

loon and others who appeared in the limelight on this proposition may now realize that while Missouri voters could be fooled in 1912, they can not be fooled all of the time.

S. D.



### The Trick That Failed.

In Ohio, as in Missouri, plutocratic interests sought to push through plans of their own by appealing to ignorance and prejudice concerning the Singletax. As in Missouri, the scheme ignominiously failed. The State Board of Commerce, in order to block municipal ownership, initiated an amendment limiting the tax rate of localities and authorizing an unscientific and unreasonable form of classification of property for taxation. It endeavored to secure popular approval of this amendment by proclaiming that it would "make the Singletax impossible." But the people of Ohio either saw through the trick or do not want the Singletax made impossible, for they rejected the measure by over 200,000 majority. The State Board must now devise some other scheme to block municipal ownership.

S. D.



### Wealth Without Work.

What rich man was it who said that Henry George had first shown him the one sure and safe way to wealth without work? There are others equally quick to perceive. The following advertisement appeared in a recent issue of the New York Times:

Tentative Land Value Maps of the City of New York for 1915 Prepared by the Department of Taxes and Assessments, and published today by the Record and Guide.

This issue contains 140 maps and an index map, showing the tentative front foot values of inside lots on each side of every block and of acreage where the land has not been subdivided into blocks and lots, in the Boroughs of Manhattan, Bronx, Brooklyn, Queens and Richmond, upon which the assessments for the year 1915 are intended to be based, subject to correction by the Tax Commissioners. These Land Value Maps will be invaluable to any one intent upon making use of the opportunities for profitable investment that will be opened up by the new rapid transit lines.

Price, \$2.00 per copy, The Record and Guide Co., Publishers, 119 West 40th street, New York City.

Is this to be the result of pointing out to our city dwellers the immense momentary and future values in the land which belongs, or ought to belong, to them all as members of the community? Those who are to be benefited by any reform are usually less quick to see the possibilities of it than are its opponents.

GRACE ISABEL COLBRON.

### Once More: The Right to Work.

In reference to the editorial comment on page 914 on the circular of the Colorado Coal Mine Managers' Committee Mr. J. F. Welborn, president of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, sends us the following statement:

Evidently you were not fully versed in the facts of the controversy at the time the editorial was written, nor was the prominent educator and economic expert who commented on the statement of the operators in regard to the constitutional right of every man to work, where, for whom and upon such terms as he sees fit.

This strike was not the work of the managers of the mines or of any large portions of the miners, less than ten per cent of whom were members of the United Mine Workers of America. It was planned outside of the State of Colorado, led by outsiders and financed from the outside. It was brought about to shut out of employment all but miners who were members of that particular union and compel mine owners to collect for it, from the men's wages, such dues, assessments, benefits and fines, as it might levy against the workmen.

I am sure that had we yielded to the demands of the United Mine Workers of America, when their officers came into the State a little over a year ago, more men would have left our employ than for varying reasons responded to the strike call. "You must discharge every one of your 12,000 loyal and satisfied workmen unless they join the United Mine Workers of America" was the effect of the demand of the union. To have recognized it would have meant the closing of all the mines of Colorado to all workmen who would not become members of that organization.

Colorado is today turning out all the coal that the market demands. The workmen are strongly opposed to the acceptance of the truce proposal which provides for re-employment of those known by many to have been guilty of violence. Is it not our duty to protect those men who have been loyal to us and not force them into working relations with others who have murderously attacked and threatened them?



While all this is interesting it is beside the point. There was no discussion in that editorial of whether the mine owners should or should not have granted the demands of the union. The discussion concerned only their statement that in resisting these demands they were upholding a right which they claimed for every man "to work where, and for whom, and upon such terms as he sees fit." If such a right exists then it belongs to the union miners as well as non-union, and conditions must be wrong which shut them out from work in the mines controlled by Mr. Welborn. If it does not exist it can constitute no defense of the mine owners' course.



The right to work is a right that should be

claimed for every man. But it is neither necessary nor desirable to add thereto "where, for whom, and on such terms as he sees fit." To enforce the right to work all that is needed is to give labor access to all unused natural opportunities. But every attempt that has been made in Colorado to take steps toward establishing the right to work has met with bitter opposition from the very interests that now claim to be standing for more rights than justly belong to the workers.

It is because available mining lands are monopolized that the miners' right to work is restricted. Because it is so restricted workers have no other means of resisting oppression than by banding together in such organizations as the United Mine Workers. Like all palliatives this plan has its weaknesses and its objectionable and unfair features. But it is unjust to hold the union workmen or union officials responsible for these. The responsibility lies with economic conditions that make combination necessary for defense of labor, and with the individuals who, as citizens, uphold these conditions. Such individuals can not properly complain when they find themselves injured by forces which their own acts have called into being. Upholders of monopoly do not seem entitled to sympathy when they suffer from the acts of labor combinations.

s. d.

### Getting the People to the Land.

A correspondent who speaks of himself as having been a "near" Singletaxer since Henry George published *Progress and Poverty*, but still doubts that the Singletax would secure "free access to land," writes:

All my experience and most of my observation and reflection confirm me in the belief that the great mass of men who want access to land for the purpose of working it, find no insuperable obstacle to earning and paying its price. Those who find difficulty in doing it are chiefly of the class that find difficulty in doing anything anywhere. On free land they would find the same difficulty in making a living that they find where they now are. The great difficulty is within, not without. I realize very vividly now, and realize its significance, in looking back to my boyhood on the land, that what the great proportion of the neighboring farmers' boys wanted was not "access to" but "exit from" the land. And repeated trial by benevolent associations seems to me to have demonstrated that few of the mass of the unemployed and unemployable can be gotten away from the city by any push or pull, and what few make the trial mostly return. Few of such men were ever present for the drawings of the public domain during the last score or two of years. At such distributions too, I believe, that the proportion of

genuine farmers, men who really wanted land to till and live their lives on, instead of to sell and make a speculation out of the "unearned increment," is small.

The fundamental error of the correspondent lies in his supposition that he is a "near" Singletaxer. He is very, very far from it. It may be doubted, indeed, if any one can be a "near" Singletaxer. The question is so simple and definite that he must be or not be. One who imagines himself a Singletaxer, but is not, will betray the fact by the strange and contradictory positions assumed. Our correspondent, for instance, seems to think the land to which men should have access is in one part of the earth, and the men who would have access to it in another part. Or that the men are afloat on the ocean, vainly seeking a means to reach the land. This thought appears in his reference to his "boyhood on the land," and to the efforts of well-meaning persons to get the unemployed in the cities to go on the land. The inference to be drawn from this is that these persons do not wish to be on the land, that they have no use for land. But is this a fact? Are not all these persons now using land? Will they not continue to use land as long as they live? When the correspondent quitted the farm of his boyhood days, was it not to change from that piece of land to another piece of land? Is he not today, though living in a city, as much dependent upon land as when he lived on a farm?

When Singletaxers speak of opening up land to use, or making land accessible, they do not mean that the people in the cities shall go on the unused lands in the country, to become farmers. It is not unlikely, indeed, that with the improvements in farming implements there may be fewer farmers than at present in proportion to the urban population. What the Singletaxer means is to have access to land, to all land, to any land, to the land that will at any given time best satisfy human wants. The relative desirability of land is now measured by its price; and the high priced land is not in farms. Men not only must have land, but they do have it; the difficulty is that they use it under unfavorable conditions. Owing to an erroneous system of taxation the men who use the land are obliged to pay the land owners for its use, and in addition they must support the government that makes the land valuable. This paying twice for the same thing constitutes a burden on production. Society endures it. The constant addition to the power of labor by science and invention enables men to live in spite of the handicap; but the bur-