

French. But that takes money. How shall it be found.

Please inform the readers of LAND AND FREEDOM of our difficult situation. We would be glad to receive subscriptions to a new French edition of "Progress and Poverty." Be good enough to make an appeal for this purpose. Americans are rich, they can easily help us if they will. —ALBERT CAUWEL.

## The Vanishing Home

**I**N the city of Detroit there are 218,973 "homes."

Of these 133,253 are occupied by renters.

Only 82,679 are owned by those who live in them.

Of those 82,679 owned by their occupants, 49,509 are mortgaged.

There are but 31,506 occupants who own their own homes free of encumbrances—but 14.9 per cent. of the total.

*The Advertising Weekly* actually boasts about this! It says: "This shows a very high percentage of homes owned, almost twice the percentage of St. Louis."

Poor St. Louis!

It has come to a pretty pass when a business magazine can brag that 14.9 per cent. of the families of a city own their homes free of encumbrance.

If it could brag that the rest of the families live in co-operative homes, free from the grip of the landlord, it would be something to brag about—but the rest of the families are precisely in the grip of the landlord, except those who are in the grip of the mortgagee.

Owned homes are vanishing—and nothing the own-a-home crusade can do will stay the tendency toward the vanishing point—*Toledo Union Leader*.

## Despoiling the Sanctuary

**T**HE matter of vanishing rural beauty to make way for "suburban building sites" is not a matter of individual vandalism like the despoiling of roadsides and the Sanctuary. The fault there lies far deeper in the economic basis of our social structure as now constituted. As long as land values, that fruit of the earth which man obtains not by his own labor, but by the gradual growth of the community, therefore by the united labor of all the community, can be diverted as individual profits, into private hands—just so long will villages grow ugly as they grow bigger, and natural beauty be destroyed as the thing that stands between the individual and his profits. The history of every growing or coming community shows how, long before the growth of the community demanded it, natural beauty, fine trees and all the rest of it, have been sacrificed for the speculative values to come, values that belonged to all, but went to the few.

Anywhere we begin to study and love the processes of nature, the beautiful growing things, do we, if we be honest, find ourselves understanding these fundamental economic truths, for no economic reasoning is fundamental if it cannot be linked in some way with nature's laws.—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON in syndicated article, "Bird Notes."

## The Farmer and the Tariff

**I** HEARD nothing of a radical nature from Senator La Follette or his followers during the late campaign. If I understood them aright, they proposed to antidote the evils wrought by one kind of class legislation, by other and futher class legislation.

Such proposals may be drastic and even vicious, but radical they certainly are not, more's the pity. To me they seemed worse than useless. The system of class legislation and special favors is too strongly entrenched in the affections of powerful interests to be upset by anything in the nature of a conflict on interests. Nothing short of a radical public conviction of the foolishness of all class legislation can bring about the desired end of fair play for all.

The last four years have been hard for the farmer and for all business depending on farm prosperity—and what business does not? During those years some two millions of people were forced out of farming and added to our town and city population, many of them losing their all in the shift. And the town and city industries lost just as many possible customers. Who profited? Even the "Money Power" suffered, as the hundreds of failed banks in the West testify.

I see no intelligible reason for this state of affairs other than that all classes are intently engaged in the meanest of pastimes—trying to get the better of one another.

### FARMER A POOR SCHEMER

The farmer, though a worker and producer and therefore not fitted to be a schemer, has engaged in the scheming, and got much the worst of it, as might be expected. I doubt if any class really gets the better of it, for human society is so put together that an injury to one often results in injury to all.

It is nearing four years since the Emergency Tariff law was enacted, followed by the Fordney-McCumber law, both putting a tariff on wheat. Last winter the tariff on wheat was increased. All through these years and the ups and downs of the market wheat was heavy. It sagged and sagged. It proved beyond question that the tariff could not put up or keep up the price of an article of which we produce a surplus for export.

Why is a tariff? Wages were always higher in this country than in Europe, even in Colonial times when Britain tried to suppress manufacturing here and to maintain the colonies as a dumping ground for her own mer-

chandise. The first arguments advanced in our Congress for a tariff dwelt on this fact—wages were so high here that men with money could not engage in manufacturing unless the prices of imported goods were brought up to the cost of producing them here. In other words, a tariff was needed for the protection of capital! The cry has changed to the much more popular demand for protection of labor, and the "American standard of living," but the real reason has not changed.

Why should any class seek advantage by class legislation? God is just, and nature hath an alchemy by which such advantage is neutralized and nullified. Special advantage for one is disadvantage for others.

### "DOWN WITH SPECIAL PRIVILEGE"

Protection has been misnamed. It is only a senseless obstruction to the commerce and prosperity all the nations might otherwise enjoy. Take the maps of Europe and the United States. Take the trade barriers that rest on the European boundary lines and in imagination set them down on our state lines. What would become of our interstate trade? What would the trade of Europe become with those barriers removed?

—STEPHEN BELL in *The Farm Journal*.

## Farmers and the Land Problem

THE mortgage debt on the farms of the United States was \$1,726,000,000 in 1910. It is now more than \$4,000,000,000. Other debts owed by the farmers bring the grand total to \$14,000,000,000. The National Grange, ultra-conservative farm organization, is responsible for the figures. Not a very promising showing for the Nation's basic industry.

So far as the mortgage debt is concerned, it is largely due to speculation in land. Agriculture's problems will never be permanently solved until the farmers bravely face the land question and solve it in the interest of the men who live by tilling the soil rather than in the interest of the speculator.

So far as we know, only one farm leader of national prominence ever had the courage to suggest a fundamental remedy. The late George Hampton, for many years director of the Farmers' National Council, was a follower of Henry George and believed the Single Tax would drive out the speculator and relieve the dirt farmer of much of his burden. Hampton preached that doctrine to the day of his death and won many converts.

Of course the mere mention of the Single Tax will cause bankers and politicians to see red, but the farmers will never get anywhere so long as they look to bankers and politicians for guidance. They must organize and study their problems from the grass roots up. If they do that, they will soon discover the evil effects of land speculation.

—*Labor* (Organ of Rail Unions.)

## Adam Smith on Taxation

ADAM SMITH, sometimes called the "father of political economy," was a Scotchman. He studied at Glasgow and Oxford. He was professor of moral philosophy in Glasgow university.

He resigned his professorship in 1764 to teach the young duke of Buccleuch and take a two year trip on the continent. While on this trip he stopped at Paris and it was there that he became acquainted with Quesnay and his disciples and was a frequent and welcome visitor at the apartments of Quesnay in the palace of the king.

The work which made Adam Smith the founder of political economy was "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of the Wealth of Nations." He started this investigation after he returned home from his continental trip. Adam Smith had the leisure to do this, being in receipt of a liberal pension from the Duke of Buccleuch.

Henry George contemplated an edition of the *Wealth of Nations*. It is to be regretted that he never entered upon even the preparatory steps of such a task, so far as his posthumous notes reveal. This work would have been of inestimable value, for Adam Smith will be read long after a great deal of the so-called political economy is forgotten.

Smith fell into many errors even when treating of land rent and its varied relation. But there is so much of value in his general discussion of the subject of taxation that we venture to quote the following extracts from the *Wealth of Nations*. They do not greatly differ from the teachings of the present day Single Taxer.—Editor LAND AND FREEDOM.

"The rent of a house may be distinguished into two parts, of which the one may very properly be called the building rent, the other is commonly called the ground rent.

"The building rent is the interest or profit of the capital expended in building the house. In order to put the trade of a builder upon a level with other trades, it is necessary that this rent should be sufficient, first to pay him the same interest which he would have got for his capital if he had lent it upon good security; and, secondly to keep the house in constant repairs, or, what comes to the same thing, to replace within a certain term of years the capital which had been employed in building it. The building rent, or the ordinary profit of building, is, therefore, everywhere regulated by the ordinary interest of money. Where the market rate of interest is four per cent. the rent of a house which, over and above paying the ground rent, affords six or six and a-half per cent. upon the whole expense of building, may perhaps afford a sufficient profit to the builder. Where the market rate of interest is five per cent. it may perhaps require seven or seven and a-half per cent.

"Whatever part of the whole rent of a house is over and above what is sufficient for affording this reasonable profit, naturally goes to the ground rent; and where the owner of the ground and the owner of the building are two different persons, is, in most cases, completely paid to the former. This surplus rent is the price which the inhabitant of the house pays for some real or supposed advantage