

Single Taxers in the country to sustain a weekly paper—an out-and-out Single Tax organ? I have no money to give toward the establishment of such a paper, but I would give my whole time and energy to working for such a paper, in any position for which I am at all qualified, at bare living wages. That's offering all that it is in my power to offer. When I consider what the Socialists are doing, what the Populists are doing, what even the few Anarchists are doing, and then try to make out what we are doing, I feel like crawling into the nearest hole and pulling it in after me.

H. J. CHASE.

Newport, Rhode Island.

BIRTHPLACE OF HENRY GEORGE.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

I have just been reading the number of "Little Journeys to Homes of Reformers" by Elbert Hubbard, devoted to Henry George, in which he says: "Born in Philadelphia in 1839, on Tenth Street, below Pine, in a house still standing, and which should be marked with a bronze plate, but is not, etc."

It seems to me Single Taxers should show more reverence for the memory of their dead leader than to leave the knowledge and place of his birth to pass into oblivion. Not only should the house be marked as suggested by Elbert Hubbard, but the property should be purchased and carefully preserved as an historic land-mark of the cause. I should think it would be a fitting task for the league of women's Henry George clubs to undertake this work. Some day it will be a point of interest in Philadelphia, second only to Independence Hall and other revolutionary relics. If this is not done the house is liable to be torn down at any time and the chance of preserving it entirely lost.

I am impelled to make this suggestion to you as the official representative of the cause, trusting you will mention it in a future number of the REVIEW with the result of preserving the house with its connection to the Single Tax movement.

W. L. MIGGETT.

Anne Arbor, Mich.

In answer to Mr. Miggett and others of our readers who will be interested, we will state that the house in which Mr. George was born is in good hands. It is owned by Dr. Thos. S. K. Morton, a wealthy Single Taxer, of Philadelphia, and is tenanted by a family in poor circumstances, for the neighborhood is a lowly one. But it is in good condition. It will not be sold nor torn down, and Dr. Morton will, we are confident, see to its preservation as an historic landmark in the march of liberty, not second to Independence Hall.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW.

A QUESTION.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

I recently heard a well-known and authoritative Single Taxer claim that farmers really pay the high ground rents obtained by landlords in cities where farm products are often marketed or exchanged. In other words, that the returns to the labor of Manitoba farmers, for instance, are lessened by the demands made in Toronto or London by the owners of the land where exchanges are made. I claim that this is probably fallacious. It is true that of the thousand bushels of wheat dealt in on a certain day in Toronto the landowner will claim a share, but it seems reasonable to believe that this share, together with the wages and interest due the broker, or exchanger, come out of the increased value which the wheat has at Toronto rather than at Manitoba. Practically, as I look at it, a thousand bushels of wheat, transported from Manitoba to Toronto, and by marketing having been placed so much nearer the consumer, have become, so to speak, 1100 bushels, and the cost of transportation, of brokerage and of standing room for the broker, all have to come out of the extra 100 bushels, and do not in any degree lessen the wages of the original producers.

What have our Single Tax experts to say on this interesting point?

GEORGE WHITE.

ANSWER.

The fallacious claim that "farmers pay the high city rents" is a variation, in more complex terms, of the old contention that "rent is added to the price." While rent is paid out of product it does not increase the price of any unit of a particular commodity. (It is not necessary now to discuss apparent exceptions that do not affect the matter under discussion, and it will be simpler to omit terms of money value.) The price of a bushel of wheat is the cost of raising it on the "poorest" land in use for wheat growing, and wheat raised more cheaply sells for the same price, the difference being rent.

Transportation is a factor in determining the "poorness" of land for production and in causing rent. It must be remembered, too, that much of the high ground rent in Toronto is due to purely local causes; factory land, for example, reflecting in its rent the saving of energy resulting from production at that location in preference to another.

The value of wheat in Toronto is increased over its value in Manitoba by the cost of transportation and distribution. It is confusing, however, to say that the 1,000 bushels become 1,100, or that the landowners in Toronto will take a share out of any thousand bushels of wheat sold there. What they really take a share of is the hats or coats or other tangible things that in the Toronto market are exchanged for the wheat. In other words, the thousand bush-

els of wheat that on the farms of Manitoba are worth in exchange, say, 1,000 hats, become worth in Toronto 1,100 hats. Some of these extra hats go to the people who brought the wheat by rail, some go to those who are handling it in the warehouses, and some hats go to those who own the ground upon which the business of distributing the wheat is carried on. But the landowners would not get these hats were it not that it takes less labor to put wheat into the hands of the ultimate consumer by carrying on these processes of trade in the city than to try to do them in a more scattered way. Consider the waste energy if every man had to go to the depot in Toronto and look after the year's wheat supply needed for himself and family. And if he had to go to the wheat field, modern civilization would be impossible.

It is the enormous saving of energy due to the increased facilities of distribution in trade centers that brings about high rent, but at the same time increases the productive power of the race as a whole. Ultimately, and in spite of the absorption of a large part of this saving by private takers of ground rent, the farmers of Manitoba get more of the material things of this world in exchange for their labor (as expressed in wheat) than go to the growers of cereals in Asia, for example, where the processes of distribution are simpler and the ground rents of cities are less.

The price of wheat at the farm in Manitoba is not decreased because of the high rents paid on land where the grain is marketed. The price is lessened, however, by land monopoly anywhere, that restricts productive power and thereby lessens the return to all labor. If the hatmaker has to use poor land he can make fewer hats, and the farmer will get fewer for his wheat. In so far as high rents result not from the usefulness of land but from restriction in the supply, the farmer like every other worker pays them indirectly.

A. C. PLEYDELL.

ONE OF THE TRIALS OF THE EDITOR.

We print many letters showing the high opinion in which the REVIEW is held. It is but fair to say that there is another side. Because the following letter is a type of the very few received during the last year we reprint it:

"Some years ago I notified you to cease sending the REVIEW to me. At that time you took the liberty of sending it at your own risk, and at a later date I received a bill to pay for a pamphlet I never ordered.

"I will now take the liberty of paying that bill when it suits my convenience, no matter how long a time may expire before I am ready to do so.

"I now notify you for the last time not to send the REVIEW to me.

"If any reach me I will throw them in the waste basket.

"I am not interested in the Ancient History of the Single Tax movement but rather in the Radical movements which live men and women of to-day are engaged in.

"If I want to teach the Single Tax Philosophy I can read what Henry George himself said on the subject, and not waste my time reading the hallucinations of a lot of his disciples, who undertake to explain his meaning, to make it square with their own shallow conceptions of what a great mind, a great deal to big for them to understand, meant—any one who can read English can understand Mr. George; his conceited commentators only show how little they know when they attempt to improve on his work."

We do not print the name of the sender of this, because the communication speaks for itself. It may be necessary to say that Mr. — has been a subscriber to the REVIEW from the beginning. He was accustomed to renew promptly. This he was in the habit of doing in person. It is true that about two years ago he said that owing to the loss of his position he would be unable to renew, and he may have accompanied this statement with a request to discontinue. But it has not been our habit to cut off any known Single Taxer for such a reason, unless positively commanded to do so, and it is certain that we told Mr. —, as we are in the habit of doing on such occasions, that we would continue sending him the REVIEW and he could pay for it when able. When about two years ago Mr. G. was given a political appointment by reason of his being a Single Taxer, we presumed to send him a regular notification of the expiration of his subscription. The above letter is the result.

Of course we might ask awkward questions. We might inquire why the gentleman was ever a subscriber to the REVIEW, renewing year after year, if he objects to the "shallow conceptions" of the "conceited commentators" who in the columns of the REVIEW have sought for a reconciliation of those differences of interpretation which some disciples of Mr. George, quite as distinguished as himself, perhaps quite as intelligent, and certainly more polite, have sought in the interests of more effective agitation. But to ask these questions of a man capable of writing such a letter would be a waste of time. We therefor pass him up.

As for the reference to the "radical movements which live men and women are engaged in," we remember the time when Mr. — was not so optimistic as to the outcome of such agitations. Of course, we can imagine how their importance becomes magnified when one obtains a job as a result of engaging in them. The Single Tax movement, too, may in such an environment and through job-holding spectacles, begin to look "ancient."

Mr. — says he will suit his convenience