

lem of taxation. At all events, the social question can be easily reduced to the formula of a question of taxation."

Friedländer weakens the effect of an otherwise authoritative work by his closing chapters on the eccentric Eugen Dühring, whose own recantations in later life took away any value his economic teaching may have had.

About twenty of the candidates for the new Reichstag elections are good Single Taxers. Adolf Damaschke himself, the leader of the party, is candidate for the mandate from Jena.

Beside the bi-monthly organ of the party, *Die Deutsche Volkstimme* a new and bright little weekly, in the Rhine country, *Die Rheinische Rundschau*, has placed itself at the service of our ideas, and more and more single tax articles are appearing in journals of all political coloring throughout the country.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

#### IRELAND.

Mr. Michael Davitt is out with a scheme of his own for the settlement of the Irish Land question. We have had occasion to comment in these columns on what seemed to us Mr. Davitt's failure to apply his own unalterable convictions as to the justice of immediate and unconditional emancipation of the land from the grip of the landlords. To this latest scheme of the truest friend Ireland has to-day, there remains the same objection. Mr. Davitt's desire to do something practical to hasten the settlement of the question has evolved a plan which is remarkably ingenious, and which will no doubt find support in some quarters. If proposed by the Balfour government, or any government capable of carrying it out, it would be worthy of support, just as any way is better than no way at all to a desirable point. The objection to this scheme is that it comes from Michael Davitt, who believes that landlords as landlords have no right which any legislation is bound to respect. Why not continue to preach the full doctrine, and leave these painfully evolved plans of settlement and compromise to the men whose business is compromise—the politicians of England, "the dominant partner" in the ill-assorted union of Great Britain and Ireland. Does not Mr. Davitt perceive that his business is not with the devising of governmental plans, but the rousing of Ireland to the demand for a full and unconditional settlement? Not that Parliament would be likely to accord such terms, indeed, immediately or at any very early time. But they would yield such terms of settlement as public opinion could be educated to demand and such terms would be as favorable as Mr. Davitt could secure by devising schemes of his own. For in the present

state of the Balfour government does any one believe that the plan of the "father of the land league" has any chance of being even considered?

"I start with the proposition that in accordance with strict justice the landlords of Ireland are not entitled to their fares from Kingston to Holyhead for the loss of their criminally abused proprietary rights." There speaks the true Davitt, "But," he continues, "as conventional justice for the claims of prescriptive right cannot possibly be repudiated by the English government or avoided by Ireland, if a peaceful settlement of the land war is to be arrived at, we must face the question of compensation."

Then follows in detail the plan Mr. Davitt proposes, and on which no more intelligent commentary has appeared than the following from the columns of the Cork County *Eagle*, a paper which is always sound and unshaken in its devotion to true economic principles:

"Speaking of Land Nationalization, the 'Father of the Land League,' says: 'I still hold fondly and firmly to this great principle, and believe a national ownership to be the only true meaning of the battle-cry of the Land League—'THE LAND FOR THE PEOPLE.' In another passage he writes:—'Ownership must, therefore, be qualified by obligation, or duty, or tax, to the State, which will recognise the conditions on which the community at large—that is, the country as a whole—will allow the *natural heritage* of the people in the soil to be so owned, occupied, or expedited by any section.' These passages, it is evident, contain the pure principles of national ownership, or Land Nationalization, and clearly maintains the great truth that occupiers of land owe to the State, and to the State alone, a certain obligation, or, in other words, a rent for such possession as will give them the free use of the soil, which is the most important factor in the production of wealth—is, in fact, nature's store-house, and therefore could not be made the private property of a section of the community without inflicting gross injustice and serious injury on the community as a whole, particularly the toiling masses. Mr. Davitt then gives his suggestion, which, he believes, will effectually settle the land question, and in consequence stamp out that pernicious agitation which for so many years has convulsed Ireland, and brought in its train so destructive a period of social unrest. Briefly, that idea is this. England will give its credit for £150,000,000, which will roughly be the amount required at twenty-one years' purchase to buy a rental which he estimates at the nett value of £7,000,000 a year. The Treasury can easily raise this loan at 2½ per cent., and the rate of interest required on this principal would be 3½ per cent. This would allow of a

balance of one per cent. for a sinking fund, which is to pay off the principal in about forty-nine years. In the liquidation of this debt Mr. Davitt would require the Irish tenant to pay a sum of £100,000,000 whilst the remaining £50,000,000 would be paid off by the Irish community, which would thus be buying for itself an income of one-third of the rental of Ireland. This arrangement would mean that instead of a nett rental of £7,000,000 to the landlords, the tenants and the country would only be required to pay the much smaller sum of £5,000,000 annually for a period of forty-nine or fifty years. The £2,000,000 difference would be compensation to the tenants for improvements which they have effected in the soil for periods extending farther back than twenty years, for of such the Land Commission takes no account. Now, although this is a most ingenious arrangement, and one which was evidently the result of much thought, we cannot altogether agree with it. The appropriation of a third of the rental by the community is, indeed, most equitable as far as it goes but stops very far short of what justice should demand. Bearing in mind that rent is paid solely and only for the inherent productive power that is in the earth—the most valuable bounty of nature—why, we ask, should not the community, to whom undoubtedly that natural bounty belongs, take to itself the whole rental, instead of merely a third? Mr. Davitt's proposition is so far illogical, for the very fact of the State taking to itself even a third proves conclusively that the ownership of the soil does not in equity lie between two individuals—the landlord and tenant—but is the property of the whole community. This being so why should any government, by handing over the soil to the tenant class, give them an unfair advantage over other workers and members of the community, who have just as valid a claim to be considered and benefited?"

#### RECEPTION TO MRS. ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL.

Mrs. Eliza Stowe Twitchell of Boston was tendered a reception by the Women's Henry George League of New York, on the evening of Monday, February the twenty-third. The reception was held at the Lotus, 113 West 79th St. Mrs. Twitchell was passing several days with friends in New York and the League took this opportunity to honor a woman who has done so much for the cause. Mrs. Twitchell's writings for Single Tax have made her name known to friends of the movement throughout Massachusetts and beyond the borders of her home state. She has been for years one of the most valiant fighters in the van for Single Tax and

Eastern Single Taxers took pleasure in showing her their appreciation of what she has done. Before a well filled hall Mrs. Twitchell made an address which was received with great applause and which is well worth quoting in part here. After expressing her pleasure at meeting so many friends of the cause, and saying that she was glad to see women enlist themselves openly in so good a movement, as there was much work for Single Tax, that women might do among other women, Mrs. Twitchell went on to speak of the various ways of furthering our cause.

"We all know with what terrible earnestness the early workers of our reform attacked landlordism; how they waxed eloquent against private property in land, and demonstrated the justice and the advantages of taxing land values. I know something of the untiring labors of these early workers, and am proud to say that I had some share in their enthusiasms; indeed, so convinced was I, at one time, that all we had to do was to prove the justice of our cause, and people would rush to our ranks by the thousands, that I can remember thinking the millennium so near that possibly some of the speeches I was preparing would not be needed.

" . . . . But there is great difference between a negative and positive presentation of a truth. To attack Landlordism is revolutionary; but to say that Society is an organism that lives and grows and produces a value quite separate from the life, growth and value produced by the individual units composing it, is bringing good news to the people."

Mrs. Twitchell cited the instance of the farmer, the greatest natural conservative in the world, . . . .

"Tell an American farmer that private property in land is unjust and he thinks you will dispossess him of his land. Tell him you seek to put all taxes upon land values, and the term 'land values' is so new to him, that he is alarmed at once. . . .

But tell him that ground rent is a social product, and that you seek to socialize it, and so give him his share; tell him that it is ground rent upon which monopoly is feeding, taking the share that belongs to the public; tell him that whoever receives ground rent receives a social privilege, that you seek to equalize privileges and so remove tax burden . . . . then give him time to think about it, and ten to one he will work his own way to the moral side of the matter and understand at last."

Mrs. Twitchell paid tribute to the work of some of the prominent Single Taxers, mentioning Lawson Purdy, Tom Johnson, C. B. Fillebrown, and others, and ended with a hopeful outlook for the future from the general enlightenment of public opinion, and the spread of Truth and justice.

## ELECTION OF TOM L. JOHNSON.

Tom L. Johnson has been re-elected Mayor of Cleveland by an increased majority. "I attribute my election to the determination of the people that the corporations should not rule," the Mayor is reported to have said. "The people have endorsed my administration and I am satisfied."

In Toledo, Mayor Jones is also re-elected. Jones, though not a Single Taxer, is with the forces of progress, and his election is a deserved tribute to the man as well as a testimony to the common sense of the people of Toledo. He was elected in the face of the most extraordinary opposition of the two machines, and an agreement between the newspapers, not even to mention his name. The result is, therefore, all the more the people's victory.

## STORY OF THE AUTHOR OF "MY DICTATORSHIP."

Mr. C. W. P. Amies tells the following interesting story in a private letter printed in our bright, little contemporary, "Taxation," of West Australia, detailing, how Mr. Singer, one of the authors of "The Story of My Dictatorship," first read "Progress and Poverty":

"You know Mr. Singer is not a rich man now—he never was; but when he first came to London it was a question of getting a living. A certain young German, to whom he had been introduced by a friend, was ambitious to bring out a book, to be published under, or above, his own name, and was looking for some one to do the brain-work. This task was an easy one for our Mr. Singer, and, for a certain pecuniary consideration, he agreed to edit the work. Business was started, and Singer comes along with the introduction, started something in this fashion: 'In the following chapters we propose to investigate the basis of society, and to lay bare the workings of our social system. If, in doing so, we draw the veil and expose what is hideous or unclean, it is because truth demands us to do so.' Our German aspirant was thunderstruck, and, being of a timid type and governed by the traditions of his class, took strong exception to the language, and mentioned, by the way, that if he put his name to such language as that he would be ostracised by his people. The whole matter in the introductory chapter was discussed during the debate, and the German called Singer a 'Georgian.' Singer said: 'Why do you call me a Georgian?' and he pointed to a book on the table, and said: 'Because you believe as Henry George does.' Singer said: 'Will you permit me to read that book?' I have never heard of Henry George." It

was 9 o'clock in the morning when we commenced the discussion, and we had continued it throughout without leaving the room or having any refreshments. It was 6 o'clock now. We went out for tea. Afterward I went home, and, going to my chamber, I settled into bed, and by the light of an oil-lamp on a shelf on the bed I read through every chapter of that great book, and when daylight came in the morning I turned over the last leaf."

The Brooklyn Single Tax League has been holding a series of Friday night lectures, which have been well attended. Among those who have addressed the club during the months of March and April, are Chas. O'Connor Hennessey, Jacob Cantor, Rev. Henry Frank, John R. Waters, Rev. A. J. Brucklacher, Henry George, Jr., and Lawson Purdy. At the Friends' Church, Lawson Purdy will debate the Single Tax on the evening of April 25th. The church is on the corner of Lafayette and Washington Avenues. The League has changed its meeting place to 1279 Bedford Avenue.

## MR. WEEKS' CALL FOR INDEPENDENT POLITICAL ACTION.

## THREE COMMUNICATIONS.

(We have received a number of communications expressing a desire to reply to Mr. Weeks' article published in our Winter number urging independent political action. A number of these gentlemen have failed to send in their letters. Up to the time of going to press we are in receipt of but three letters on the subject, all of which endorse Mr. Weeks' position.)

Mayville, N. Dak., April 8th, 1893.

To the Editor:

The interest manifested in your suggestion in the Autumn Number, relative to a national organization of Single Taxers, is not such as that to which, by its importance, it is justly entitled. In my opinion there is nothing so much needed for the progress of our movement throughout the country as a strong national organization to undertake the publication of a monthly, or weekly, journal of propaganda and news and carry on other lines of work. Of the desirability and necessity of such an organization there can, it seems to me, be no question, and I would suggest that steps be taken at once in the direction of securing a list of all the active Single Tax workers in the country. The Louisiana Purchase Exposition at St. Louis next year will furnish an excellent opportunity for a Nation Convention or Congress, at which the completion of a strong organization might be effected.

The article in the Winter Number by Mr.



Weeks, on "Independent Political Action—Our Duty," I read with a great deal of interest. He certainly puts the argument for independent action in a very strong light, but it seems to me that at present the wisest thing to do is to endeavor to make the Democratic party more truly radical and prevent its falling into the hands of the conservatives. Should the Democratic party be captured by the "re-organizers," for which I am not looking, affairs would, I think, take such a turn as to give us an opportunity to secure the acceptance of our ideas by a new radical party which would undoubtedly arise to meet the occasion. There is a lesson for us, I believe, in the parable of the leaven which was placed in "two measures of meal" and which continued working quietly until it had "leavened the whole lump." The foregoing is the position I am inclined to take with reference to national political action. So far as local independent action is concerned, I am frank to say that my views have been somewhat changed by a visit which I made to Chicago four months ago. There I found that the Single Tax party had succeeded in a very considerable measure in bringing our proposition to the attention of the masses of the people and in securing for it a very fair consideration. I spent almost a month in the city, and was surprised at different times to hear our cause endorsed in places where I had least looked for it. The opportunity which the party movement affords during campaigns of putting everybody interested to work is an item which must be taken into account in any consideration of this question. Before going down there and investigating it somewhat I had been opposed to any and every kind of independent action on our part but, from my experience while there, I am led to believe that, for purposes of agitation and education, local independent action may be made use of to advantage. In other places where the conditions are different it might not, of course, work so well and is largely a matter to be determined by those on the ground.

J. EDWARD TOTTEN.

Chicago, February 14th, 1903.

Editor, *Single Tax Review*:

I was pleased to see in the Winter Number of the Review the good editorial called forth by Mr. Weeks' strong argument for independent single-tax political action. I believe his contribution about three years ago to the symposium held by the National Single Taxer on that subject was partly responsible for the decision to start a Single Tax party here in Cook County; and as that party has since carried on four campaigns, and, as the experiences of those engaged must on a smaller scale be similar to the experiences which will follow ac-

tivity in a National Party, a letter from me may not be out of place.

When the resulting schism in the Chicago Single Tax Club occurred, I was in great doubt as to the course I ought to pursue. My closest single tax friends; the men in whose judgment I had most confidence; and nearly all who could be called either representative single taxers, or monied men, were among those who seceded; and I was in full accord with their opposition to the project. As the trouble was over a mere question as to the wisdom or foolishness of a proposed move, and in no sense over a matter of principle, and as I realized that whether I wished it so or not, our cause was going to get the credit or the discredit of a party movement, I finally determined it my duty to remain with the old club and do my little toward making the action creditable. Upon more intimate acquaintance with the party leaders, I was surprised to find that few, if any of them, looked upon it as a way to elect single tax men to office, or directly bring about a single tax regime; but favored it solely as a method of propaganda, by which the truth we hold could be thoroughly advertised; all sorts of single taxers, even the half-fledged, the luke-warm and the timid could get to work; more people could be reached in their stores and homes in a few weeks than could be gotten out to lectures in years; papers and tracts could be distributed broadcast; much newspaper notoriety obtained; many unknown sympathizers discovered and more complete and classified lists compiled, while we were becoming better acquainted among ourselves and more familiar with election laws and practical politics. That idea has been persistently ignored by the seceders, and has never been thoroughly considered, perhaps, by opponents to party action, but it caused me to become an active member of the party; and, while I still firmly believe that from a purely political point of view, the arguments against such a movement are sound, and while matters have not always gone my way, I have never for an instant had cause to regret my choice. I have been a single taxer since 1888, and have taken part in all kinds of schemes to awaken interest in and gain converts to that plan, but my practical experience during the past two years has fully proven to me and also to every man of the score or two who have worked with me, that independent political action offers greater propaganda opportunities than all the other devices combined. The political aspect is the very thing that affords the excuse which encourages the average single tax man to become aggressive, and at the same time gives the voter enough interest and patience to listen. In a local campaign at least, (because the tariff question is eliminated) we have proved that as single taxers we minimize prejudice and can reach the ears of



democrat and republican alike, and I am certain that single tax has become better known in Chicago since 1900 than during all the preceding years. Club meetings have been kept up as usual and a significant feature has been the fact that we are never so easy financially, as when carrying on campaigns. The general public has treated us remarkably well, and a large part of the assistance given us has come from new converts and persons who became friendly. It goes without saying that much more could have been done if the local single taxers had put up a united front, for the only serious obstacle has been the apathy or the sarcastic opposition of acknowledged single taxers. And therein I think lies the rub. As long as an appreciable proportion of the single taxers, will, because they cannot have their own way, act in such a manner over any question that does not involve our principle, results will naturally be small; for while the propaganda possibilities of a party movement are very great there must be something like unanimity if those possibilities are to be made the most of. As yet anything like unanimity along this line seems impossible to me, and I confess I have lost much of my former confidence in single taxers and possess a growing belief that comparatively few of them want the single tax badly enough to even deserve to get it.

If that is the case how can we expect the public to desire it? If the time of single tax is to come before events absolutely force it we have got to earn it. Single Taxers are numerous enough in Cook County, and probably in the United States to make a fairly creditable party, and if after a thoroughly representative conference at which, *for educational purposes*, a majority voted for a National Party, every single taxer would loyally do his part to carry on the campaigns exactly as though political victory was fully expected, great good would certainly follow regardless of the size of the vote. Our vote, as counted, has been small and all who looked upon the movement as political quickly dropped out of sight.

A large vote should not be looked for. The people cannot yet be trusted to vote right on a party ballot, but they have shown in many places that they can be trusted to vote about right on measures. Our propaganda (of all kinds is preparing them to vote YES, when, while voting their old straight party ticket a single tax proposition shall be submitted to them on a separate referendum ballot. To effectively propagate, we must reach the people, and I am now positive that through political action that can best be done, and that if a single tax national party, with that end in view, had been started in 1886 and continued to the present day the single tax would now be the burning issue between the two great par-

ties through one or the other of which in all probability it must ultimately come.

Very respectfully yours,

GEORGE C. MADISON,  
698 Orchard St.,  
Chicago, Ill.

New York, April 3, 1903.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

In the Winter Number of the *Review*, Mr. Edward T. Weeks, of New Iberia, La., has advanced some very cogent and forceful reasons why the Single Taxers of the United States should organize into a political party. I, for one, consider all his points well taken, and some of them exceedingly so. Of course, Mr. Weeks' proposition will not be favorably received by those among us who aspire to be recognized as the "conservative element." Now, conservatism may be ever so honest, and sincere, and well-meaning, but it is after all only the tangible evidence of that timidity which inclines men to bear with the ills they have, than fly to others that they know not of. It may, therefore, justly be regarded as narrow-mindedness, for to be broad in one's views requires courage above all else. No great reformer was ever conservative in the sense that he was apprehensive of possible consequences. As all of human endeavor is relative in its nature there is nothing absolutely certain until proven so, and the man who never experiments is the man who never demonstrates anything.

Why should any single taxer balk at the engine of political action? If we had some little, petty, picayune issue to go before the people with—like one of those over which the two old parties are everlastingly splitting hairs—this aversion could be accounted for. But we have the grandest moral issue to back us and compel success that any political party ever had. The single tax proposition is the greatest of economic truths, and when once seen can never again be obscured. Truth of whatever kind will sooner or later force recognition and compel action. Evidently then our first duty as single taxers is to show those of our fellow-men who have not yet seen it, the truth as we see it. This can best be done by forming a national party because in that way we can reach the greatest number with the least effort.

How can we consistently ask men to join in a movement which is as devoid of unity of action as ours is? I, therefore, sincerely hope that a national convention will soon be held as proposed by Mr. Weeks and other single taxers. Sooner or later we must enter the field of active politics; why not sooner rather than later? It is all nonsense prating about the people not being ready for the single tax. They are. Just watch them. They are clutching at

every shadow of reform like drowning men at straws. How much more eager would they be if the real substance of the thing were put before them?

Respectfully,  
F. H. BURYSON,  
of the Seaman's Union,  
37 South St.,  
New York City.

### BOOK REVIEWS.

(Owing to press of matter, reviews of John Graham Brooks' *Social Unrest*, from the pen of Mr. Bolton Hall, and *Benevolent Feudalism*, from the pen of the editor, are crowded out of this number. They will appear in the Summer Number.)

#### "TOWARD THE LIGHT."

Mr. Lewis H. Berens, co-author of "The Story of My Dictatorship," etc., has written another book "Toward the Light," (Swan, Sonnenschein & Co.) a collection of essays and studies in ethics and economics, joined and related into a complete logical work.

It deals with subjects about which his thoughts are neither illusive, elusive or delusive.

Single taxers, who are uncertain about various knotty points in political economy will find their perplexities stated and explained, in simple and lucid illustration and argument.

Mr. Berens is an avowed single taxer, in almost thorough agreement with Henry George, from whom he dissents, however on the question of "Interest," whether it is natural or by-product of distorted economic conditions. He contends that "Interest" springs from private appropriation of rent and legal privilege and will disappear along with their abolition.

Yet upon his own showing "Interest" will continue as a regulator for the economical production of "auxiliaries—tools" alternating between premium and discount, according as the supply is deficient or in excess of demand tending to an equilibrium (pages 160-161).

"Land" and "Labor" are the primary factors of production, supplemented in advanced conditions, by what Mr. Berens terms "Auxiliaries of production—Tools," a capital definition of "Capital," the change in terms, however, does not change the factors.

It goes merely as a matter of statement that these "auxiliaries" are neither one or the other factor—"land" or "labor"—they are both, consequently, to assign "wages" to "labor," "rent" to "land," excludes, (if distribution be limited to these terms, rent and wages) any definite term to the earnings of "auxiliaries."

"Auxiliaries—Tools" are termed capital

to differentiate it from "land" and "labor"; since it is therefore necessary to make a distinction in the terms of the factors, it is equally important that the *earnings* of the factors bear distinctive names.

Matter, and the forces of nature, comprehended in the term "Land" are not only active before and while labor is operating with them, but in some cases continues to produce increment even after they are changed, modified, separated, combined, etc. by labor, and converted into exchangeable "goods." The competition of various commodities, some of which continue to grow in value, while others remain stationary or depreciate gives rise to a value determined by the value of the depreciating commodity, analogous to the "No rent" land in the phenomena of "rent."

Rent attaches to a place, but after land has been disassociated from its fixed condition and directed on its way toward satisfying human needs, the unearned increment that before attached to *the place* will now be added to *the product*, a store of wheat will increase in value with the lowering of the margin of cultivation.

Advancing civilization will, if past experience is any criterion, make the production of a "good" an easier task; what now requires ten days' effort to produce, may in a week or a year be produced by nine days' work, during the same time that other "goods" are being produced with even a greater saving of labor, while concurrently some things will require no less exertion than before. This variation will, in deferred rewards of enjoyment, be naturally distributed by the play of competitive interest.

If I loan, for a year, the work of ten days, represented, for example, by a barrel of flour and at the expiration of the time when payment is to be made, a barrel of flour can be produced with nine days' work, should I, in justice, be paid the then value of a barrel of flour or the prevailing value of ten days' work?

I believe that interest is natural and necessary to average this advancing gain and distribute its advantages equitably.

This problem of whether interest is natural and therefore persistent, is not to be solved by legislation. Right conditions will bring its own settlement of the question, and Mr. Berens aptly sums up the situation in the conclusion to his chapter on "Interest." He says: "It is, therefore, not natural and equitable, but unnatural and unjust."

Many earnest Social Reformers may, however, still remain of the opposite opinion. It is, therefore, a matter of congratulation that differences of opinion on this somewhat abstract, if not merely academic, question cannot be any real cause of antagonism or separation between any who are seriously desirous of establishing justice, and of securing to mankind the fruits of jus-

tice. All can unite to attain this end; and when it is attained, then if "interest" continues, we shall know that it is both natural and just; whilst if it disappears, we shall know that it was unnatural and unjust; that it was, in truth, but one of the fruits of privilege and monopoly, of that unjust social system which produced poverty in the midst of plenty, and which conferred advantages and privileges on the few, at the cost to the detriment of their "disinherited" fellow-citizens.

The exposition of value could be clearer. There is an implication at least that "value" is a "ratio" and cannot therefore be increased or decreased as a total. No single which has been so completely demolished by Henry George in the 'Science of Political Economy.' But the book is altogether a good contribution to the growing literature of the single tax.

The historian will some day trace out the development of an established right order of society from such writings as Mr. Berens' and others who have been inspired by the great genius of Henry George.

BENJAMIN DOBLIN.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

Chicago, Ill.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Regarding your request for opinions on the matter of a national organization and a national organ, I would say that I think the organ must precede the organization. It is easier to get people to subscribe for a paper than to contribute to the support of an organization concerning the doings of which they are not being kept regularly informed.

To make the paper attractive enough to draw subscribers for other reasons than merely a sense of duty, I would suggest that all long propaganda articles be barred from its columns. Very few read these articles, so that there is nothing gained by publishing them. Something on the order of the short and sharp comments on current events, by means of which the Appeal to Reason has succeeded in building up an enormous circulation, would be much better. The Appeal to Reason has achieved success because it can be appreciated and enjoyed by non-socialists as well as socialists, and consequently has attracted thousands of the former class to its support.

I think also that, if possible, the various struggling single tax papers, such as *Why*, the *Detroit Commonwealth*, etc., might be induced to consolidate. The combined subscription lists of all these papers may be enough to make one paper self-sustaining.

S. DANZIGER.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I have watched with a great deal of regret the many attempts that have been made in the past to establish and place upon a solid financial foundation a national organ that would be worthy of the cause, for the only question in connection with the building up of a strong organ has been the one of money. I do not consider that my opinion is of any value upon matters of this kind, but I have always felt from the time I was connected with the *Single Tax*, some sixteen years ago, that among the first essentials to the early success of our cause was the establishing of a national organ upon such a scale as would command the respect and attention of intelligent people throughout the world, besides being the means to keep *Single Taxers* informed of what was being done, and of the progress of the movement everywhere. This tends to keep up the enthusiasm, without which success is out of the question, and we have but to go over the past few years in the history of the movement to prove conclusively, I think, the truth of the above assertion. I can truthfully say that the only thing that has ever caused me to feel in the least discouraged in the early success—that is, say, in our lifetime—of the cause is their lack of interest or indifference of *Single Taxers* generally in a national organ. Nor can I understand why it should be so, especially when I see how enthusiastically the Socialists support, not one, but a half dozen or more of party papers, to say nothing of numerous other publications which are daily growing in circulation.

W. W. WILES.

Beaver, Pa., Feb. 5, 1903.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I notice in the last issue of the *Single Tax Review* that Booker Washington denies the published statement of Brother Bailey, that he is a *Single Taxer*. At this I am not surprised. Mr. Washington, in his lectures, reveals a shortsightedness of economic questions that is foreign to single taxers. He no doubt feels kindly toward the single tax movement, and perhaps has a notion that he is a *Single Taxer* himself, but I feel quite certain that he does not realize the full import of the George philosophy. I have a friend quite intelligent and well read who tells me that he believes in the single tax philosophy, not because he understands it himself, but because he believes in the men who are single taxers. Might not this be Mr. Washington's dilemma? And thoughtlessly he pronounces himself a single taxer.

Yours fraternally,

CHARLES R. ECKERT.



(The following letter is from a Texan, a newspaper man, and one who is favorably known for his work in behalf of the single tax. In view of the recent vote for the single tax in the House of Commons which was defeated by a narrow majority of thirteen, we are able to appreciate how closely Mr. Fitzgerald's optimism is "founded on fact.")

I have seen all of Europe that I shall ever care to see again. Not that Nature has not been lavish in her gifts to men even in that quarter of the world, for she has been very kind to them, and there is much to be seen there, but the gifts and the things to be seen are the property of the very few and the poverty of the many is appalling. No one can know it only he who has seen and partly experienced it. I have trod the ground that Henry George trod twenty years ago, but I saw things that George never saw—things that, perhaps, were hidden from his ken. George never visited a "Model lodging house" or a "spike" in the winter time as I have done, and he never saw the true depths of degradation to which man has fallen in the British Isles.

Poverty there is so general and acute that extreme cases of destitution excite no comment whatever. There are no *extreme* cases of poverty to record; the whole social situation is extreme. Extreme cases of poverty are not the exception, but the everlasting rule, and it is impossible to exaggerate the situation, and summer and winter are all one to that tenth of the population which is said to be and is, hopelessly "submerged." In November there were 20,000 school children in the east end of London going to school every day with "noffink for dinner" in their dinner baskets. The London *Daily News* said the children must be fed and clothed and it immediately opened its columns for subscriptions to save the little ones. The Tory papers call the London *Daily News* a "Radical organ," but it can intelligently discuss the single tax. Strange how every man who is "for men," who loves his fellowman, should be called a "radical." I am glad to be a radical.

You would like to know, no doubt, how "the cause" is progressing on the other side. It is progressing wonderfully, smoothly and without the least friction from within. The single tax finds its great support among the business and mercantile class and an intelligent conception of the fundamental principle of single taxism—freedom of opportunity—is held by them. The question is thrust upon them there and they meet it at every turn in the economic highway. They couldn't avoid it if they would. It confronts them eternally, and their conception of the aims and purposes of the single tax couldn't escape their intelligence without insulting it, and the consequence

is that "business" and "commercial" England and Scotland are for the single tax. When the United States have traveled as far along the road of Progress and Poverty that Britain has traveled, they will be for the single tax, too. And for that day we must be found waiting.

JAMES FITZGERALD.

We regret to chronicle the death of James T. Barnard, of Hamilton, Ont., a leading single taxer of the dominion. Mr. Barnard was well to do, and was far and favorably known to the Canadian workers in the cause. His death leaves a vacancy not easy to fill.

The New York *Times* having referred to Mr. Louis F. Post as a socialist, Mr. Daniel Cavanagh, of this city, took the trouble to write a letter to the editor, calling his attention to this error. The *Times* did not publish the letter, but sent to Mr. Cavanagh the following explanation. It will be remembered that the *Times* once referred editorially to the single tax as the "ideal system" of taxation, but this was just on the completion of its present building, when the tax assessors swept down upon it, and demanded a slice of its value. Its opinion of the "ideal system" has undergone a change since that time. Following is the letter to Mr. Cavanagh:

DEAR SIR:—As you have doubtless noticed, we have already printed a letter setting Mr. Post and his views straight and that, we think, makes it somewhat needless to print your own very interesting letter on the same subject.

As to the plea for a single tax, we have printed very many columns and your letter on that subject, and the portion of your letter referring to that subject hardly, we think, adds to what has already appeared.

It is a pleasant picture you present of having all the vacant lots built on, and it would be doubtless extremely interesting to see all the dwellers from Avenue A moving en masse and occupying lots facing on Central Park and other desirable locations; but if all the lots in the City of New York were built upon, they would house several times the number of people who now live within the confines of the city.

We presume that somebody or another would be willing to pay the owners of the property for the loss they sustain in having no tenants for their beautiful new buildings, although that point does not seem to be made clear in your letter.

Respectfully,  
The New York *Times*.

To this letter Mr. Cavanagh replied:

Permit me to thank you for taking the trouble to return the article which I sent you about Mr. Louis F. Post explaining the difference between a single taxer and a Socialist. I'm glad that you recognize the fact that there's plenty of room in this town for "Several times the number of people that now live within the confines of the city." Of course I do not know how interesting it would be to some people to have "All the folks from Avenue A move up to Central Park West." But I'm positive it wouldn't be horrible. The fresh air might kill some of 'em off in short order. But the children would no doubt get used to it in time, especially after they'd lived in that neighborhood long enough to get blue blooded. As for reimbursing the landlords for any losses they might sustain by the adoption of the single tax I can only respectfully refer you to a much abler writer than myself, (Mr. Henry George in "Progress and Poverty"), who covers that point exhaustively. A letter to the *Times* must necessarily be brief and many things that should be covered must be left unsaid.

Thanking you once more for your courtesy in returning my letter, especially as I never enclose stamps. I remain,

Respectfully yours,  
DAN CAVANAGH.

#### SINGLE TAXERS HONOR JEFFERSON.

The anniversary of the birth of Thomas Jefferson was celebrated at a dinner given by the Manhattan Single Tax Club at the Hotel Vendome on the evening of April 13th. About 100 members of the club attended the dinner. Speeches were made by Congressman Robert Baker of Brooklyn, Judge Samuel Seabury, Dan Beard, Henry George, Jr., and C. E. S. Wood of Portland, Oregon. Miss Grace Isabel Colbron read a poem on Jefferson, written by Joseph Dana Miller, which appears in another page of the *REVIEW*.

(Expressly for the *REVIEW*.)

#### SERIAL ECONOMICS, NO. 4.

By James Love, Author of *Jap. Notions of Pol. Econ.*

The first step towards truth is in recognizing error.—SPINOZA.

I have prepared this additional paper, "By request;" though not without fear, for repetitions are so apt to tire that it is rarely prudent to respond to an encore. Besides the game is hardly worth the powder. For except economists, mainly unfledged, no one seems to write for these economic

quarterlies, and except the same men and a few undergraduate parrots no one ever opens them. So that they might well be associated with the Constitution of the United States as the school boy defined it, "That part of the book at the end which nobody reads." In the Philadelphia free library I find them always in place. (Leaves cut to be sure but the librarians do that), while the other magazines are in constant use. Yet they make a brave show—heavy calendared paper, large type, wide margins; conducted under the supervision of economic committees of Yale or Columbia, or Chicago;—storage batteries of wisdom from which prudent people keep aloof. However students, (or rather memorizers) who seldom read anything they do not have to, soon find that often there is more to be gained in learning error than truth, and that by dipping into these cabalistic papers and affecting to comprehend them, they not only win golden opinions from teachers, but ever seeking not knowledge, but diplomas, they thus smooth the ways. Resembling in this respect the hygienic feeding of an elder brother of mine, who eating nothing except as the faculty commend it, takes bacon at breakfast not that it is nutritious or that he likes it, but because he has been assured that "It serves to lubricate the passages."

True political economy "Is the simplest of the sciences. It is but the intellectual recognition, as related to social life, of laws which in their moral aspect men instinctively recognize and which are embodied in the simple teachings of Him whom the common people heard gladly." Other sciences may be left to specialists. But political economy, dealing with the "Distribution" of wealth, is the one science of which every one easily could and should be a master. Yet as if society had turned over to them all of its "Trained intelligence and moral worth" (Ely's words), these professional assignees of a discredited "Economics" take possession of the whole field of controversy, leaving the rest of us in the plight of my old friend Deufel, who unable to collect from a bankrupt, explained to me in grief that "Assignee take all! Don't leave other folks *some*." These gentlemen do not study, they read, they memorize, they fill themselves full of other men's ideas and produce none of their own. "Much reading," says Schopenhauer, "Deprives the mind of all elasticity. \* \* The mind that is overloaded with alien thought is deprived of all clear insight, and so well nigh disorganized." And the Philosopher of Archy Road in the same vein, writes: "Readin' is th' nex' thing this side of goin' to bed f'r restin' th' mind. \* \* Believe me, Hinnessy, readin' is not thinkin'. It seems like it, an' whin it comes out in talk it sounds like it—to thim as doesn't think."

Now in the Journal of Political Economy for December, 1902, I find a review of the last book of Prof. Seligman of Columbia, a gentleman who has been admiringly called "The Economic Cormorant," and who has read himself into a state of intellectual disintegration. The same man who, a few years ago, insisted that when one loses a cow he not only loses the value of the cow but also all the milk and calves it might have yielded in an indefinite future, adding "What I complain of is the ignorance of your Single Tax men in the Science of Finance. \* \* If you desire to study it a little more in detail, permit me to refer you to a few works on the Science of Finance, such as Schaffle, Grundsätze der Stenerpolitik, pp. 176-190; or Rau, Finanzwissenschaft, Vol. ii., pp. 22-27; or Pantaleoni, Traduzione del Tributo, pp. 168-183. Here as in countless other works, you will find the theory plainly set forth." The new book is The Economic Interpretation of History, reviewed by T. N. Carver of Harvard, who commences: "It is a favorable sign that economists are showing a tendency in recent years to take the broad view or to consider the bearing of economic facts and principles upon the broader questions of human progress and social development." In this the italicized words might well be omitted as useless, the closing words "Social development" being a mere paraphrase of "Human progress." Besides, which are the broader—economic laws (natural laws) or political and social institutions resting upon them? He quotes Seligman thus, "To economic causes therefore must be traced in the first instance these transformations in the structure of society, which themselves condition the relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life." This reads smoothly and seems to have a meaning. But when *thought* about, has it? "Economic causes" is a common but ambiguous term. Webster defines economic as "Relating to the means of living or the resources and wealth of a country." Condition, Seligman uses for *govern* or *cause*. While "The relations of social classes and the various manifestations of social life" is a mere wordy paraphrase of "structure of society." These give the passage a learned effect, but being corrected we find that Seligman really says: "To causes relating to the means of living or to the resources of the country must be traced these changes in the structure of society which themselves cause the structure of society." Says Carver: "If, however, one begins reading upon the subject, he would soon find (the economic way of saying, "One soon finds however") that the economic interpretation of History means the dogma," etc. "It is to the discussion of this dogma that Prof. Seligman has turned his brilliant pen." In this way these men pat each other on

the back. Than Prof. S. no more tiresome and wordy writer exists. That his tongue ever runs before his wit is to be seen in "Japanese Notions," where a passage of 180 words from his "Finance" is easily reduced to 49, 131 redundant words in a passage of 180! What such men have in mind, says Schopenhauer, is trivial. But they spin it out in prolix incomprehensibility so that it may look learned and deep. Carver writes that "The necessities of economic life" and "The necessities of economic existence" forbid the socialistic system. May be, but what is gained by putting "economic" before life and existence? And while Seligman (condensing his verbosity) in referring to Das Kapital, says of Marx, that with the exception of Ricardo there has never been in economics a more powerful and original intellect. Carver affirms that Marx' Das Kapital must be classed among "crank literature." So it goes, nothing that outsiders may say of them can be more severe than what they say of each other. And this applies to all philosophy. Thus John Stuart Mill, writing to Bain of Hamilton: "I did not expect to find his works a mass of contradictions. \* \* It almost goes against me to write so complete a demolition of a brother philosopher." Yet, they all hold to philosophy as the quintessence of wisdom or at least of policy. "Philosophy is the chap for me," said schoolmaster Squeers. "If a parent asks a question in the classical, commercial, or mathematical line, says I, gravely, 'Why, sir, in the first place, are you a philosopher?' 'No, Mr. Squeers,' he says, 'I ain't.' 'Then, sir,' says I, 'I am sorry for you, for I shan't be able to explain it.' Naturally the parent goes away, and wishes he was a philosopher, and equally naturally, thinks I'm one."

In the Economic Journal for December, 1902, I find "Practical Utility of Economic Science," by Edward Cannan, who says: "This practical utility is not in private business but in politics." Thus travestying Hadley, now President of Yale, who says that his "Economics" "is an attempt to apply the methods of modern science to the problems of modern business." A discordance that makes economic "Science" look sick, and tends to illustrate Cannan's own remark that there is no text book that commands any really wide acceptance. Further illustrated by this, also from Cannan. "The question of distribution. Why some are rich and others poor? The teacher will explain that the share of each person depends on the amount and value of his contribution to production whether it be labor or *the use of property*." To be contrasted with economist Mill's remark, "That the reward instead of being proportioned to the labor \* \* of the individual is almost in an inverse ratio to it; those who receive the least labor \* \* the



most." Says Cannan, "If the *general working of the economic organisation* had been understood" (the italicized words he makes a paraphrase for "economic laws"), the London County Council would have acted otherwise than it did. But he has already said that no text book is generally accepted, and we know that most of the recent writers deny that there are any economic or moral laws at all (Ely, Hadley, Seligman, etc.), and instance this passage from himself, "The economic theory has great utility in promoting peace among men." How? By declaring that our policies to be efficient must rest upon *justice* as the supreme law? Hardly. It promotes peace "By enabling working men to get rid of that stupid cry for 'Rights and Justice.'" "They demand a living wage \* \* and rend the air with complaints and get subscriptions from a compassionate but ill informed public," etc. However, he kindly admits that we cannot expect people who "suffer by them to regard even the most beneficial operations of the *economic organisation* with enthusiasm or even satisfaction." He seems to feel that "Economic Organisation," a structure built up in violation of economic laws, and toppling in consequence, is co-terminous with economic law. And, to use Madam De Stael's language, "Treating virtue as a conjectural science and entirely submitted to circumstance in its application," he says, The rich do not hold their wealth "Because Moses brought it down from Sinai," (that is because of the moral law that the product belongs to the producer—the law that thou shalt not steal), but simply because it happens to be convenient for society not to rob them.

"A knowledge of economic theory would help the practical man." (Cannan's theory would surely help a practical thief.) "To any one who has grasped the main drift of economic theory," etc. But whose theory? What theory? Were earth's discordant economists in congress assembled, he *must* know that to the question "What theory is the true one," the reply would be, in a unanimous shout—MINE!

Aesop's ass in an Economic Lion's skin might have been a fairly good deception had he, while concealing his ears held his peace. But, when he essays to roar—Presto, the illusion is over.

But, not recognizing the disrupting and dis-social effect of our land system, confusion of thought and bewilderment of expression affect all social discussion whatever. Kidd's "Social Evolution" is in point. To which we may apply Montesquieu's words about a book of his day. "The more it is deficient in proofs the more it abounds in probabilities \* \* And as a prodigious fund of erudition is interposed, not in the system but around it, the mind is taken up with the appendages and

neglects the principal. Besides such a vast multitude of researches hardly permits one to believe that nothing has been found." In this book on page 6 we read, "We have little in common with the past. It may be searched in vain for any clue to the solution of the problems which confront us in the future." Yet, on page 351, he quotes approvingly from Lecky that at no distant date we shall be able "To \* \* detect in the slow movements of the past the great permanent forces that are steadily bearing nations onward to improvement or decay." The term "great permanent forces" meaning *moral laws*, which history shows lead to improvement or to decay, as they are or are not conformed to. And if it is true that "To use many words to communicate few thoughts is everywhere an unmistakable sign of mediocrity," what is to be thought of his *style*, of which this passage of 88 words that can be easily reduced to 36, is a sample. "It may be observed also that the public opinion which earlier in the century regarded with suspicion (as tending to the infringement of the prevailing theories as to the restricted nature of the duty of the state), even the attempt to regulate the hours of women and children in factories and mines has already come to view as within the realm of reasonable discussion proposals to strengthen the position of the working classes by enforcing a legal eight hours day and even a minimum wage in certain occupations." As reduced, "Public opinion which once regarded with suspicion even the attempt to regulate the hours of women and children in factories and mines, now regards as reasonable proposals enforcing an eight hour day and even a minimum wage."

In the Quarterly Journal of Economics for February, 1903, is "A study of the science of welfare," by Fred. Kellogg Blue, 41 pp. Followed by two pages, of five diagrams, resembling geometrical ones. He commences, "There is now an urgent demand for a really scientific political economy." Putting it, however, in these words, "In the development of Economics according to modern scientific methods perhaps the most urgent demand is that which calls for a concept which will bring together all the various truths that have been presented and embody them in a consecutively developed and unified structure." He says, "Stated in terms of the psychological feelings of the individual the production of material things for the purpose of satisfying needs and desires or of gaining pleasure, involves an expenditure of effort which is accompanied by pain or disagreeable feelings. \* \* \* Stated in terms of the metabolism of the organism, with which the production of wealth possesses certain analogies, the utility of the time spent in the production of anything is measured by the difference between the build-

ing up or preserving of organic tissue finally resulting from the act, and the tearing down the tissue involved in the effort of production." He then states the matter physiologically, and in other ways. While Diagram No. 1, "Let the distance from O to a point T in the line OT, represent the time spent," etc., etc., is to assure us that whatever it is he is maintaining, the argument is clinched. However, we who are not alumni must, like the participants at a seance when the materialization speaks in Greek, and "the evidence is of things not seen," have a receptive faith in the medium. The article ends with a partial synopsis of it, 3 pp., 15 numbered items. I give only the first and last.

No. 1. In any act of conduct of any organism the utility of the time spent in the act depends upon catabolism and environment.

No. 15. When the quantity of capital borrowed is controlled by the consumer, the distribution of the loanage between the consumer and the possessor is determined by the rate of interest which corresponds to that quantity of capital affording a maximum income, to the rate of interest, to the consumer of the capital.

Prof. Blue, and other quarterly economists, are regardless of Paul's warning, "Except ye utter by the tongue words easy to be understood how shall it be known what is spoken? for ye shall speak into the air" because they know that to be reputed an oracle in the colleges one must *not* write to be understood.

*Ask we for what fair end the Almighty Sire,  
In mortal bosoms wakes this gay contempt,  
These grateful stings of laughter, from disgust*

*Educating pleasure? Wherefore but to aid  
The tardy steps of reason.*

*Benignant Heaven,  
Conscious how dim the dawn of truth appears  
To thousands; conscious what a scanty pause,  
From labors and from care, the wider lot  
Of humble life affords for studious thought,  
To scan this maze of "Logic," therefore stamp'd  
The glaring scenes with characters of scorn;  
Obvious and broad e'en to the passing clown,  
Had he but time to look.*

—Adapted from AKENSIDE.

The enemies of Tom Johnson claim that he didn't keep his promises. They neglect to add that it took thirteen injunctions to prevent him from keeping them.

Johnstown Democrat.

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS OF C. B. FILLEBROWN AT BANQUET OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX LEAGUE, HOTEL VENDOME, BOSTON, APRIL 13TH.

## GROUND RENT.

### I. WHAT IS THE NATURE OF GROUND RENT?

As defined by Mr. Thos. G. Shearman, GROUND RENT is, in its nature, "a tribute which natural laws levy upon every occupant of land as the market price of all the social as well as natural advantages appertaining to that land, including necessarily his just share of the cost of government." It is found operative in every civilized country, automatically collecting "from every citizen an amount almost exactly proportionate to the fair and full market value of the benefits which he derives from the government under which he lives and the society which surrounds him." It is a tribute, "a tax, just, equal, full, fair, paid for full value received." "It is not merely a tax which justice *allows*; it is one which justice *demand*s. It is not merely one which *ought* to be collected; it is one which infallibly *will be* and *is* collected. It is not merely one which the State ought to see collected; it is one which, in the long run, the State *cannot prevent* from being collected." "Seldom has there been a more beautiful illustration of the wise yet relentless working of natural law than in the proved impossibility of justly collecting any tax other than upon ground rent. It shows that Nature makes it impossible to execute justly a statute which is in its nature unjust." This definition of Mr. Shearman is offered as one difficult to be improved upon or further condensed.

Such, it may be added, is the nature of rent—ground rent that all the public and private improvements of a community today are reflected in the land values of that community. Not only this, but the value of all those ideal public improvements conceived of as being possible under Utopian conditions would be similarly absorbed, as it were, in the ground, would be reflected in its site value. For illustration: Suppose you stand before a big mirror, you see your image perfectly reflected before you. If you are a man scantily, shabbily clad, so is the image in the glass. The addition of rich and costly attire is imaged in the glass. Load yourself with jewels and fill your hands with gold, in the mirror, true to nature, is the image and likeness of them all. Not more perfectly, nor more literally, is your image reflected in the mirror, than are public improvements reflected in the value of the land.