COMMUNICATIONS.

Editor *Single Tax Review:*

I am glad to note occasionally that others of our faith beside myself are strongly opposed to the name by which we are known.

Of all the ills which communities are heir to we have the strongest condemnation for taxes. We believe that a tax in any form is an act of force whether practiced by the State or the highwayman; that taxing is simply a taking of that which belongs inviolably to the man who has by his labor earned it; that there can be no moral justification for taking from any man that which is his own whether the taking is performed by one man or a community of men.

We are not in any sense taxers. On the contrary, we abhor taxes—of which there are legions of all sorts: Grafters, watered stocks, protective tariffs, monopolies of public utilities, *ad infinitum*, *ad nauseam*.

Why, then, should we call ourselves Single Taxers, when the greatest of all sinners is the taxer? For no other reason than lack of a name that fits us better.

Now, in a community composed entirely of people of our faith, what particular custom would distinguish us from other communities? Would it not be the rendering unto the community the things which we concede belong to the community? In which case what act would more distinguish us than the act of rendering? Religious sects are distinguished by names which qualify them. Universalists, Episcopalians, Unitarians—these names mean something. The Abolitionist was a man who believed in the abolition of slavery. But Single Taxer for those who do not for an instant believe in any sort of tax; who are fundamentally, morally and physically, tooth and nail, opposed to taxes in any form, is a misnomer which slanders a most noble body of men and women. What are we, then? We are *Renderists*. We would render unto the community the things which are the community's, just as in our Lord's time we should have rendered unto Cæsar the things which were Cæsar's. The act of rendering, returning, giving or assigning to the community is the act which we would have distinguish us as consistent followers of our great Leader, who used the name "Single Taxers" "for want of a better one." To be sure, "*Renderist*" is not in the dictionaries, but neither is "Single Taxer."

Let us get right in this matter before the "Standard" gets us in wrong.

J. A. DEMUTH.

OBERLIN, Ohio.

Editor *Single Tax Review:*

Suppose I own the "House in a remote district, far from any neighbor" that Mr. Ernest Crosby takes for an example. Before Mr. Crosby came and built his house and laid out his beautiful park my land was worth nothing and my house $500.

After Mr. Crosby came my land and house together are worth $1,000. Now suppose my house burns down. Is not the increase in the value still there, less the value of the house; or, rather, the cost of replacing it? I do not argue as to who caused the increase in the value but merely want to remark: what is the use of speaking—or writing about the increase in the value of the house when it is so plainly apparent that the increased value attached solely to the land.

H. W. NOREN.

ALLEGHENY, PA.

Editor *Single Tax Review:*

I think Mr. Fillebrown is right.

We should not use the expression "We propose to abolish the private ownership of land."

The effect of that statement to a man who has not yet given enough thought or attention to the Single Tax to know anything about it, is simply in most cases, to make him close his mind like a clam does his shell, against all favorable consideration of the subject.

His idea is that we propose to destroy all titles to land and entirely upset the present order of things, and before you can clear his mind of this impression, he is prejudiced against your propositions. There is no use of using an expression that will antagonize a man at the very beginning.

Now the height, depth and breadth of the Single Tax proposition is to gradually release the products of labor from taxation and increase the tax on ground rent until it is all taken for public purposes and by this means eliminate the monopoly in the holding of land.

I think it can be said that there will be no ostensible attempt to "abolish" anything. No attack on the private holding of land, but simply a demand that those of us who monopolize land or any natural opportunity shall pay to the public what it is worth to one individual to keep the public off that natural opportunity.

There is work enough and difficulties enough before us in convincing the average landowner that the rent of land should pay public expenses without putting the proposition in an unnecessarily forbidding, and perhaps to him even an alarming form, for I think that the proposition to "abolish private property in land" would convey to most men's minds the idea of revolution or chaos.

Let us never in our literature, speeches or conversations on the Single Tax use the expression referred to.

THOMAS HUNT.

KENNEDY, OHIO.