

No wonder his soul was stirred to high purpose! No wonder his eloquence gave "the breath of life" to a cause for which at last the time was ripe.—ELIZA STOWE TWITCHELL.

FROM ONE WHO FIGHTS FOR
ENGLAND.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I take the opportunity of a few days' sick leave from the trenches to renew my subscription to the REVIEW, which is always instructive and welcome. It is a pleasant change from the thoughts of our misguided assailants.

What misery their protectionist ideals (they are the mainstay of tariffs today) and their land gambling (which goes far to gag even such lofty souls as Adolf Damaschke and Dr. Schrameier) are bringing on their country and all the world! It is a vast pity that Bryan cannot see that a state of war is a trivial evil compared with the results of protection and land monopoly whether in peace or war.

What might not be done for the world if only the United States would take a stand for Henry George's philosophy! That they might or might not be "at war" with any or every other nation at the time would matter about as much as if you ate your eggs boiled or fried—yet poor Bryan talks of "peace" in a country ravaged by "pirates" and "hordes of ferocious wild beasts," as George well said.

Good luck to you and keep up your War.
—M. J. STEWART, Falmouth, Eng.

HOW WE MAY ALL BECOME STATIS-
TICALLY RICH

The following letter by a Melbourne Single Taxer has been addressed, not for publication but in acknowledgment of the editor's clear vision, to the *Saturday Evening Post*.

In your Editorial of the 19th June you say "Dividing that (the unimproved land value) by the number of inhabitants is merely a sort of grim statistical joke." May I point out that this quo-

tient is most important, but that it represents the amount of the National Debt per head, not wealth as the statisticians would have us believe.

It comes to the same thing whether a Government sells a bearer bond for a given annual income for a lump sum or whether it sells the title to collect rent on a piece of land for a lump sum.

Nobody would think of taking the market value of the National Debt and dividing it by the number of the population to get at the wealth per head. Why then should the land value euphemistically called "real estate" be treated this way and our friends the statisticians expect to get away with it? It is a fine thing to see common sense in such a widely read paper as the *Post* for it is quite time that somebody called their bluff.

HEARKEN TO THIS PARABLE:

"A certain successful General returned to his native burg after the war. His admirers wishing to make him a present but having no money gave him a franchise to throw a string across Main street and collect one cent from all passers by.

"In the course of time the General wanting ready money sold his income which amounted to \$10,000 to the public for \$200,000 in bonds. The purchasers were satisfied with 5% on their investment and the General blew the money and died.

"Many years afterwards a genius arose in that town and said, 'Let us cut this string' but a great outcry arose against him for it was shown that the income from the bonds was the sole support of all the widows and orphans in the community. Besides, said the statisticians, you will destroy \$200,000 of wealth and if you divide that by the number of the population you will all be poorer by the amount of the quotient. So the string is still across Main Street and they are thinking of putting up some more and making themselves statistically richer."—VINCENT PANTIN.

THE Single Taxers of Philadelphia celebrated the birthday of Henry George by a "Twilight Pilgrimage" to the birth place of "the prophet of San Francisco."