Island and still have one-third of the State unoccupied? The boys enjoyed the hour's talk. There will be no trouble about the boys understanding political economy, and thereby becoming good citizens, when the world is willing to know the truth or in other words, to be free.

"Public Ownership" was discussed before the British Club in the evening. This club is a vigorous and growing society. They mean to do things, and to that end are not only willing but anxious to learn things and so are not nervous as to whether or not certain questions regarding property rights be fully and freely discussed. The Bannerman victory appears to have stimulated lovers of freedom the world over. The British Club of Providence looks good to a plain westerner.

On Sunday, May 6, an address was given at Paine Memorial Hall, in Boston. The meeting was largely made up of what is sometimes called the radical element, but was very encouraging because of the fact that these same radicals are beginning to make precise discriminations, a sort of activity we trust our conservative friends will emulate.

In Wesleyan Hall, the Methodist ministers were visited, and after a somewhat unpromising beginning the hall filled, and the interest increased, until, at the end, many questions were asked. We were really surprised to discover that the Single Tax had much earnest support. Our friends of the church are learning that the second command can be very largely obeyed through the agency of public functions—a fact that seems heretofore to have generally escaped their notice. The ancients made idols with

their hands. We seem inclined to make intellectual idols. Still a justice of our State Supreme Court proposes a constitutional convention to revise the United States document. Virtue still lives—even on supreme benches. All of which indicates that preachers and lawyers are breaking long-established habits—the world moves.

The Scotch Clan at Hyde Park was visited and addressed on the subject of "Robert Burns." They were to some extent surprised to find a "foreigner" who urged to a fuller realization of the sterling worth of their great poet. They were frankly told that for a century they had been lauding Burns to the skies, while steadily refusing to accept his ideals. Until very recently Scotland has sent to Parliament only representatives of those classes who felt the full power of Burns' attack. How many genuine champions of the cause of Honest Poverty has Scotland sent to Parliament during the past one hundred years? How many opponents? Count 'em.

The Citizens' Association of Quincy is made up of the active members of Quincy's very select population. Quincy has all the modern attachments of civilization, and if to be thoroughly civilized is to be aristocratic, then is Quincy most intensely aristocratic. These gentlemen are evidently highly cultivated. It was a pleasure to talk to them. They said it was a pleasure to listen. Being cultivated, they undoubtedly know the desirability of truthfulness. The problem of taxation was shown. Some present absurdities were exhibited. Some of these absurdities caused laughter. Many questions were asked—but, in spite of good nature, cultivation, etc., these questions were practically all devoted to hiding the truth contained in Carnegie's claim, that what is one man's privilege is another man's right. America professes to love freedom. Scotland claims to revere Burns. Neither appears to comprehend the nature of the thing adored. America's notion of freedom, like Scotland's idea of Burns, seems to strongly resemble the idolators concept of deity—very woodeny.

On the next day the high school of Brookline was visited. Here was to be found the true American. He (and she) had not yet learned that there was something in the structure of our American life that must be concealed. We must not tell the truth, because our society is itself a lie. Therefore to tell the truth is to put oneself at outs with one's neighbors—and that is bad form. Bad form is the unforgivable sin. But as the pupils were not yet sufficiently cultivated to grasp all this, we had a most pleasant session and they will not be in the least adverse to looking into the dismal science.

At Worcester, Mass., a very good meeting was held. Mayor John T. Duggan occupied

a seat on the platform. Prof. A. Gordon Webster, of Clark University, presided. The initiative and the referendum was first considered, after which the public ownership of public utilities was examined. The initiative and referendum, or direct legislation, is securing an increasing share of public attention. This is very likely the result of a more rational method of presentation. Many a good cause has been lost, or at least greatly hindered, by the ill-advised methods of its most earnest friends. The American principle of government is that the people as a whole are sovereign. If so they surely not only have the power but the duty to exert the authority of sovereignty when need arises. How can this be done to-day? Elect legislators and congressmen; then governors and the president; then courts in the states; then wait till federal judges die. What sovereign ever tolerated a similar series of interferences with the expression of his power—without being ridiculed? Initiative and referendum are simply well tried methods whereby actual power may be realized. The appeal from the chair on a point of order in ordinary parliamentary procedure is the referendum. Making a motion is the initiative. Without these two forms how could any society control its officers? How can the American people control their officers without like forms? They cannot. In relation to public ownership the good people of Worcester are much interested. Slowly it is becoming evident that our ferocious struggle for private gain is certain to defeat itself. Poverty is contained in the forces which make for progress. Our people would not believe George. They prefer the process referred to by Carlyle. He said "facts," if we do not heed them, will make us feel them bye and bye, We are surely feeling facts if there be any truth in the beef report, or if the price of coal be not mere illusion. Men exert force as individuals, either alone, or in such voluntary association as they find to be effective. Also they do, and must exert force as a society, that is, all the people occupying a given territory must act together in regard to some matters. These are necessary acts of sovereignty. If we ignore this fact, Carlyle says, we will be made to feel it. The whole problem now confronting the American people is, the legitimate *versus* the illegitimate exercise of this necessary sovereign authority. The mayor said he agreed with us. Mr. Webster said he did not intend to endorse any position, but he proposed to examine every position. Papers gave lengthy report.

The Twentieth Century Club of Boston is a body worth meeting. Mr. C. B. Fillebrown presented a paper on the effects of taxes on property of different kinds. This paper was so illuminating that no one could fail to appreciate it, unless he made a simple clerical error, as is often done in book-keeping. Mr. Fillebrown's wit is of the

variety known as humor; while full of fun, it hurts no one—it helps some. Mr. White followed, and a number of questions were asked. These were answered and after adjournment some waited on the speaker and said their understanding of George's proposals was much clearer than ever before. Such admission was accepted as complimentary to George. The notion that George was merely advocating the violent confiscation of private property is gradually giving way to a saner idea. It is now quite widely realized that he was really concerned to stop rather than to inaugurate the confiscation of private property.

A society in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, known as "Kommers," invited a presentation of Single Tax notions. They are a bright, alert lot of young fellows. The season was late, many members struggling with preparation for examination. As a result attendance at luncheon included in above invitation was small, but that interest was excited was made plainly evident by the questions that followed the address.

On Sunday afternoon a lecture on "The Dignity of Labor" was given before the Y. M. C. A. at Pawtucket, R. I. The audience received somewhat unusual views with a very fair spirit. The Y. M. C. A. is destined, with many other societies, to be even more useful in the future than it has been in the past. The leaders of this society said the talk gave much food for thought.

In the evening "Henry George and His Doctrine" was presented at the Bell Street Chapel in Providence. This is an endowed society, and is liberal in thought. The pastor will be with us as soon as he becomes familiar with economic literature.

The Baptist ministers' meeting was attended on the following morning. Ex-Gov. Garvin also attended. The ministers were in no way antagonistic, and had many questions to ask. The gathering was of course small, but it is believed that these occasions are fruitful.

In the evening a meeting at Sharon, Mass., was attended, and here we met one man whom nothing would satisfy. Meanwhile he had no position of his own.

Spoke at the High School at Southboro, Mass., on the following afternoon, and before the Board of Trade of the neighboring city of Marlboro in the evening. The latter meeting was presided over by the Mayor and was attended by most of the prominent business men of the city. The city is devoted mostly to the making of shoes. It was really surprising to perceive the favor with which our gospel was received. The larger part of the banqueters were inclined to accept our general ideas, and were closely attentive to explanations as to their detailed application.

"The French Revolution" was given before the Radical Club of Providence, R. I., on the following evening. It was a pronounced success in the opinion of all those present. The feudal lord's power was shown to be identical with that exercised by our modern monopolist. Freedom from monopoly as a result of rational taxation is now as when proposed by Turgot, the remedy.

The Boston University was visited next day, and an hour occupied before the class in political economy. The class evidently appreciated Single Tax economics. Attention was called to the fact that men make food, clothing and shelter—therefore they know how—therefore again, the processes can be examined, and a conclusion as to them be demonstrated. In short, the uncertainty that obtains in economic literature is absurd. This was a new idea to the class—maybe to the professor. At the same time we can pray earnestly for the time when all educators will favor freedom as does Prof. Baldwin. Absolutely no strings were tied to the speaker. If the class did not receive the Single Tax gospel the lack cannot be charged to Prof. Baldwin.

A meeting was held at New Bedford and another in Morgan Memorial Building, in Boston, before the Total Abstinence Guild. This closed our work for the time being in Boston, and the season was closed by a series of meetings in and about New York City.

A talk was made before the Women's National Single Tax League, then in session in Brooklyn. The women were more than kind in expressing appreciation of the occasion.

On Decoration Day exercises are annually held at the grave of Father McGlynn. For this year A. J. Boulton and John Z. White were selected as speakers. The grounds about the grave were filled with people and it is really inspiring to see the gathering of Father McGlynn's old and tried friends as well as those who have learned to love his memory without having known his charming personality. The occasion is one on which to preach McGlynn's gospel, which we all know included the Single Tax without excluding anything that is good and true.

The Board of Trade at Ridgewood, N. J., was visited and addressed. It is encouraging to find so many business organizations and schools that are no longer afraid to hear the truth. The Board gave the most careful attention and seemed favorable to our conclusions—though they were cautioned to do nothing hastily.

A return trip to Pawtucket, R. I., was arranged for the purpose of appearing before the Business Men's Association. This was a fine meeting. The plain fact of monopoly

—and its basis in unfair law—is becoming plain to all. Once this fact is generally affirmed, the end will be in sight.

A small meeting at Nutley, N. J., was held. A very fair one was held under the auspices of the Civics Club at E. Orange, N. J. The Independence League at Harlem Casino in New York City was addressed. The Men's League at Irvington, N. J., proved to be good ground. They voted the address to be the best they had heard on economic matters. That's why they are appreciated. A small group was met at Tarrytown, N. J., and a large meeting addressed at Ossining, N. Y. The latter is a branch of the Independence League which is being formed through New York State and bids fair to cause the politicians to sit up and take notice. Another meeting was held in Flatbush (suburb of Brooklyn). Also at the Seventeenth District Municipal Ownership League in Brooklyn.

At Trenton, N. J., a fine meeting was held. The assessors of the city were in attendance and asked questions. Everyone seemed highly pleased—save one socialist who was evidently of a melancholy temperament. The burden of the world was on him—and he wanted the "tools." He was advised to secure to all men the equal opportunity of making them.

An unexpectedly good meeting was held at Rochester, N. Y. The Independence League is visible at this point. Our good friend, J. M. Campbell, is still at work here—and where Campbell is there will the Single Tax gain.

THE NEW PRESIDENT OF THE WOMEN'S SINGLE TAX LEAGUE.

Mrs. Minnie Rogers Ryan, who was elected President of the Women's National Tax League at its recent convention in Brooklyn, N. Y., was born and educated in Delhi, Indiana. Her father, William Rogers, for many years an ardent Single Taxer, came here from England in '59 and in '61 enlisted, and fought through the war that the curse of chattel slavery might be abolished.

Her grandfather, Robert Rogers, was one of the radicals during the years that preceded the repeal of the "corn laws" in England, and many times went into hiding for weeks at a time to escape arrest, for having written songs which became popular, and which were uncomplimentary to the "powers that were."

Though only well into her "teens" when she moved east with her father's family, it was not a year before she was an earnest Single Taxer. Always of a quiet, thoughtful disposition, and having spent her childhood where there was plenty of room for all—none very rich, and none very poor, it