

### THE CHRISTIAN SCIENCE OF THE SINGLE TAX.

MRS. GOLDZIER RENEWS HER EXPLANATION.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Christian Science is a method of healing human ills by Truth and Love.

Single Tax is a truthful and loving method of economics which will heal all poverty and sickness, and hence all crime, for more crime is caused by poverty than any other way. Human beings are naturally good, but the fear that their natural wants may not be satisfied makes them selfish, and selfishness causes all other sins.

Under the Single Tax no one would be afraid that he would not get all and more than he needs. A living could be made so easily that no one but a crank and faddist would think of accumulating a lot of wealth that neither he nor his heirs could enjoy.

Vast fortunes could not be made; but even if they could, they would not hold the present power of dominion over less fortunate beings. The power in vast fortunes today is the fact that what one holds the other is deprived of. Under the Single Tax this would not be so. As land is the source of all wealth, and as no one would be able to have more land than he was actually using, much land would be free, and no matter how much wealth one man owned, others could have just as much by making it out of land.

Only when land, the source of wealth, is monopolized and held out of use is the supply limited.

Single Tax would tax landlords out of existence. There would be but one Lord, and that, God, all his people acting as His agent—His Son.

We no longer worship gods many; it is time we rid ourselves of lords many, especially landlords many; that can be done by taxing the land to its full rental value. All a man wants the land for, is the rent. If the rent does not go to the man but to the State, the man will not care for the land. He will only take so much as he needs to live on, or what is necessary for the application of his labor and capital.

God is Lord of all, even of the land, and there should be no lesser lords—no landlords.

Christian Science is Christian and so is the Single Tax.

Christian Science is scientific and so is the Single Tax.

Things equal to the same thing are equal to each other; hence Single Tax is equal to Christian Science.

A sum is equal to all of its parts. But if you omit some of its parts there is no sum.

Christian Science is equal to Single Tax and all its other healing qualities; but if you leave Single Tax out there is no Christian Science left, but only a very inadequate religion.

Single Tax without any other part of Christian Science contains enough Principle to carry the Children of God to eternal Life and happiness. But the other part of Christian Science is so beautiful that we want it too.

We want and can have all, but first and foremost is the Single Tax, for it gives us the earth which is the manifestation of God from whom all blessings flow.

"Whom" has for its antecedent "earth" or "God," just as the reader feels at the particular time of reading. But for the sake of the reader who has learned that all is God and there is no matter, I will add since there is no matter, the earth is not matter, but Spirit manifest; which makes Paul's quotation understandable. "In God we live, move, and have our being."

JULIA GOLDZIER.

### PRIVATE PROPERTY, WHAT IS IT?

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

The discussions that have been going on in the last few numbers of the REVIEW regarding the question of private property in land have been very interesting to me.

Some of your correspondents appear to think that the Single Tax idea is to allow the land to remain as private property, or in private ownership, while its rental value is appropriated by the State. The Single Tax is interpreted as a tax which will not destroy private property in land, when its rental value ceases to be private income. This is equivalent to saying that the rental value of land and the land itself are two distinct things. This is surely an error. We cannot separate the value of a good thing from the good itself, when a productive good ceases to have any income value to the individual user. So far as he is concerned it ceases to be property. If we abolish the rental value of land, wholly or in part as private income, we abolish to the same extent land as "private property." In other words—when the state levies a tax on land values, it taxes the property itself—the tax is paid in property.

What I wish to call your attention to is this. I think that your correspondents misunderstand what the term "private property" really means, because, if we look at the meaning of that term as consistently defined by the Single Tax Economics, we will see that land is not really private property at all. We will see that because land being of such a nature that no part of it can be privately or exclusively owned by any individual, it cannot be private property any more than it is private wealth. To be sure, the common every day meaning of the terms "private property" and "private wealth" is "Anything whatever that can be bought, sold, exchanged or devised, and where value can be expressed in terms of money;" and this includes land; but we

know how Henry George treated that definition when speaking of the term wealth. So let us take our cue from Mr. George, and just see what the terms "private property," "public property" and "common property" really mean.

When we are buying property or goods, we are not buying mere material things such as soil, wood, stone or iron, made up into certain forms. We are buying utilities or material services. Some special forms of matter that have been "moved, combined or separated, or in other ways modified" so as to admit of the natural power they possess being directed to the advantage of man. The function of goods can consist in nothing else than in a giving off, or rendering up, or putting forth—or to use the terminology of physical science—the passing of energy into the satisfaction of a concrete want. We value and desire and possess goods only on account of the utility or usefulness that are expected from them, and the material itself from which they are made form only the bodily shell. It is the utility of a thing that we buy and sell, and not the mere labor-form, and the market value of a utility is the social estimate of the services which the good will render. It is not mere physical matter we desire, it is utility, or material services. Utility is the basis of value. physical property is merely the form—the bodily shell, as it were.

So when we speak of the value of a thing, we mean its utility or usefulness, and this is real property. The real meaning of property then, is the material services which the goods possess, or which fit them to satisfy human desires. These utilities are the completed goods ready for the consumer, and they have embodied in them certain material services which are contributed from three different sources, namely—(1) Services rendered by the individual (those of them that work). (2) Services rendered by Society through government; and—(3) Services rendered by nature. These three factors co-operate in producing commodities or utilities, and no one of them can produce anything in modern society that will satisfy human desires without the assistance of one or both of the others. And it is a law of nature that each of those whose services are required in forming utilities should receive their just share of the joint product and in proportion to the services rendered. Nature demands that every atom which it contributes shall be returned to it. And it is also a law of nature that each of the other factors should receive theirs. That share of the product that remains with the individual is his own private property, and that share which is retained by the State is public property, and the services rendered by nature in the form of matter and natural forces, such as gravity, cohesion, resistance, sunshine, air and moisture—the whole combined into unity—is *common* property. Common to both

society and to the individual, freely rendered. Common to all and special to none. These natural forces cannot possibly be individually and exclusively owned, because nature is unity and not divisible. Land cannot therefore be individually owned because it is common to all and not special to any. No one can fence in a piece of land and say "this part of nature is special to me—exclusively mine from the zenith to the center of the earth." Where is the dividing line? If the planet Mars should cross the boundary line it would come within his title-deed. A part of material nature cannot be separated from the whole, being as "one in the many and the many in one." Nature cannot be individualized. But the rent of land is the product of society; and balances the value of the services which society renders.

The product that is embodied in rent is public property, and no person can rightfully claim even a fraction of it. Private property, on the other hand, is the product of the individual. Farm improvements, houses and implements, consumption goods, in fact whatever he has produced and received by rendering his services, are his own private property. When, however, certain persons claim portions of the land as their "private property" and demand a share of the product for the use of it, they are receiving products for which they have rendered no services. And to say that it is just to allow these men a share of the product as payment for the services rendered by nature, is to recognize them as creators of nature. Those products received by the landlords are taken from the laborers. Society, through government, demands and must receive its share of the product, and if that share does not come in a natural way, it must come some other way.

As to a title as private owner of land, it is not necessary for one to have a title as private owner in order to secure ownership in the improvements. All that is necessary is a title to the improvements and this will include the warranty of possession in whatever form they may exist in space. And this is all one is entitled to providing he renders to society full payment for value received.

H. N. McDONALD.

Toronto, Canada.

## PROPERTY IN LAND.

LETTER FROM JOHN Z. WHITE.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

The question has been asked me, what Mr. George meant when he said: "If private property in land be just, then is the remedy I propose a false one; if, on the contrary, private property in land be unjust, then is this remedy the true one."

In the same line of thought, on page 384, he said: "as nature gives only to labor.