

broken chairs and old lumber, in his front yard. Under it should appear the caption, "Reducing His Taxes," or "Welcoming the Assessor"—anything you please that will give a reason for his apparently irrational conduct. It could be pointed out that the man is not crazy—at least, not nearly as crazy as the system of which his activities as pictured are the *reductio ad absurdum*.

**S**AYS the *Evening World* in a recent issue: "A soldier's bonus, if it comes at all, is coming out of American pockets." Oh, ye of little wisdom! We have shown how the bonus can be paid without taking a penny from the taxpayer.

**T**HERE were 142 contributors to the Single Tax Party campaign fund in the recent mayoralty contest in this city. Only 32 of these contributors are members of the party. This is the best possible testimony to the value of this method of popularizing the Single Tax, in that its value is recognized by those who are not prepared, for one reason or another, to openly proclaim themselves in favor of the party.

**H**ENRY MORGENTHAU in January *System* says "there has not yet been discovered a scientific method by which the results of industry may be satisfactorily divided between labor and capital." Mr. Morgenthau is a great admirer of ex-President Wilson. It is reported that Mr. Wilson had a well thumbed copy of "Progress and Poverty" on his desk. Will Mr. Morgenthau ask Mr. Wilson if he has arrived at any conclusion respecting the suggestion Mr. George makes in that work as to how the results of labor may be satisfactorily divided between labor and capital?

The trouble is, Mr. Morgenthau, that the results of labor are not divided solely between labor and capital. There is another and silent factor of which you make no mention. That is *land*. There is another and silent partner—that is the *landlord*. Maybe if this sum of the division of labor be considered with reference to this omitted factor the problem will be found not so puzzling.

**A**N advertisement in the *Cleveland Press* says: "Footsteps are worth money because footsteps make property worth money. The enormous increase along Euclid avenue has in ten years increased the value of business property (land) from the Square to Mayfield Road an average of 319 per cent." And every pious landlord along Euclid avenue says, "God bless those footsteps."

**A**LITTLE bulletin issued by the North Church Lincoln Club, of Cleveland, Ohio, asks, perhaps in a perfectly friendly spirit: "To all Single Taxers—if the truth of the Single Tax is as obvious as you believe it is, how do you explain its failure to gain ground during the past years?" Well, if it has not gained ground (though it has) the answer is that the Single Tax is not obvious. Truth is not usually obvious. "Truth lies at the bottom of the well." You have got to look for it—and look hard.

## EDITORIALS

### Resolves So-Called Wealth Into Its Elements

**T**HE simplicity of the Single Tax, that to the wise and far-seeing is its chief recommendation, suggests to others of a different order of minds an inadequacy to meet the complexity of existing conditions. The latter are found pointing out that the Single Tax fails to touch the power of a Rockefeller, or, at all events, wholly to resolve into harmless elements the tremendous power of monopoly which is involved in the control of a billion dollars.

It is true that under present conditions the ownership of vast wealth exercises a preponderating influence over other millions industrially employed. But the Single Tax is not a surface reform. It goes deep. Under it much of Mr. Rockefeller's wealth would cease to be wealth at all. For much of this so-called wealth is paper representing control of natural resources; all of this would be valueless. Much of the real capital that is under Mr. Rockefeller's control would begin to exercise an independence of its own, freed as it would then be from the dominating influence of any small group in control of the natural resources that form so large a part of the so-called Rockefeller wealth.

One has but to conceive of the Single Tax as the key which swings open the door to all the natural wealth of the world, mines, forests, and farm lands, the door that has hitherto been shut to labor and capital save on the payment of excessive tribute, to realize how far-reaching is this great reform. To make the earth free for its sons—why talk of anything else till that is done?

### Stewart Browne Imitates Marie Antoinette

**W**HETHER Marie Antoinette really asked "Why don't they eat cake?" when she was told that the people were dying for lack of bread, or whether the French Queen has been made a victim of mistranslation, may be left for the historians to settle. The remark remains typical of the reactionary or Bourbon mind.

Here comes Mr. Stewart Browne, of New York, the president of the United Real Estate Owners' Association, arguing before a legislative committee for the repeal of the emergency rent laws that stand between the tenants and eviction, admitting that there is some overcrowding in the cheaper apartments, but contending that "there are plenty of \$50 a room apartments" for rent. No, dear reader from beyond the Harlem, this does not mean \$50 a year; the New York reckoning is by months. To the man with three or four children, whose salary has been put on a "pre-war basis" of thirty or thirty-five dollars a week, this information that if he is thrown out of his present living quarters he can get a "parlor, bedroom and bath" for \$150 a month will be—re-assuring. Let the rent

laws be repealed, by all means, and don't waste any sympathy if even the whole 100,000 tenants against whom eviction proceedings have been brought despite the rent laws, occupy the sidewalks and city parks with their families and belongings. An easy remedy is open to them—they can "eat cake."

## Decrease Taxes and You Increase the Landlords' Tribute

A DISPATCH from Long Beach, Calif., tells of a municipally-owned oil well just leased, which "is heralded as a possible tax reducer." No doubt if the flow of oil is considerable in volume, the tax rate may be lowered. But what would it profit the people of Long Beach in general, if there was enough oil yielded to pay all the municipal expenses? There would be a saving to those who now pay license taxes and personal property tax and other of the numerous burdens on industry; but unless these taxpayers were also owners of sites in that city, they would find their saving to be only temporary. Very soon the value of land in Long Beach would rise, because business and property being relieved of taxes, business men could afford to pay more rent for the privilege of remaining in such a fortunate city. The only persons who would gain would be the owners of land, who would be relieved of the taxes which they now pay towards public expenses, and in addition would be enabled to charge non-landowners more than at present for the privilege of living and transacting business in Long Beach. As long as the rent of land is left in private hands, the effect of any beneficial public enterprise is simply to raise the value of land and to increase the tribute which landowners, as such, can levy on the rest of the community.

## A Notable Series of Articles

THERE ran through many issues of the *Rural New Yorker* a series of articles by John J. Dillon, entitled "A Primer of Economics." Part L. which appeared in the issue for Nov. 12, 1921, is entitled "What is Economic Rent," and the treatment leaves nothing to be desired. Mr. Dillon, after defining economic rent, asks this pertinent question:

"To whom does economic rent rightly belong? Since the community creates economic rent, it rightly belongs to the community. Since economic rent is created by the community, and belongs to the community, why does it not go to the community?"

Does the landlord do anything to create economic rent? The landlord can do nothing as an individual to create economic rent. It comes into being whether he likes it or not, and whether he wants it or not. It is created entirely by the needs of the people of the community and is paid by them."

Mr. Dillon then shows the similarity between city land and cultivated land, the principle governing rent being the same.

Part LII, appearing in the issue of the *Rural New Yorker* for Nov. 26, treats of the Single Tax, and Mr. Dillon says:

"The Single Tax would not change the amount of revenue to be raised. It would shift the payment of it from those who now pay it, who are mainly the ultimate consumers, to the owners of land. From information at hand and experiments already made, it would seem that the option would not affect much, if any, the farmer's direct tax for local expenses."

Mr. Dillon calls attention to the fact that while government has encouraged investment in land, it has not guaranteed it. But as government has encouraged such investment Mr. Dillon would proceed with caution, and suggests a shifting of taxes to absorb five per cent. of land values annually until the total land value is taken. He says that if the American people are convinced of a great principle they would find a way to put it into practice without hardship to the individual.

We cannot too strongly commend this very notable series of articles. They should find their way into book form. John J. Dillon the author, has been publisher of the *Rural New Yorker* since 1893. He has been president of the State Agricultural Society, and was State Commissioner of Foods and Markets in 1914. Coming from such a source this remarkable contribution to economic discussion and the practical endorsement of the Single Tax programme, is of great value. Mr. Dillon's conclusions should be brought to the attention of granges and farmers' organizations everywhere.

## Credit Due Representative Mondell

SOME of those who were present at the Chicago Convention of the Forty-Eighters will remember that Dr. T. J. Kelly, of Iowa, gave an account of a treaty made between the Shoshone Indians, of Wyoming, and the United States government, respecting a piece of land about a mile square on which were located the Thermopolis Springs. These springs, according to the conditions of the treaty, were to be considered the property of the State, never to be alienated. This was done, according to tradition, at the instance of the chief of the tribe, Washaki.

This romantic incident has been repeatedly told, but on investigation Dr. Kelly finds the story is tradition merely. The reservation of the springs was made at the instance of Mr. Mondell, now Republican leader in the House of Representatives.

In a letter recently received Dr. Kelly says: "There is one aspect of the matter which while depriving the incident of its romance carries a significance more important than that given to it by the traditional account. Brought face to face with a condition not befogged by the mists of custom, Representative Mondell, usually a conservative, saw as clearly as Henry George would have seen, that this gift of nature must not be alienated from the most humble