

was leased in October, 1908, by the Board of Education to the Wise Realty Company (later merged into the Lincoln Realty Company), for a term of thirty-five years at a total rental of \$2,835,000. For the first five years the rental was \$3,780 per month, and for the remaining thirty years a rental of \$7,245 per month. These lots, known as the Lincoln School lots, included no improvements of any kind at the time they were leased. The four-story structure now on the lots was erected by the Wise Realty Company. The point that the writer wishes to make clear in regard to these lots is this: Sixty-four years ago, when San Francisco was a hamlet lying on a few sandy, windswept hills, these lots possessed little or no value. It is the wonderful growth of San Francisco during the last half century that has made this small parcel of land so immensely valuable. The question now arises: Why should not San Francisco derive revenue from all of its valuable land? If it is the increase of population that enables us to collect a rental of \$7,245 per month from a small piece of unimproved land, then is there any good reason why we should not also collect some of the "unearned increment" that has attached itself to all of the land on this little peninsula?



Economic Aspect of City Planning.

The American City, June.—If a stranger from Mars had wandered into a session of the National Conference on City Planning in Toronto last month, he might almost have imagined himself at a religious convention. And if the love of justice is the chief element of true religion, our visitor would have had ample grounds for his supposition. . . . If the stranger had prepared a report of his observations for transmission by ethereal wireless to the Planetary Conference on Town Planning in Mars, it might have started somewhat along these lines:

"Our young neighbor Earth is at last beginning to learn some things in the planning and building of its cities. It is learning that a thousand men have more rights than one man, and that a million have more rights than a thousand. It is learning that unrestricted liberty of individual action is not synonymous with community welfare. It is learning that to landholders as a whole restrictions are more valuable than full liberty. It is learning that the right of the individual to light and air and ease of access in a growing city is dependent on the giving up of the far less important "right" of doing as he would with his land—if, indeed, he is not one of the great majority whose economic condition does not permit the owning of any land whatsoever."

Our Martian visitor could not fail to comment also on the growing recognition of the community's right to a just share of the values which it creates. He would have heard, from two men who had taken leading parts in the planning of the world's greatest subway scheme, a declaration of their belief in ultimate municipal ownership, and in assessments for benefits as a correct principle in the financing of urban transportation systems. . . . In his report to his Martian friends the stranger would have referred to the discussion of these economic questions as among the most fundamental features of the Conference. He would look forward to the time when

the cities of the world will learn to finance their public works and maintain their government entirely by assessments or taxation on land and on other natural or legalized monopolies—on those things, in other words, which automatically absorb the financial benefits of community growth and of wise governmental expenditures.

RELATED THINGS

CONTRIBUTIONS AND REPRINT

QUESTIONS

For The Public.

Strong sons of toil, whose hands have built
A thousand palaces of stone,
What profit have you for your years?
Have you no homes to call your own!

Your arms have dugged from gloom of night
Earth's hoarded warmth, in fears untold;
The firelight gleams on many a hearth—
Your children perish with the cold!

In countless mills, in gloom and grime,
Your daughters' nimble fingers fly
To clothe the multitudes of earth—
But they who weave, in rags must die!

—Thomas Curtis Clark.



HOW LABOR CAN BE HELPED.

From a Letter to Louis F. Post Dated Copiague,
N. Y., Aug. 15, 1913.

Complying with your invitation to write a letter giving my opinion as to what can be done by the Department of Labor to advance the opportunities for profitable employment of wage earners, I submit the following:

Where two men strive for one job wages fall.

Where two jobs strive for one man wages rise.

The problem, then, is to eliminate one of the two men, so that the other man may meet the job (or the owner of it) on an equal footing, where a dicker can be made as between man and man, and not, as now, between a master and a suppliant for work.

How can this be brought about?

That is for your Department to ascertain; but I would say that it can be brought about by broadening or opening up the road to opportunity—to bring about a condition where the surplus man can remove himself from rivalry for the aforesaid job and become self-supporting.

How can he do it?

Here we descend from the heights of theory into the valley of experience and fact.

Less than seventy years ago 147 men, women and children were driven from their homes in what is now the Middle Western section of the