

The Single Tax By Louis F. Post.

An explanation with illustrative notes and colored charts of the land, labor and fiscal reform advocated by Henry George. 100 pages besides 16 pages of charts. Neatly bound in strong paper covers. Price reduced to 45 cents. Published by Frank Vieth, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

For any Book on Earth

Old or New, write to

H. H. TIMBY, Book Hunter,

Catalogues Free. Conneaut, Ohio.

THE PUBLIC

A Serious Paper for Serious People.

A weekly review of history in the making, conducted in the spirit of Jeffersonian democracy.

LOUIS F. POST, Editor.

\$1.00 a year. Six weeks trial subscription, 10 cents.

Address, THE PUBLIC, Box 687, Chicago, Ill.

Books by Henry George

| | CLOTH | PAPER |
|--|--------|-------|
| Science of Political Economy | \$2.00 | |
| Progress and Poverty | 1.00 | .50 |
| Social Problems | 1.00 | .50 |
| A Perplexed Philosopher | 1.00 | .50 |
| Condition of Labor - The Land Question - Property in Land. Bound in one volume | 1.00 | .50 |
| Protection of Free Trade? | 1.00 | .50 |
| " " Congressional edition | | .05 |

The above will be mailed postpaid on receipt of price. Address.

FRANK VIETH, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.

FEBRUARY, 1902.

"No consecrated absurdity would have stood its ground in this world if the man had not silenced the objection of the child"



Special Feature of this Number.
ANARCHISM: THE CAUSE AND THE REMEDY
By Robert Cumming.

PUBLISHED AT CEDAR RAPIDS, IA.

6570

Why?

A Monthly Magazine Devoted to Taxation.

PUBLICATION OFFICE, 527 S. TENTH STREET,
CEDAR RAPIDS, IOWA.

SUBSCRIPTION RATES—United States and
Canada, 25 cents a year. Foreign subscriptions,
50 cents a year.

EXTRA COPIES—One copy, 5c; 12 copies, 25c;
36 copies, \$1.50.

CHANGE OF ADDRESS—In request for change
of address please give both your old and new
addresses.

COMMUNICATIONS—Address communications
and make all remittances payable to
Frank Verlin, Cedar Rapids, Iowa.



SPECIAL NOTICE—If this publication comes to you
regularly, some friend subscribed for you. No bill
will follow. Do not refuse it.

Entered at the Cedar Rapids, Iowa, postoffice as
second-class matter.

Vol. 5 FEBRUARY, 1902. No. 2

CONTENTS

| | Page |
|--|------|
| ARCHISM: THE CAUSE AND THE REMEDY. By Robert Cumming..... | 35 |
| HOUSE NOT MADE WITH HANDS. By C. F. Shan- drew..... | 55 |
| EARNED INCREMENT—SHIFTING TAXES. By H. J. Chase..... | 59 |

After reading this, hand it, or mail it, to some other person who
will give it a thoughtful reading, and in that way assist in increasing
our subscription list.

ANNOUNCEMENT.

The next issue of "Why?" will con-
tain "The Case Plainly Stated," by H.
F. Ring. This has been one of the
most popular presentations of the single
tax ever published and we believe will
be more popular than ever in the new
and attractive form of "Why?" Owing
to the extreme lateness of this issue the
interval between this issue and that for
March will be very short and those who
may desire extra copies of the issue con-
taining "The Case Plainly Stated," will
insure themselves against disappoint-
ment by sending their orders at once.

The form of "Why?" is slightly differ-
ent than it has ever been before and it
is end of a series of experiments. The
demand seems to be for a pocket maga-
zine and we have arranged to supply
that demand. It may suggest the "fad"
journals which are becoming quite plen-
tiful. These "fads", seem, however, to
have suited the popular idea, and as
popularity is essential to success, imita-
tion, in form at least, will hardly be con-
demned. "Why?" has made its final
change.

Anarchism;

The Cause and the Remedy

By Robert Canning.

Anarchism is the very opposite of socialism. Thorough-going socialism is defined as "all government." Anarchism as "no government."

All anarchists agree that government is an evil that should be abolished. But no anarchist believes that the abolition of government would create chaos. They claim that disorder now exists as the result of government. They teach that in a state of "no government," Nature would restore order and establish justice by means of trade, and that mutual interest in our trade relations, near and far, will promote peace, fellowship and brotherhood.

They have faith in Nature and in human nature. They call attention to the fact that as a rule mankind prefer the smiles rather than the frowns of their fellowmen. And that fact, they claim, supplemented by the average love that forever warms and glows in the human breast, serves better than the policeman's club to protect the weak from the strong, the innocent from the vicious.

They teach that government is organized force, necessarily oppressive. That the cunning and un-

scrupulous unavoidably get control of government and use it merely to promote their own selfish ends. Anarchists point to monopolies, special privileges and trust-breeding tariffs, saying: "These are the legitimate fruits of government."

They claim that if government were disbanded, monopolies and special privileges would at once cease to exist, and that voluntary associations would take the place of franchise corporations, build and equip railroads, street car lines and all other public utilities by public consent, just as they do now, and would own and operate them as private enterprise, just as they are now owned and operated—as private enterprise.

Count Leo Tolstoi is an apostle of anarchism. He regards it as in harmony with Christ's teaching, and as a follower of Christ, Tolstoi teaches the doctrine of love and non-resistance.

Prince Kropotkin is another apostle of anarchism, though of a school not sound in the faith that free competition will effect a just distribution of wealth.

Kropotkin anarchists differ from other anarchists, as protectionists and socialists differ from free traders, and for the same reason—distrust of competition.

And while protectionists build tariff walls as "improvements" on the natural order, and socialists dream of a system devised by men as a substitute for the system that God designed for the direction

and guidance of industrial effort, and for the just distribution of wealth, the the Kropotkin anarchists advocate communism as a sure means of escape from the supposed evils of competition.

Such are the teachings of philosophical anarchy—Jeffersonian democracy in everything save its advocacy of "no government," and its consequent endorsement of the anarchistic principle of allowing private enterprise in public utilities.

All public utilities are vital public functions.

Private enterprise in public utilities furnishes the incentive and the means for franchise corporations to secure control of legislation. This, truly, is what has happened:

The granting of special privileges has resulted in bringing every government on earth under control of the privileged classes, and the powers of government are everywhere used for the furtherance of special interests utterly regardless of human rights and human suffering.

Ours is no longer a government of, by, and for the people. It is a government of, by and for the privileged classes. Enjoying special privileges in our streets, owning and operating our railed highways, having parceled out among them our natural resources on which all classes of hand and brain workers are dependent, directly and indirectly, for the opportunity to earn a living—the privileged classes thus can and do select whom they please to legislate for them.

They make the slate. The word is passed. Their candidates are truly named, nominated, and in the majority of cases, elected. Thus the privileged classes manage to keep a corrupt majority in all our city councils and state legislatures, no matter what political party is in power.

In like manner congressmen, governors, supreme court judges and presidents are selected to serve special interests.

And that the majority of them, with all the characteristic inconsistency and shamelessness of pledged hirelings, do serve special interests, is shown by their criminal procedure in all departments of government—legislative, executive and judicial, all of which are in the main “administered, not for the people, but for the privileged classes.”

Consider the facts of recent experience—facts that demonstrate the criminal course pursued by government from bottom to top—from the city, which represents the smallest or ward units, to the nation, which represents the largest unit of government. Take for instance, the recent action of the mayor and city council of Philadelphia.

CITY MISRULE.

Last June the whole country was startled by the action of the Philadelphia city council, which granted to fourteen chartered companies franchise privileges covering every feasible route throughout the entire city. These fourteen franchises were

granted on the cheapest possible terms. They were given away to these fourteen companies for nothing.

The Hon. John Wanamaker at once wrote to Mayor Ashbridge, asking him not to sign those measures. To furnish the mayor the best reason for withholding his signature, Mr. Wanamaker offered to pay to the city two million, five hundred thousand dollars for the franchises about to be given away, with fares fixed at five cents each. In explanation of this offer, Mr. Wanamaker, in his letter to the mayor, said: “My offer for \$2,500,000 is not because I conceive that sum to be the measure of the value of the franchises granted by these ordinances, for I believe them to be much more valuable, but merely as an indication to your honor in concrete form of the magnitude of the gift conferred upon private citizens without return to the people. It seems to me that to give away such franchises for nothing when others stand ready to pay millions for the same rights is little short of public plunder.”

Mr. Wanamaker also said: “I will cheerfully pay the sum I have named, but I suggest to you that if the new ordinances required franchises to be put up at auction and sold to the highest bidder, an amount largely in excess of that which I have designated could be readily secured.”

He also called the mayor's attention to the fact that every attempt in the councils to require the corporations favored by the ordinances to limit the

fare to three cents and to give free exchanges and other propositions having in view the public interest, were incontinently voted down. As the case stands to-day before you, therefore, the people will get nothing for these franchises, their treasury will not be one cent the richer, passengers will have no cheaper transportation, and the only gainers will be those financially interested in the projects to which your honor is asked to give the sanction of your approval."

The mayor knew that Albert M. Johnson's syndicate of wealthy capitalists and experienced street car operators had been trying to secure franchises at three cent fares and universal transfers for actual business.

In reply, Mayor Ashbridge said that the council had no right to grant the franchises in question to Mr. Wanamaker, as that gentleman did not have the necessary charters.

Mr. Wanamaker then wrote to Mayor Ashbridge a second letter, from which I will now quote:

"You say that I had no charters and that the council should not have made the grants to me. Very well, for the sake of argument, be it so. There is no legal or other objection to you and your colleagues selling to me the franchises of which you are now the donees and owners without recompense to the city. I therefore renew the offer which I made to the mayor, to pay, as therein stated, to the city of Philadelphia \$2,500,000, and in addition

thereto I will add \$500,000 as a bonus to yourself and associates personally for the conveyance of the grants and corporate privileges you now possess. There is no strong opposition to this proposition. When you and your associates assign to me capital stock ownership and control of the corporations you now possess, with the engineer's plans, I will pay to you the sum of \$500,000, and you may pay to the city of Philadelphia the \$2,500,000, under the conditions stated in my letter to the mayor, and \$1,500,000 of which amount I should stipulate should be used for the deepening of the Delaware river channel and \$1,000,000 to be applied to the building of the public schools and for the purpose of public education. In addition to this I will agree on the surface roads, covered by your charters and the ordinances that three-cent fares only shall be charged between the hours of five and eight eight a. m. and five and seven p. m., and not over five cents for the other hours; and I will further agree that any time within ten years the city of Philadelphia may resume the franchises upon the payment of the actual money expended and invested in the various enterprises covered by the charters and ordinances. If the proposition I have made to you is not acceptable I should be glad to know what sum will tempt you and your associates to surrender the privileges you now own, and which were obtained by methods so unusual and defiant of the

public will as to have aroused the indignation of the people of the entire nation."

Mr. Wanamaker was right when he said that his offer large as it appeared, represented only a trifle of the value being given away. The Hon. Tom L. Johnson, who has been in the street railroad business all his life, is authority on franchise values. When interviewed on the Philadelphia deal, this is what he said:

"The most recent wholesale giving away of public franchises in Philadelphia is one of the greatest outrages ever perpetrated in America. It is a repetition of what recently occurred at Columbus, Ohio, and has taken place in many other American cities, but this case is on such a stupendous scale that it should arouse not only Pennsylvania, but the whole country. Unless we can stem this tide of public corruption in the granting, public regulation and taxation of franchises, our whole political system is in danger. Under the direction of political bosses, subservient legislatures and city councils, aided by the mayor of Philadelphia and the governor of Pennsylvania, the people of that state have been deliberately robbed of more than \$100,000,000."

The wrong, however, is not so much in the value given away, as in the power conferred in a franchise—a power that inevitably promotes political corruption and results in the control of government by the privileged classes.

The action of the Philadelphia aldermen differs

from the regular practice of aldermen only in degree, not in principle. The same is true of nearly every other city in the United States. Philadelphia hoodlums gave fourteen franchises away at one fell swoop. Nearly all other American cities make a practice of surrendering their franchises one by one.

This then illustrates the criminal corruption prevalent today in city government.

STATE MISRULE.

Let us now consider how state government is administered. Take for example Pennsylvania state legislature, and the part it played in the Philadelphia franchise grab. The fourteen franchises grabbed in Philadelphia at the one time were secured by the tentacles of only one arm of the Quay octopus in the form of a law guided by Quay through the state legislature, and which was no sooner approved by the governor than it reached forth its thousand arms to secure all the available and prospective franchises in all the cities of the state.

I will now quote from Louis F. Post's paper, *The Public*, one of the most ably edited and reliable papers ever published:

"Senator Quay is the leader of this cynical assault upon public rights. Under his direction a new kind of railway bill was 'jammed' through the legislature and signed by the governor. It provided in general terms for the incorporation and regulation of street railway companies—for elevated, underground or surface purposes, or all these—

giving to them the right of eminent domain. This right, with reference to particular property, attaches by the law to the corporation first claiming it in its charter and describing the property it requires. Before the public was aware of this new law, Quay's pirates had filed charters covering the streets of scores of Pennsylvania cities. If the law holds, they thereby acquired the first rights to condemn those streets for street railroad purposes, and the right will be good for seven years without being used at all. In other words, these charters have now a salable value as mere legal rights to blackmail cities. Among the charters were fourteen for Philadelphia, covering every feasible traction route—surface, elevated and underground—in the fraternal city."

That infamous law, passed by the state legislature and signed by the governor of Pennsylvania, secured for Quay the necessary votes, and he was elected to a seat in the United States senate.

Take as another example of misgovernment in the state of Illinois—one instance, the infamous Allen bill—empowering cities to grant fifty-year franchises. Think of it! Fifty years surrender or usurpation of the people's right to a voice in the management of the most vital affairs of government! Fifty years government of these matters so vital to public interest—fifty years government without consent of the governed.

Yet the very fact that state laws limit or inter-

fere in any way with the right of local self-government shows that something is wrong and at variance with republican institutions. It indicates how the liberties of the people are tied up in the interest of the privileged classes. Each and every village, city and state should at all times be free to manage its own purely local affairs in its own way without let or hindrance from any power outside the people exclusively concerned.

NATIONAL MISRULE.

From Quay and Allen methods of misgovernment so common to almost every state, let us now see what is going on by decree and sanction of our national government.

War for the conquest and subjugation of a weaker people struggling for liberty. Filipinos shot down by American guns, pierced by American bayonets, the self evident truths of our own Declaration of Independence on their dying lips. Subjugated peoples cowering under our once glorious flag of the free. Colonial schemes instituted in the name of "government of the people, by the people and for the people." Oh, the hypocrisy and perfidy of these crimes! Porto Rican tariff decisions rendered by the United States supreme court sustaining sectional tariffs in plain violation of the constitution, which in spirit declares that no tariffs shall be levied between the states; that no export duties shall be levied, and that all import duties and taxes

levied by the United States government shall be uniform throughout the territory under our jurisdiction.

All these wrongs have been committed and persisted in by the United States government since February 4th, 1899; and to-day all these iniquities are sustained by the highest tribunal in the land. The United States Supreme Court has rendered its decision upholding these national crimes, in open violation of the organic law of our being as a republic—the organic law expressed in the Declaration as a self-evident truth—that all governments derive their just powers from the consent of the governed. It has all been done under the party lash wielded at the dictates of a few powerful and unscrupulous land and franchise grabbers.

Had there been no prospective franchises or other valuable monopolies to be secured in the Philippines, there would have been no effort made in the name of our republic to get control of Filipino affairs. There would have been no war on our part in the Philippines; no subjugated peoples cowering under our flag; no colonies established under our sway in imitation of despotic Spain, and the land-grabbing British empire; and no sectional tariffs to be sustained by recreant supreme court judges. These wrongs are all of a piece and contrary to all precedents, they were all virtually sustained in the Porto Rican decisions. The United States supreme

court thus overruled the self-evident right of a people to govern themselves.

These are some of the wrongs that we now see being perpetrated in the name of the people, in the management of national affairs, and in the special interest of the privileged classes.

But these wrongs are not what philosophical anarchists say they are. They are not the inevitable results of government. They are due to the errors and crimes of misgovernment.

THE CAUSE.

Misgovernment is the inevitable result of an unjust distribution of wealth, which gives political power. Unjust distribution of wealth is due to unequal opportunities to produce and acquire wealth, and inequality of opportunities to produce and acquire wealth is due to the government granting special privileges instead of maintaining a fair field and no favors.

That mistake once committed made it second nature for the beneficiaries to guard against the mistake ever being corrected. "Let well enough alone" has been their motto from the time of their first land grant or franchise.

Though I have placed political corruption from bottom to top, its course of development has been from top to bottom. Corruption in government began with us when our Republic first transgressed the law of its own being—when it first transgressed the right of a people, the right of its own people

to manage their own local affairs in their own way. Corruption began when the United States government meddlingly began providing for its own support by levying protective tariff taxes, or internal revenue taxes, thus interfering with the right of each state to raise its proportion of the national taxes in its own way. The same wrong has been committed by each state against its own cities and villages, debarring them of exercise of their right to raise their quota of state taxes as they see fit, and by placing under state regulation the management of purely local affairs, such as city gas and water plants and street car service.

These wrongs of misgovernment, spreading from top to bottom, have fostered every form of monopoly and special privilege and made them difficult of correction by removing them from the direct control of the people plundered by them.

The privileged few, grown powerful by special favors from the government, have now in their control the ship of state. For the chart of self-evident right—government by consent of the governed—they have substituted the chart of self-evident wrong—government without consent of the governed.

They have swerved the good ship from its course and headed it towards the rocks, in greed and gain.

Special privileges, that is the wrong which has disinherited mankind and made the privileged few the masters of the unprivileged many, whose abso-

lute dependence on the few for the opportunity to make a living is the cause of enforced idleness, low wages, discontent, strikes and anarchy.

Is it any wonder that when men become convinced that the strike is a failure, and when they realize also that in all countries industrial conditions remain about the same, or rather tend from bad to worse, no matter what political faction attains power—is it any wonder that with these facts staring all men in the face, some men arrive at the conclusion that government is a delusion and a snare, and become anarchists—even of the desperate kind?

This, though not a justification, is an explanation of anarchy.

NEW DANGERS AHEAD.

Since the shooting which resulted in the death of President McKinley, the insane utterances of press and pulpit and public men clearly indicate that the assassination of the president will now be made the pretext for the assassination of liberty.

Will any lawyer, or anyone else, who is now clamoring for a change in our criminal laws, please tell us wherein the law as it now stands does not sufficiently provide for the arrest, fair trial and conviction of murderers like Czolgosz?

What is the meaning of all this clamor for change in our criminal laws under the pretext of stamping out anarchy? It means that an attempt shall be made to abrogate the right of free speech,

free press and peaceable assemblage. Virginia constitutional convention, soon after the assassination of the president, decided to strike out of its bill of rights the constitutional guarantee of free speech, but has since inserted a strong free speech clause by an overwhelming majority.

The danger however is not yet past. The sentiments that public men and plutocratic newspapers freely express, are by no means confined to a condemnation of criminal anarchists. The Hon. David B. Hill, ex-governor of New York, recent United States senator from that state, and who is still a candidate for the democratic nomination for president in 1904, declares he is opposed to drawing any "fine spun distinction" between murderous anarchists and those who call themselves philosophical anarchists. The attack will not be confined to the suppression of the doctrines taught by peaceable, philosophical anarchists. Leading republican newspapers, the New York Tribune at their head, have coolly charged to Bryanism the assassination of the president.

I desire to quote again from the pen of Louis F. Post on this point:

"Let there be no mistake. This movement for the abrogation of constitutional guarantees of free speech and for the creation of a new form of treason—or rather, the revival of an old one—has for its object larger game than philosophical anarchists. No effective law to suppress philosophi-

cal anarchists can possibly be drafted which would not be a most powerful weapon for any party in power to use against the opposition.

"The proposition to make it treason to commit an assault upon the president would, if adopted, be one of the hardest blows possible to level at American liberty. It is freighted with even greater danger to individuals than is the abrogation of free speech. For, if it were treason to make an assault upon the president, then, an assault being made, everyone who could be connected with its perpetrator personally or shown to have spoken or written vigorously against the president's policy would be subject to trial as a traitor. What a drag net that would be for catching in its meshes patriotic men who were distasteful to a corrupt administration at Washington! Speakers and editors would speak and write with a sword hanging over their heads or a noosed rope dangling menacingly before them. They could never know when the "confession" of a crazy assassin and the malice of political enemies would not torture their legitimate criticisms into words counseling treason."

THE REMEDY.

The remedy for "Philosophical Anarchy" is free speech, and, perhaps, more philosophy, the anarchists themselves to be the judge of their own opinions.

All men, without distinction, should be pro-

ted in the exercise of their right of free speech, as at present guaranteed by the constitution, subject to arrest and punishment for the abuse of that privilege.

The remedy for destructive anarchy, or for anarchy of any kind, does not lie in repressive measures. For, in down-trodden Russia, and in starving Italy, agitators are hunted and hounded like wolves. They are denied the right of peaceable assemblage, free speech and free press. Yet nihilism in Russia and anarchy in Italy know no abatement.

The true remedy for anarchy is to be found in the improvement of social conditions, in just government, in the restoration to all men of the equal rights in Nature's bounty.

This truth was demonstrated by actual test in the United States for a hundred years. For during that time we could sing, and in welcome to foreign immigration did sing that, 'Uncle Sam is rich enough to give us all a farm.'

And while it was America's proud boast that this republic was an asylum for the oppressed of all nations, and the oppressed came here and could go out on free American soil, build homes, and earn a living for themselves and for those dependent upon them—their anarchistic ideas, so far as this country was concerned, were at once forgotten.

The true remedy for anarchy is the remedy pointed out by Henry George. That remedy is in accord with equal justice to all, and is simpli-

city itself. In method it is the most conservative; in results—the most radical, fundamental and far-reaching. It is the natural, therefore the only right and true way of securing for every human being, young and old, rich and poor alike, his just and natural rights. It involves the abolition of every form of monopoly and class privilege, and these are the real wrongs.

The true remedy, as pointed out by Henry George, entails the exercise of the right of local self government, the application in all its fullness, of the principle of a republic—the right of a people to manage their own affairs in their own way. And this, the natural and true remedy, consists of but two propositions:

First—Public ownership and operation of all public utilities.

The application of this principle will at once eliminate special privileges and restore equal rights to all in the realm of public enterprises.

Second—The single tax, which means one tax, and that to be levied on the value of land independent of improvements. In other words the single tax means the public appropriation of ground rent for all the needs of government, and the abolition of all other taxes.

This natural taxation will at once make the land accessible to all on equal terms, eliminate every form of monopoly, and restore equal rights to all in the realm of private enterprise.

Land titles will remain and land be bought and sold under the single tax regime just as at present. Each shall be his own judge of the land he shall hold. He will pay into the public treasury, in the form of a tax, the full ground rental, whether he holds his land idle, or puts it to its best use. This will make it to every man's interest not to grab more land than he can profitably use. There will then be land enough for whoever wants it. The owners of valuable land will then find it to their interest either to put it to use themselves, or let it go to those who will use it. Millions and millions of acres, at our very doors, will then be available for any one to use, and acquire. And we may again extend a welcome to the oppressed of other shores. And the anarchists among them, amid just and free conditions, will once more and forever forget their anarchistic teaching.

A HOUSE NOT MADE WITH HANDS.

By C. F. Shandrew.

Once upon a time a very great and powerful and wise ruler determined to do something for his people whom he lovingly called his children. So he built an immense house of many apartments. He stored the cellar with coal and introduced a water supply, and when all was finished he gave the house as a free gift to his children inviting them all to live there and expecting them to manage it for themselves.

At first, the people being few in number and the house being very large, enjoyed it in common, but as population increased, some of the rooms because they were easier of access, or nearer the passageways or the coal or water supply, or nearer the centers where the people congregated, or for other reasons, became more desirable than the other rooms. These desirable rooms were either seized by the first comers, or by the strong, the cunning or the unscrupulous, and in course of time came to be reorganized as their property. Then it came to pass that those who wished to enjoy rooms of more than ordinary desirability were compelled to first give wealth to the so-

Land titles will remain and land be bought and sold under the single tax regime just as at present. Each shall be his own judge of the demand for coal and acquired ownership in all of the remote and unused apartments. These they held idle against the time when they would be in such demand that later comers would pay the owners for their use.

Others went to the cellar and seized the coal supply so that thereafter when people wanted coal they could no longer get it for themselves by going after it, but first had to buy admittance to the cellar. Still others seized the water supply and the passageways, all for the same purpose, that they might levy toll upon those whose necessities compelled them to use coal or water or the passageways.

As more and more people arrived they were either forced to the remote rooms which being difficult of access had not been taken up and where separated from the rest of the inhabitants and being a long way from the coal and water supply they could barely live, or else were compelled to seek a living in the passageways by begging and such arts. In consequence of all this some few of the inhabitants became very rich, while many, notwithstanding their industry and frugality, remained very poor. Now from the beginning a revenue was needed for the care and maintenance of the building, and it had become the custom for the governors of the building to periodically send men nosing through the apartments

to find out if possible how much wealth the occupants had and then to take a part of it for the common expenses.

The wealth so collected was called a tax, and the people hated taxes intensely, so they hid their wealth and lied to the tax collector or bribed him. In course of time the governors desired more wealth but the people refused to part with it. Then arose a great statesman who said the people would not object to paying taxes if they did not know that those who brought goods into the building had a large portion of them seized by the governors for taxes. The importer could then sell what was left, but in order to get back the tax, he increased the price. Thus taxes became hidden in the price of goods, and though the people complained of hard times they thought the importer or someone outside paid the taxes and they permitted the governors to take more and more wealth each year. And because the people were so ignorant of the effects of taxation they suffered in many ways. But in course of time a Sage arose who told the people that they erred in taxing things that men made, and that the proper revenue with which to take care of and maintain the building was the premium or rent which the rooms commanded. This premium, or rent, he proposed should be collected in the form of a tax, and this plan he called the Single Tax because it contemplated the abolition of all other taxes.

He pointed out that the building was large enough for all for it were not monopolized by those who would neither use it themselves nor permit others to use it, but by charging the monopolist with the rent they would then no more monopolize rooms which they had no immediate use for than people now hire all the rooms in an office building or hotel or all the seats in a railroad car or theatre. In this way plenty of room would be made for all now in the building, the passage-ways be freed from beggars, the people in remote places brought nearer the centers, and new comers might enter on equal terms with first comers. The monopolies of coal, water, etc., would in like manner be broken and everyone would then have access on equal terms to the bounty of the builder and donor whose name is God and whose house is the earth.

UNEARNED INCREMENTS—SHIFTING TAXES.

By H. J. Chase.

I am inclined to think that these two questions are the most difficult ones a Single Tax advocate is called upon to answer:

(1) Are there not unearned increments in other things besides land?

(2) Can not a tax upon land values be shifted?

When I say these questions are difficult, I mean that it is not always an easy matter to convince, even intelligent people, that buildings, e. g., do not increase in value as population increases; or that a tax on land values is unlike most other taxes, i. e., cannot be recovered from some person other than the one upon whom it is levied. However plainly Single Tax men may see these truths, it must be borne in mind that the ultimate adoption of the Single Tax proposition depends upon the conversion of our opponents, or at least those of them who are thoughtful, to our views. I offer the following suggestions, not as containing anything original, but as possibly helpful in certain emergencies:

In the first place, it ought to be understood that

when we assert that there is no unearned increment in anything except land, we are stating a general truth. We are not denying that there are fluctuations in the values of labor products or of land. But while increase of population is accompanied by no increase in number of natural opportunities, it is accompanied by a more than proportional increase of labor products. Consequently, while the price of land tends to rise, that of labor products tends to fall. If a person starts from, say, Portsmouth, N. H., and proceeds to the summit of Mount Washington, he will frequently find himself going down hill before he reaches his destination; but, upon the whole, his ascents will amount to more than his descents by several thousand feet. It seems to me that his progress inland is a fair illustration of the course of land values in most, if not all, civilized countries; and his return to the seashore likewise illustrates the mode of the decline of the values of labor products.

The writer had the following instance brought to his notice as an example of unearned increment in a house:

A man leased a lot of land for a period of ten years at the rate of \$100 per year. On this lot he erected a house costing \$3,000, from the tenants of which house he received during the first year \$150. But population began to increase in that vicinity, and the second year he received \$300 from his tenants, and the year after \$400. Had not that house greatly

increased in value, and was not the increased value due to increase in population? Now, the average assessor and the average real estate dealer know that the house was not worth any more, in fact not quite so much, at the end of the third year as it was when first erected. They know that if the house had been destroyed during the third year, that it could have been replaced for \$3,000, unless building materials and the wages of labor had meantime varied appreciably. They know that no insurance company would insure the house for any more than it would cost to replace it, or if a company did so it would not keep its contract. But there are many intelligent people who have to have these things distinctly pointed out to them. Clearness of statement and frequency of repetition are essential to the removal of doubt upon such points as this. Sarcasm, spoken or printed, does not do one bit of good.

Professor Seligman, I think it was, cited the improvement of wine in quality as it grows older as a case of unearned increment, and I have heard the same citation made more than once since the meeting at Saratoga last September. It does not seem to have occurred to the man or letters, and possibly it has not occurred to others, that he might as well have called attention to a hill of growing corn as a case of unearned increment. The farmer brings certain elements into juxtaposition, and leaves nature to do the rest. It is generally considered that he earns

about all he gets out of a cornfield. The producers of wine do precisely the same thing that the farmer does—bring grapes in contact with a press of some sort, the juice in contact with a vessel, and the vessel in contact with a cellar or other storehouse. Labor makes the press, the vessel and the storehouse, the ultimate object of all which appliances is to retain the wine in a position where it may be affected by natural forces or processes. Probably wine producers are of the opinion that their product in the end "costs about all it comes to."

Congressman R. G. Horr recently cited the case of a colt's developing a 2:13 gait as an example of unearned increment. But horsemen know that colts of uncertain pedigree do not often develop that rate of speed, and that the training of a trotter is a task to which few men are equal.

But it is not my purpose to attempt to meet all the instances of alleged unearned increment to which my attention has been called. I merely wish to remark, as in the beginning, that while it may be plain enough to us Single Tax men that there is no unearned increment except in land, nevertheless, it is not so plain to other people, and it behooves us to deal with every alleged instance of such increment in other things in a careful and thorough manner, above all, avoiding even such faint suspicions of sarcasm as the writer may have already laid himself open to in the course of this article.

As to shifting the tax on land values, it ought to be understood that the proposition that such tax cannot be shifted is a general one, as is likewise the proposition that a tax imposed upon an article in the course of production can be shifted. Nobody, so far as I am aware, asserts that under no circumstances whatever can a tax upon land values be shifted, or that under all circumstances a tax upon, say, houses can be shifted. The tendency of taxes upon land values is to remain with the person upon whom they first fall, and the tendency of a tax upon houses is to rest finally upon the user of the house.

If a tenant rents a piece of land subject to taxes, he will have to pay those taxes, and if the valuation of even the bare land is raised before his lease expires, he will usually have to bear the consequent increase in taxes. But by taking a lease subject to taxes the tenant is for time being the virtual owner of the land. On the other hand a tax upon an empty house cannot very easily be shifted, and other exceptions to both propositions might be adduced. But generally speaking, if there is an increase in taxes upon houses, capital employed in building must do one of two things—either itself shoulder the increase, or charge it over to occupants, i. e., consumers of houses. If capital accepts the former alternative it must content itself with smaller returns. But it was receiving, presumably, no more than the average return before, and rather than receive less it will look for

investment in some other direction. But, if the increased taxation is to be charged over to the consumer of houses, practically the consumption of houses, will decrease, i. e., people will try to content themselves with less expensive or narrower quarters.

The first effect of the increased taxation might be, consequently, a rise in the rental value of inferior houses, and a decline in the rental value of superior houses; but, upon the whole, there is a decreased demand for houses; and, consequently, capital lacks encouragement to invest in that sort of production. After awhile, the increase of population will have so far outstripped the production of houses, or existing houses will have so far worn out, that house rents will rise, and the owners of houses will begin to collect the increase of taxation from tenants in the shape of increased house rents. Capital will then begin to be invested more freely in the production of houses, because it can now count upon receiving the average return. This same explanation will apply to all other products of labor besides houses. Taxation of labor products discourages production, and decrease in production ultimately causes rise in prices.

Taxation upon land values cannot discourage the production of land. On the contrary, it, so to speak, increases such production. It causes some land, at least, which was being held for an advance, to be offered at a lower price, and if the tax were so adjusted as to amount to all, or nearly all, of the annual rental value of bare land, all land now held for a rise would either be improved by present owners or offered for sale.