

TO CLEAR UP A CONFUSION.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Rent cannot enter into nor come out of price, nor cost. A. C. Pleydell is right, but perhaps an illustration might help Mr. Cowern. A. and B. sell hats:

	per day	cost	price	profit
A on Broadway sells	100	\$1.50	\$2.00	\$50.00
B in Yonkers sells	10	\$1.50	\$2.50	\$10.00

A less price yields A a fund five times that of B for his wages and rent. If the reward for labor of distributing, or profit, be called wages, than the rent comes out of wages. It will be seen that what seems "too plain for argument" is really a superficial view. If B's rent comes out of his price of \$2.50, how can a greater rent, paid by A, come out of a less price, \$2.00? The fact that prices are lowest where rent is highest suggests a flaw in the argument that rent MUST come from price. Read *Progress and Poverty*, Book VIII, chap. III.

C. F. HUNT.

CHICAGO, Ill.

FROM A. WANGEMANN.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I always find ample stimulation in the *REVIEW*. Most of us need it, for the natural bent of the reformer's mind is to run in a rut.

Bolton Hall's definition of "What is the Single Tax" is the most lucid yet. But I want to give the *REVIEW* readers some thoughts on A. J. Wolf's letter who asks for action. Who comprise the "thinking public" which Mr. Wolf desires to interest? Habitually we still apply the term to the learned professions—the higher type of politicians—parsons—petticoats, and that conventional aggregation best described as the impotent middle class, fast being ground pulpy under our modern industrial system of capitalized land monopoly. This is the "thinking public" we address.

We press writers have addressed said T. P., lo! these many years, each in his own way reciting $2 \times 2 = 4$, and I reckon we will keep at it.

But, Mr. Editor, the world moves and new party alignments are being formed on

economic lines: Aristocracy and Privilege entrenched versus Democracy and the Golden Rule aspirations. These are slowly crystalizing, as any mind not hidebound in partisan bigotry and conventionalism can see.

Brother Wolf asks for action. Well, is it necessary to point out that organized labor has taken the second step in cooperation—has gone into political action—not as an affiliation move with a political party, but as an economic body. Here then we have a deliberate political activity based on economic grounds exclusively—a phenomenon worth our close sympathetic attention.

As you will surmise readily these organized wealth producers still lack even a kindergarten knowledge of sociology and political economy. They need that knowledge. They will get it either from the Single Taxers or from the State Socialists in America. The Churches can not furnish it to labor unprivileged. The Churches lay stress on the moral factor. The Socialists concern themselves with the materialistic factor of economic environment. The Single Taxers consider both the economic environment and the factor of moral responsibility. Labor once fully informed in economics will then be in intelligent position to abolish private land monopoly. Here then is a big field for action.

The next move then is to get about it. How and by what method shall we act? Mr. Editor, being slightly modest, as we Chicagoans all are, I will not encumber the pages of the *REVIEW* with advice. Let your readers do their own pondering. As for me, my method is to mix with the leaders and rank and file of workers—get to know their ideology, methods of logic, prejudices, and approach their minds accordingly. Strip off the tenaciously clinging veneer of conventional habits of thought and speech which so often prevent us from being of real service to our fellows.

A. WANGEMANN.

CHICAGO, Edgewater, Ill.

FOR some months past Gavin D. High has been assistant financial editor of the *Evening Sun*, and in the absence of his chief practically in charge of the financial department.