

the development of a demountable structure, which may be utilized for residence and commercial purposes upon leased land. The response was nil, but this entering wedge to the solution of the land question should no longer be ignored.

Within a radius of twenty miles of every city lies sufficient unused and partially used land to provide a homestead and a place for work for each of our homeless and jobless families. This land lies within as well as without the city limits and comprises sites suitable to every type of enterprise. The present owners hold these sites in anticipation of future profitable sale. The hope of future profits through rentals is not the incentive that promotes this speculation. Consider, for example, the city of Chicago. It is estimated that the sites plotted out and held by speculators, within commuting distance of this city, would furnish homes and business sites for a population of 75,000,000. Are the present owners of these sites so dull that they do not realize that not within the lives of any of their grandchildren will Chicago attain a population amounting to one-quarter of this number? To whom do these owners hope to sell their holdings? Why, to other speculators who can carry the torch of land speculation down through the ages. What will happen if sales decline and finally cease? Will men continue to pay taxes on land that can bring them a revenue only through rentals from a generation yet unborn? It is not reasonable to think that they would continue to hold land from which they entertained no hope of returns.

Rather, it is logical to expect that they would seek renters for their holdings immediately. This they undoubtedly would be forced to do. They would quickly discover, however, that there are not enough renters to go around, and that as a consequence many must be left holding title to land for which neither they nor any other of this generation have any use. The end—result would be the return of a considerable portion of our country to government possession. Our present so-called marginal lands would be the first to return to the public domain, and land that today draws moderate rentals would become marginal. Gradually this new marginal and would be abandoned and the margin of cultivation raised to a higher level, with the result that wages, which are dictated by the margin of cultivation, would increase steadily.

Coupled with this disruption of land speculation would arise a taxation problem for our generation to solve. Those possessed of demountable structures would argue that such structures be classed as personal property, which is exempt from taxation in some sections of the country. As the use of demountable structures increased, the number of those who differentiate between land and improvements would be augmented. Millions who today can not be brought to realize the necessity of land value taxation, would clamor for it, in defence of their own interests. The taxation problem would be thrown into the public forum, opening up a discussion which would afford the followers of Henry George with the greatest opportunity they have ever enjoyed for the propagation of their doctrine.

Those who believe that our people would not adopt the demountable structure, have but to consider the rush of American families to the trailer-home to see how great is the desire of our people to escape the toll of landlordism. Give these families a modern home containing all conveniences to which they are accustomed, under circumstances that will permit them to escape the toils of the land speculator, and they will abandon not only the stable structure but the trailer as well.

Edwin J. Jones of Westfield, N. J., told in the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM of a plan for leasing to prospective home-builders a small tract of land belonging to that city. The demountable structure, without any legislation, will make a similar leasehold plan possible for every community. Why not encourage the development of the demountable structure?

Erie, Michigan.

ROBERT L. MCCAIG.

#### AGREES WITH MR. CARROLL

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Mr. Joseph R. Carroll in his letter in the May-June issue of LAND AND FREEDOM hits the nail square on the head.

Ever since I saw the cat more than fifty years ago, I have been advocating Single Tax in season and out, and it has been my experience that those who would benefit the most by abolishing land monopoly, are the hardest to convince. These same people defeated Tom L. Johnson in Cleveland and caused his premature death, after he had spent millions of dollars trying to bring about conditions to make their lives happier.

In my opinion "Progress and Poverty" is the greatest book ever written, for it proves that we can escape at least 90 per cent of our present troubles if we follow Henry George.

It was my pleasure to hear him denounce land monopoly in Ash-tabula, Ohio, and to this day I still seem to hear his resonant voice.

Some day if we heed his advice, before our civilization goes on the rocks, the world will dedicate a memorial to Henry George, more impressive than any other ever erected to the memory of any human being.

Painesville, Ohio.

H. BIEDER.

#### "PROGRESS AND POVERTY" NOW AMONG THE BEST SELLERS

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your advertisement of the new book on the last page of LAND AND FREEDOM is so well worded that I think leaflets of it should be printed and distributed among the faithful to enclose in their letters, and private post-cards of the same might do much to increase its circulation.

*"Three times summoned to Rome, he flatly refused to go, and after six momentous years of waiting Rome came to him."*

When in the history of the Catholic church, did such a thing ever happen before? That statement ought to make churchmen of every creed tumble over each other to get a copy—and learn the reason why!

Hope the book will have a rush that will revive our "almost blunted purpose" and put "Progress and Poverty" among the best sellers again.

Houston, Texas.

P. W. SCHWANDER.

#### A CRUSADE FOR SOCIAL JUSTICE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I would like to express my appreciation of LAND AND FREEDOM which covers a vast field in economics in a masterly manner.

At present things look very hopeful for our cause, as there is in New Zealand a "Crusade for Social Justice" preaching that there is no necessity for poverty—just what we have been saying for sixty years. This crusade seems to be getting a good following including all the churches, not omitting the Roman Catholic. They admit that they cannot point the way by which Social Justice may be brought about, but are calling on the "experts" to do the job.

We are doing our best to show them the way.

Auckland, N. Z.

C. H. NIGHTINGALE.

#### PRAISE FOR GEORGE RUSBY'S PAMPHLET

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Congratulations on the last issue of LAND AND FREEDOM with its fund of vitally interesting material.

Your Comment and Reflection maintains its high standard—a difficult feat. I should like to add my praise to that of Mr. Burger with respect to Rusby's "Smaller Profits, etc."

Ambrose Bierce defined the word pleonasm as "An army of words escorting a corporal of thought" and antithetically, I should classify Rusby's booklet as the multum in parvo of our economic literature.

Best wishes for your continued success.

Philadelphia, Pa.

C. M. HOOSE.