many. And wealth unused wastes. And from land and labor all wealth comes. The borrower is "shut up and compelled" only when land is closed to him, and lenders are reduced to a few, and those few capable of combining to enforce terms of usury.

That much of this day's interest payments on borrowed capital are exactions, that some are excessive because of the necessities of poverty, may be granted. In other words, the bargains are not always equitable because the parties to the bargain are not uniformly free. But if they were how could the borrowing of capital in a free market for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of the borrower in the production of wealth, be of injury to any one? If the writer had first examined the nature of interest he might have avoided the many pitfalls into which he has fallen. *In a free market free men will pay no more to the lender than the advantage of the loan.* To the difficulties that perplex the writer the Single Taxer has the answer.

Note how on every page the true nature of the economic relation of borrower and lender is obscured by half statements. Thus, page 116; "The usurer's whole claim is for the service of his property. But he does not surrender a particle of his wealth." But he surrenders the use of it. If he is in a position to use it himself he forgoes the increase or the enjoyment of it, in return for something less than he could produce by using it himself.

Whether a more equitable distribution of the products of labor, a more equal ownership of the objects of wealth, would increase or decrease the rate of real interest, is a matter of conjecture. And it is of no great importance. That it would reduce or abolish altogether much of what is mistaken for interest, is beyond question. Under the Single Tax the interest now paid on money that goes to the purchase of land would of course disappear altogether. How much this is of the total interest payment of the country we can leave to those fond of computations of this sort. But it will be observed that this is not real economic interest, any more than the return for money advanced for the purchase of slaves would be—since it is concerned in wasteful processes and is the result of misapplied ownership of economic factors working at cross purposes. It is no more interest than the payment of usurious loans to pawnbrokers—which are also classed by our author in the same category.

The writer of this book seems to agree with Single Taxers in his chapter on Land Rentals, though he leaves much to be desired; and although he says "the land question requires more and deeper study than the question has yet received," nowhere does he refer to George. The reasoning of this chapter is of the same loose character as those that precede it.

Now for the conclusion, and presumably the author's solution:

"Let the government receive on deposit the surplus wealth of individuals for safe keeping and subject to their orders. Let the Postal Saving Bank be established. The government is the best possible security. The certificates of deposit would be as good as government bonds. They could take the place of the National Bank currency."

Of course, we are now as far away as ever from the abolition of interest or usury.

J. D. M.

TWO PAMPHLETS FROM GUSTAV BUSCHER.

Two little German pamphlets, entitled "A Word to the Socialists, and Those Who Would Become Socialists," and "The Extermination of Poverty Through the Restoration of an Equal Right to the Earth',' have been sent the *Review* by the author, Gustav Buscher. This ardent young German Single Taxer may still be remembered by those who met him during his visit to America, or who have read his occasional contributions to the Review. The little books show the same burning enthusiasm, the unshaken conviction that characterized our young comrade's conversation.

The first named pamphlet is a violent attack on Socialism, which is fairly true in

Digitized by Google

its main contentions, although not altogether clear in construction nor always well-chosen in expression. Mr. Buscher accuses the Socialistic doctrine in all its different phases of having offered a stone to those who cried for bread, of having led the masses of starving poor astray, by a tangle of meaningless words, a jumble of intricate phrases while professing to offer salvation. What he says of the vagueness of socialistic aims, of the unclearness regarding the important question of human rights, of the petty quarrels and time-serving policies of the leaders,—and above all, of the inadequacy of the cumbersome Socialistic state to right present wrongs,—is all quite true and is solid common-sense and logic. But Mr. Buscher puts himself under suspicion of vagueness when he says that he attaches no "practical importance to the difference between Socialism and Anarchism." Alas he forgets that many things which he praises, such as labor unions, may not be directly due to socialistic teaching, but they are certainly the outcome of a general enlightenment of public opinion due in the first instance to the initial socialistic agitation. In spite of some very good points in its reasoning, the whole dissertation is too virulent in tone, too much the outcome of an excitability of mood, which repeats itself again and again, like a scolding fish-wife. If Mr. Buscher could say the same thing in half as many words, with a clearer phrasing, the deep-lying truth of his arguments would come out all the more convincingly.

The second pamplet, "The Extermination of Poverty Through the Restoration of an Equal Right to the Earth," is devoted wholly to the explanation and defense of the tax on land values. It is ably done, the line of argument and the reasoning are clear and logical, the work of a convinced Single Taxer, who knows what he believes and why he believes it. For American Single Taxers versed in the same line of reasoning, the booklet contains nothing new or nothing noteworthy, except some very interesting data on conditions in Switzerland. Before speaking of these at greater length, I would like to quote a few very clever and striking sentences on patriotism earlier in the book. Mr. Buscher says, in a chapter entitled "Fatherland and Freedom:"

"The newspapers representing the wealthy class commend the love of one's country as the highest possible virtue of citizenship, and the defence of this country is called the holiest duty of rich or poor. But .....this fatherland, this bit of earth on which we live, is the private property of a few rich men. When, therefore, the poor man is commanded to love and defend his country, what he is asked to do is merely—to love and defend the property of a few rich men. Oh! if these homeless ones would just ask themselves why they should love their country! If those without possessions would once begin to think why they should give their lives for the fatherland! It would seem as if the duty of loving and defending the fatherland ought to be fulfilled by those to whom this fatherland practically belongs."

This is as good an attack on the absurdities of conventional patriotism as has yet been made.

We Americans have heard so much about the perfection of the Swiss Government that the description of conditions given by Mr. Buscher,—who has studied them at first hand,—will come as a surprise. Switzerland has the Initiative and Referendum in some degree, it has many reforms along the line of local option, and the Swiss peasant, in a vast majority of instances, owns the land he lives on and works. Yet Mr. Buscher shows how, in the typical Canton of Berne, more than two thirds of the land of the Canton belongs to less than one-fifth of the farmers. "The great mass of Swiss peasants have not enough land to live on," says the author. And besides, these peasants are so hopelessly in debt through mortgage, that their condition is not much better than that of the "renters" of other countries. The Swiss peasant owns his land,—nominally, but the holder of the mortgage on his farm is really the owner, and, although not in so many words, but in actual fact, bears to him the relation of an absentee landlord. Mr. Buscher says that the tax on land values will help all this, as it will fall most keenly on the holder of the mortgage,

Digitized by Google

who is the practical owner of the land.

The pamphlet ends with an inspired and ardent call to fight for the cause of a righteous taxation which will restore the land to the people to whom it belongs. But the author leaves us somewhat in darkness as to how we shall conduct this fight, for he apparently thinks but little of the Initiative and Referendum, and speaks slightingly of the power of the ballot and political agitation generally. And yet it is hard to see how this goal so well worth striving for can be reached without the use of political and legislative machinery.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

WANTED! THREE NAMES!

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

The REVIEW comes to my home every two months like a ray of sunshine in a dark and lonesome world. But as I read its columns, I am saddened by our evident lack of organization and of systematic co-operation. The sands of life are running very swiftly now for some of us, and we fear we shall never see the movement under full headway. The power of a perfected organization is untold and why can't we have it? Societies and clubs are hard to maintain and are not very effective, but we ought to have a full set of chairmen from top to bottom of the pyramid—town, county, state and national—in short, all the machinery of a political party without actually being one. Each town committeeman should have a lieutenant in every election district and every lieutenant should have a dozen captains to patrol certain streets or roads. Distributed territorially, the men composing such an organization exert a power far greater than they could in any other way. They could distribute literature, circulate petitions and collect funds and know while doing it that there are a host of other comrades doing the same thing all over this beloved country of ours. Mr. Editor, please send me the name and address of our national chairman, also of the chairman of the State of New York and of the County of Wayne. We want to know who our appointed leaders are and to whom we should report.—Lewis H. Clark, Sodus, N. Y.

TO OUR CORRESPONDENTS

We have received several contributions bearing on the articles of John Z. White and William Ryan which appeared in last issue. We doubt the wisdom of printing any of these. The problems dealt with are those which will confront a tax office at the time the Single Tax is in force, or about to be placed in force. They are far from being insuperable difficulties, and both Mr. White and Mr. Ryan deal in figures which one of them—Mr. Ryan—admits is a table of selling values whose progression is totally unlike what it would be with an understanding on the part of the general public that the Single Tax is to be enforced until it takes all that it is practical to take. Mr. White's figures on the other hand take no account of the effect that taxing a part of the yearly value of land will have on the selling value. This is quite impossible of computation, since we do not know what amount of land a given tax will bring into the market, thus affecting the selling value of all land.

Single Taxers have always taught that when the Single Tax had finally destroyed the selling value, it would then be necessary to levy on the rental value. Mr. Ryan thinks that we ought to begin now with the rental value. Perhaps, but the matter is not important. If it is a difficulty, coming tax boards can be left to deal with it.—EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

PERSONAL.

Everett Spring in a long and interesting letter in the Washington (D. C.) *Herald* compares the literary style of Henry George to that of Macaulay, not by any means to the former's disadvantage.

Frank Stephens was one of the speakers at the Contemporary Club at the Bellevue Stratford in Philadelphia on the night of Dec. 13. Other distinguished speakers were Dr. Stanton Coit and George Paish, the latter editor of the London *Statist*.

James P. Cadman, whose work for direct legislation and Single Tax has made him well known in Chicago and elsewhere, will make his home in San Diego, Calif.

Digitized by Google