

## CONFIRMS THOROLD ROGERS.

EDITOR OF SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Houston S. Chamberlain in his brilliant work, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century," lately published by John Lane, London and New York, shows the workman of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was better off than today, that "the agriculturist over nearly the whole of Europe was a freer man, with a more assured existence, than he is today; copyhold was the rule, so that England, for example—today a seat of landlordism—was even in the fifteenth century almost entirely in the hands of hundreds of thousands of farmers who were not only legal owners of their land, but possessed in addition far-reaching free rights to common pastures and woodlands. Since then, all these farmers have been robbed, simply robbed, of their property. Any means of achieving this was good enough. If war did not afford an opportunity for driving them away, existing laws were falsified and new laws were issued by those in authority, to confiscate the estates of the small holders in favor of the great. But not only the farmers, the small landlords had also to be destroyed: that was achieved by a roundabout method: they were ruined by the competition of the greater landlords, and then their estates were bought up."

See detailed account in vol. ii., p. 354. The whole book is most interesting and nearly every page has some arresting thought and eloquent passage, and the number of old-fashioned generally accepted theories or beliefs he shows to be false and untenable are legion.—A. K. VENNING. LOS ANGELES, CAL.

THOSE who eat without perspiration staining their bodies are always ready to cry "confiscation" and "disaster" when the workers and sweaters propose any measure to secure more of the results of toil to the toilers.

*The Jeffersonian*, of Los Angeles, Cal., has an article on the Single Tax by G. W. Slocomb.

ANOTHER CORRESPONDENT TAKES  
ISSUE WITH MR. WHITE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. George White thinks high city rents do not depend upon "difference of potentiality" of sites.\* There seems to be but one law of rent. Owners of city sites reap all the benefits of cooperation in production and distribution. A natural advantage leads people to cooperate on a certain site, and the advantages of cooperation are added to the original advantage. The competition of vacant sites, thrown upon the market by a land value tax, might not reduce the rent in cities as it would in rural districts, but other factors would reduce city rents. City laborers would go to the country where they could secure land at small rent or no rent. This would raise wages in the city, which must be at the expense of rent. More buyers in the country, with higher purchasing power, must stimulate distribution at rural points, also at the expense of city trade. Parcels post will stimulate mail order business, which requires less expensive sites. The oldest mail order house in Chicago recently left their Michigan Avenue site for a much cheaper site on the North Branch, before used chiefly for factories. But the site is just as good for getting mail and filling orders. We will learn that freedom of trade, and freedom to use the best methods of production and exchange, will equalize site values; raising the rent line, thereby raising wages and interest at the expense of site rent. While rent cannot enter into price, under any given condition, the lowering of rent, via Single Tax, must lower prices, as the following will prove:

Wheat is worth \$1 per bushel, raised	
on 30 bushel land.....	\$30.00
If raised on 25 bushel land.....	25.00
On 20 bushel land.....	20.00

The price is fixed by the cost on 20 bushel land. Now suppose the 25 bushel land is all held out of use, but is set free by the Single Tax and produces wheat; the cost of wheat is reduced 20 per cent. or to 80 cents, and the rent on the 30

\*Mr. White did not say that.—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

bushel land is reduced from \$10 to \$5, this now being the "difference of potentiality," the 20 land now being vacant.

There are enough city sites, now held vacant, to produce a similar effect in cities. Not a third of the sites of Chicago are used. At some spots one can scarcely see a house.

—C. F. HUNT.

CHICAGO, ILL.

---

#### RENTAL VALUE VS. SELLING VALUE.

---

##### EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. Bolton Hall may be wrong, and it may be only an academic distinction not worth discussing, whether we assess by one or the other methods—but:

Henry George's great gospel of good news to the world was, that the rent of land belongs to all people and not to the private landlord; that taxation of all kinds is a robbery of the individual and must be abolished; and all public revenues obtained by the community by the collection of rent of land.

If we had all been consistently clamoring for the resumption of rent and abolition of taxation, would the agitation in England have been as fruitless as it has so far been? The main issue being disguised as an attempt to substitute a tax on selling value of land for some other taxes, instead of showing a long suffering people, that they at present pay rent and taxes, while the reform proposed is that they pay *less rent and no taxes*.

Would the Federal Government of Australia have been able to give a setback to our reform by imposing an arbitrary, progressive tax, beginning at a penny in the £ (equal to one cent in 240 cents) on estates worth over £5,000 (roughly, 20,000 of your dollars), if it had always been presented as collection of rents by governments, instead of by (and for) landlords?

If we state our proposals in ambiguous language, we are sure to reap a crop of honest misunderstandings, besides an extra large one of misrepresentations by our opponents.

Had we been preaching the Georgean gospel in unmistakable language, would

every exponent of it require to spend half his time in showing those he endeavored to convince, that "the landlord could not pass it on?"

All who are accustomed to look at truths in the clear light of first principles, lament the doubt and confusion with which enquirers are always confronted, because the simple truths on which our great gospel is founded are obscured by their being presented under misleading names.

—G. R. HARRISON.

---

#### 250 WORD DEFINITIONS OF THE SINGLE TAX.

---

The Manhattan Single Tax Club on Sunday evening, October 13, varied its regular programme by having what the management termed an "amatur night," at which the younger element for the most part, together with those who never make public addresses, competed for prizes offered for the best 250 word definition of the Single Tax. A dozen or more competed. The following was judged the best among the men competitors by the committee of award, consisting of Messrs. F. H. Monroe, of Chicago, John Egan, Wm. Ryan, Augustus Weymann, Joseph Dana Miller and Mrs. E. M. Murray. The successful competitor was Mr. Gaston Haxo, a very young man and a recent convert to the cause. It was considered by the judges that he, more than the others, had fulfilled the requirements of a *definition* of rather than an essay on the Single Tax. Mr. Haxo's successful entry follows:

"The purpose of the Single Tax is not merely to change the present system of taxation, but to abolish private ownership of land and land speculation, which are responsible for industrial depressions and the poverty and vice of the century.

"We Single Taxers hold that all men are born with equal rights to life, and since men can only live by using the earth, they must have equal rights to its use, and the land of the country must be the common property of all the people. As it is today the land is held by the few and the rest of us are compelled to use it on their terms, and give to the owners the greater part of