

Freedom is the only universal social solvent. Capital must be freed from the toll of monopoly by throwing open the resources of the earth, and Labor must be freed from the obsession that Capital is its enemy. When both come to realize that their interests are mutual, and that each is preyed upon by monopoly, then will they have set their feet in the way of harmonious cooperation, not alone as between an individual corporation or firm and its employes, but as between all firms and all employes. Neither the labor problem nor the capital problem can be solved by a removal of the oppression to any part. It is the problem of humanity; and its solution requires the setting up of universal freedom.



### Psychology and the Farmer.

Whether or not prosperity would come if business men "only thought so," all doubts will be removed if the estimate of the June crop report is realized. Railroads may haggle over rates, manufacturers may tremble before foreign competition, and bankers may sulk in their counting rooms, but when the farmers harvest that crop of 900,000,000 bushels of wheat, 1,216,000,000 bushels of oats, and other food stuffs on the same generous scale, the wheels of industry will start up in spite of all the croakers. It is no longer a question of starting prosperity, but of devising ways and means of preventing another set of special privilege beneficiaries from strangling it when it does start.

s. c.



### One Recourse Left.

When Congress, in 1909, refused to amend the law under which the oil companies were gobbling up the oil-bearing lands of the public domain, President Taft sought to save a part of the people's patrimony by withdrawing from entry 3,000,000 acres in California. This act on the part of the Executive was thought at the time to have provided an enormous supply of oil for the use of the navy, at the same time withholding enough from the clutches of the oil trust to modify its excessive charges. But Judge Maurice T. Dooling, of the United States District Court of San Francisco, has rendered a decision setting aside the President's order, and restoring to the control of the oil companies lands estimated to be worth from \$300,000,000 to \$1,000,000,000.



This may be good law, but it is very poor political economy. That our forests, minerals, and water power should in the past have been given with-

out compensation into private hands is not so strange; that was the world's policy. But that such a thing as the giving of the California oil lands to the oil trust should have occurred at this time seems incredible. It serves to show how far our statesmen are from sanity. Fortunately, however, we are not without legal redress. No court has yet had the hardihood to deny the right of the State to tax. The title to the people's oil lands may pass into the hands of the oil trust, but the people still retain the right to tax them. Nor is this right limited beyond the power of the people to change. Not only can they levy a tax of one per cent, but they can raise the limit to four, six, or eight per cent. And by means of this right of taxation it is still in the power of the people to recover what its heedless legislators have allowed to be alienated. Let a little of the spirit shown in barring alien ownership to California lands be devoted to taxing into the treasury the annual value of the oil companies' lands. It is now up to Californians to demonstrate to the country that their intense opposition to Japanese ownership of California land is due to an honest desire to conserve American institutions, rather than to a display of bigoted prejudice.

s. c.



### A Tory Advocates Land Confiscation.

Readers of the Cincinnati Times-Star of June 1 must have rubbed their eyes in astonishment. In this extremely conservative organ, owned by Charles P. Taft, one of the nation's big landed proprietors, the leading editorial of the day was a vigorous shout for confiscation of land. In anticipation of objections the Times-Star recites how the Indians were robbed of land, and triumphantly asks "Did you ever hear of anybody seriously proposing an apology to the Red Man or a return to him of any stolen land?" To still further strengthen the case of the land-grabber, it tells how "Only a few years ago we grabbed considerable land from Spain. In 1848 we grabbed a large chunk from Mexico." Then it asks about the result and triumphantly answers "Can any human being in his right mind doubt that that territory has been more useful to humanity under the Stars and Stripes these past sixty years than if it had been allowed to stagnate under the conditions that have prevailed south of the international border?"



The Times-Star was only thinking about forcible annexation of Mexico when it made that argument. It did not realize that, once granted, the

argument might be as logically applied elsewhere. The people of Cincinnati, being stronger than Charles P. Taft, might conclude that the land he owns in that city could be made "more useful to humanity" if confiscated than "if allowed to stagnate under the conditions" which he allows to prevail thereon. The people of Texas might get a similar idea about the land he owns in that State, just as the people of Mexico already have concerning his holdings in that country. Then, again, the Times-Star's confiscation argument might impress some people sufficiently to cause its application to other lands than Taft's. In the strike district of Colorado, for instance, the argument might be very popular just now. Land monopolists, who can not calmly consider the suggestion of even the slightest application of the Singletax principle, ought to take notice of Charles P. Taft's endorsement of a measure far more drastic. S. D.



### Houston Teaches New York City.

In fighting the movement to relieve congestion of population in New York City through untaxing of improvements, Mr. Allan Robinson, president of the Allied Real Estate Interests, saw fit to publish in the Wall Street Journal statements disputing the effect of a similar policy in Houston, Texas. He did not help his case by so doing, for Tax Commissioner J. J. Pastoriza published in reply the facts concerning Houston. Mr. Pastoriza showed that without figuring increase from annexation of suburbs, the population of Houston has increased 25,000 in two years. He showed that Mr. Robinson erred in denying Houston's building permits for the first six months of 1913 to have been greater by 55 per cent than for the same period of 1911. Mr. Pastoriza produced the official figures which showed an increase of over 66 per cent. Mr. Robinson had claimed that there had been but a small increase in Houston's bank deposits and that the banks of Dallas made a better showing. Mr. Pastoriza produced figures which showed a large increase in deposits and also that while Dallas, a larger city and the center of a richer country, should have larger deposits than Houston, yet she has not. Mr. Robinson had argued from the statements of Houston's handful of objecting land speculators that the people of Houston must be opposed to the Houston plan. Mr. Pastoriza enlightened him concerning the identity of these objectors.



Mr. Pastoriza also made very clear that one

effect of the Houston plan has been to lower house rent, the very thing needed in New York City to lessen congestion of population. Says Mr. Pastoriza:

The exemption of buildings from taxation to the amount of seventy-five percent of their value has had the effect to lower house rents, which is only another way of saying that it has raised wages. The following is a short list of houses (there are many more) showing the amount of reduction in rent since the Houston Plan of Taxation has been in existence. The plan has caused many new houses to be erected, thus creating competition and changing the condition which existed before the Houston Plan of Taxation was inaugurated. Before that time there were two or three tenants for every house that was newly built; as a result house rent jumped to the skies. Now there is never more than one tenant after a house when it is completed, and sometimes not that. The result is that the owners of houses, being anxious to rent, have reduced the rent until the revenue derived from improved property does not exceed very much the interest which you can get for money in the open market. I will ask if this is not a good thing for the people of our city? S. D.



### Houston's Council Gets a Plain Statement.

Co-operation of a very unwelcome kind will be forced on Houston's land speculators should they carry out their threat to invoke the courts against the Houston system of taxation. H. F. Ring of Houston, one of the ablest and best known of Texas lawyers, will join in their efforts and add to their plea for full taxation of all improvements, full taxation of all other property including bank deposits, money loaned, stocks of merchants and manufacturers, and household goods. Mr. Ring has addressed a letter to the Mayor and Council calling attention to the fact that these forms of property are escaping taxation. Mr. Ring is already known as an authority on the principles of taxation and has done much to clarify that subject. His letter to the Houston Council is a plain statement of the case from a different viewpoint than his previous writings, and in a different form.



Mr. Ring takes the position of one who insists on strict enforcement of all existing tax laws. Since bank deposits and money loaned by banks are not taxed in Houston, he calls attention to the State laws requiring their taxation. He declares absurd "the vaporings of Singletax cranks to the effect that a systematic effort to tax credits—money loans—amounts to double taxation, since the land given as security is also taxed as well as the money loaned on it, and that the whole burden of such taxation in the long run falls upon the borrower in