

fore why should we argue with Socialists and others who change the meaning of the terms several times in a discussion? It is too bad that Mr. Loomis does not understand that in our evolution most men are still less rational than savages. Those who are slightly more rational than their fellows are those who do the exploiting, cheating, lying, stealing. Those who are more rational, and at the same time just, are still but a small voice crying in the wilderness, but taking a large view of humanity from earliest times I am convinced that we are fulfilling our biologic destiny and are approaching slowly the ideal man.

Mr. Loomis quotes Henry George to show that the selling price will not be destroyed by Single Tax. It is of no concern to me what authorities are quoted. Let us look at the facts. All land held out of use now is so held with the expectation of selling at a price. All land underdeveloped is also so held. The price expected is the highest price possible. Single Tax will certainly destroy such selling prices. Such selling prices presuppose several bidders for the land. The bidders are actuated by what they conceive to be the future demand for the land. In many cases this is pure gambling, but there are many cases in which an astute student of the trend of commerce and industry can foresee future conditions. When the holding of the land has become unprofitable because the economic rent is collected by society for social purposes no selling price will exist, since to fail to pay the economic rent would mean an ouster by the state and no man will want to pay more than the economic rent, which he would be doing if he paid some one for the privilege of taking over the land from him. To hold land then will mean to use it. To hold it idle will mean to pay for it out of wealth accumulated elsewhere. To cease to pay the economic rent will mean that one must give it up.

Now in a circumstance where a person wants a very select spot for a home or a camp and someone else is there already and is satisfied to pay the economic rent, there will arise a situation which might give weight to Mr. Loomis's contention. If the one who wants it badly enough is willing to pay the incumbent a large sum to give it up to him we might think that the sum agreed upon is a selling value of the land. But is it? Is the incumbent holding the land to collect tribute from a future buyer? The fact that he pays his economic rent for a piece of land which is not used in the production of material wealth shows that he is not holding it for that purpose. He is getting a psychic income, rest, recreation, pleasure, satisfaction of his artistic sense, a chance to revel in nature and its joys, and health of body and mind. To ask him to give up these benefits to another who wishes them for the same reasons would be unthinkable without some suitable recompense for their loss. He must forego all these comforts for a while until he can locate a place as near suitable as possible. He must have the annoyance of picking up and vacating, tear himself up by the roots, as it were. Any sum the other is willing to pay must be as equal to the comforts given up and the inconvenience suffered as is possible to compute. If he is willing to pay such a sum, and the incumbent is willing to take it, is this really the selling value of the land? No. And what is more it might be many times the value computed by capitalizing the economic rent at five per cent, depending upon how desirous the purchaser is to get it, and how desirous the incumbent is to stay. It is not the selling value of the land. It is the sum paid by one man to another to give up certain satisfactions. It does not depend upon any supply and demand in cases where others are also bidding. In this case the bidder is limited to one person but there are other parcels of land which he might have.

Brooklyn, N. Y.

JOHN LUXTON.

A TRIBUTE TO FRANK P. RAND

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Will you spare space for a brief tribute to a veteran Single Taxer, who for nearly fifty years quietly, tirelessly and effectively preached the gospel of equality, of the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man as taught by Henry George?

It was at the Anti-Poverty Fair in 1887 that I first met Frank P. Rand, who was born in Maine.

In 1898 I was in Kansas City and met him again.

In 1907 when I went to Seattle, Frank P. Rand was there quiet as ever, effective, and tireless in preaching the gospel.

In 1913 I found him again, in Victoria, British Columbia, still quiet and still busy, in season and out of season.

Always ready to talk Single Tax himself he could not believe anyone else would hesitate anywhere or at any time.

In Victoria he came to me and said "You are to talk Single Tax from the stage at the Princess Theater during the performance next Monday night."

Astonished, I said "What do you mean? An audience pays to see and hear a play, they won't sit quiet to hear some one but in with a Single Tax talk."

He said "You needn't talk very long, but you'll have to talk. I arranged it with the management. They are playing 'Shore Acres' and I told them you were a friend of James A. Herne who wrote it, and whose acting made it famous. The actor who takes Herne's part will call on you in the dinner scene and you'd better sit in the front row, and be ready." So obediently, I climbed over the foot lights, talked Single Tax briefly and escaped alive. Next day Rand called on me and said "You are to talk next Thursday night at the house warming of the new Congregational Church." I went and had a delightful evening with a very fine bunch of people. There was no chance for any Single Taxer to loaf or get rusty with Frank P. Rand. around. He was always willing to sacrifice anyone to advance the Single Tax. Now for him "Out of the darkness has stretched a hand and into the silence has come a voice, 'Well done, thou good and faithful servant. Thou hast been faithful over a few things, I will make thee ruler over many things; enter thou into the joy of the Lord.'" Bolar, Va.

WILL ATKINSON.

WE SHOULD BE REPRESENTED AT CONFERENCES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

One thing bothers me tremendously.

Everywhere there are committees and commissions and individuals making investigations and reports on the tax question, and proposals and notions and bills without number are published and introduced, many of them senseless and unjust. But hardly anywhere is the land value tax proposed or considered—the only just and practical of them all.

Why should it not be possible to have an able representative of the Single Tax plan represented at some of these meetings and conferences? Alma, Wis.

THEODORE BUEHLER

MR. STEWART RETURNS AGAIN TO THE CHARGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

My letter "As to Interest," in your Jan.-Feb. issue with Mr. Kendal's on "Some Practical Aspects of Interest" and "Note by the Editor," submitted that "The actual identifying of Single Tax with continuance of the present certain interest burden is killing its natural broad appeal;" and that natural law facts call for our standing simply on the law of supply and demand as determining interest.

As we are certainly concerned about the slow progress of Single Tax this is a proper matter to "worry" about. The fact that whatever interest there will be under Single Tax must be natural and just, has no bearing on the present importance of knowing and teaching the truth as to what it will be instead of wrongly antagonizing those whom we must convert to it in order to get it. Teaching that everybody will have capital and get interest—perhaps from the unfortunate and improvident who do not count,—simply cannot help even if it satisfies us to let it go at that.

We all agree that diverted-rent unjustly enters into "the present certain interest burden," giving it such certainty as natural values alone can give; that so far as the vote is determined by relative scarcity of capital (however normally caused) it is just and beneficial