

which is attached to land, and this is an entirely erroneous view. The value which is really attached to land, that is, inherent in land, is the value of growth, or the value of convenience for the site of a house or other social use, and this does not come into the discussion at all. The value which the Single Tax proposes to take for the public treasury is not inherent in the land at all, nor is it really "attached" to the land in any true sense. It bears the same relation to the land that a shadow does. The shadow falls upon the land, but cannot be said to be "attached" to it. In the case in point, the value is the shadow which falls from population, indicating a growth or a diminution in numbers, and consequently an increase or reduction of the value of the opportunity for business, etc. The fact that the value follows the movements of population in every particular proves that it is attached to population, and the proposal that population should own it and use it for common purposes is one which will appeal to the reason of any thoughtful man. On the other hand, the fact that a man owns a piece of land does not necessarily entitle him to own a shadow which falls upon it, even though that shadow has a market value. That value belongs to the passer-by by whom the shadow is cast.

My contention is that our question has nothing whatever to do with the ownership of land; it is exclusively concerned with the ownership of the value which attaches to population, and which merely registers upon land the increase or decrease of the community, after the similitude of a shadow.

J. W. BENGOUGH.

TORONTO.

NOT OUT OF THE PROPAGANDA STAGE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have just read your editorial in the Jan.-Feb. issue, page 69, on Politics versus Propaganda and want to say that my experience during the past year in this institution confirms your attitude. The Single Tax is to a vast number of intelli-

gent and serious citizens but a far-off, vague thing because it has not been brought to their attention, at least not in the right way. I had an experience the other day which is typical—attending a lecture by a "wise" Prof. on Socialism, a person sitting next to me made a remark after the lecture which gave me an occasion to mention the Single Tax. He became intensely interested and being of an inquiring mind in this field of thought he readily grasped the fundamental outline and expressed a desire to read *Progress and Poverty*, in which of course I encouraged him. But the point is, we are still in the propaganda stage and it is a great responsibility of present day Single Taxers to develop this feature along efficient lines. I am not going to find fault with recent political activities, as I would have to know more of the merits or demerits of them, but of this I am certain, there is vast amount of propaganda work ahead of us. Buckle's advice on page 69 of the *REVIEW* cannot be impressed too much.—University of Chicago. FRANK G. ADELMAN

WICHITA, KANSAS.

John Z. White spoke at the City Hall the evening of July 3rd on the prosperity of the cities of the Canadian Northwest, particularly as resulting from the application of the Single Tax. Although the attendance was small on account of the extremely hot weather a very good report was given in the *Wichita Eagle* of July 4th occupying two thirds of a column.

Mr. White's visit has had the effect of stimulating a fresh discussion of the important question. At noon of the same day after lunch at the Wichita Club, Mr. White spoke before a number of representative Wichita business men in the Club parlors on the same general lines and his address of something over a half an hour was listened to with very close attention by those present.

Wichita is one of those cities striving blindly to boost themselves by tugging hard at the city's boot straps. With great natural advantages, situated in the center of a most productive and highly cultivated