therefore the tax and the selling value are equal. (Very small fractions are avoided in all above calculations).

But let us go even farther and levy a tax of 200%. The public is to get 200% and the owner 5% on the same sum. So we divide $1000, the gross rent, by 205, which gives us 4.878, and this is one per cent. of the value of the land—one hundred per cent. being 487.80. The tax of 200% on this amount is 975.60 and 5% going to owner is 24.39. The two amounts of course equal the gross rent, 1000.

When it is so easy to prove that a tax of even 200% levied on the value of land would still leave land a selling value equal to nearly one half the annual rent, is it not about time to adjourn the claim that the Single Tax would result in public or common ownership?

Attention has been called to the fact that at a 5% interest rate a tax of 5% on the true value of land will divide gross rent equally between land holders and the public.

It may be worth while to note further that a tax of 10% will give two-thirds of rent to the public, and one-third to land holders. A 15% tax gives three-quarters to the public and one-quarter to owner. A 20% tax gives four-fifths to the public and one-fifth to owner, while a tax of 35% gives seven-eights to the public and one-eight to owner, and a tax of 75% gives but one-sixteenth to owner.

One important point to be noted is that up to and including the 100% rate, there is enough value in land to enable the public to recover its revenues by sale of the property if the owner becomes and remains delinquent.

This latter matter is "practically" vital, and I believe is not provided for by any of the land nationalization schemes, nor yet by any other plan save by a tax laid upon the "selling" value of land. And herein we see again the working of a perfect law.

JOHN Z. WHITE.

THE SINGLE TAX AND ITS APPLICATION.

(*For the Review*).

(This article by William Ryan was received several months ago, but because of the pressure of other matter it has been deferred. It seems to embody in itself a reply to Mr. John Z. White's article, and, for that reason, is printed in this issue along with his.) —Editor *Single Tax Review*.

There is a good deal of talk these days about changing the name of the Single Tax movement to "Taxation of Land Values." While many of us have realized the failure of the words "single tax" to convey all that the Single Tax philosophy implies, still we have been unable to find words which will take their place, explain its philosophy and at this late date be psychological enough to be substituted for the words "single tax"; words which have a very distinct meaning to thousands.

The words "taxation of land values" may mean much to the inhabitant of Great Britain, because land values there are not taxed locally, and the national tax is light and based on an ancient valuation. But in America land values are already taxed everywhere under the general property tax. To replace the well-known name "Single Tax" by "taxation of land values" would merely bring confusion.

I have always been sceptical about the current explanations of the fiscal side of the Single Tax, realizing that the selling value of land is nothing more than a purchase price for the privilege of collecting that part of the annual or economic rent which is not taken by taxation.

I have realized that when the time comes to put Single Tax in operation, we will have trouble unless we adopt the plan of taking the annual rent, or if expediency requires it, progressively to take a greater and greater part of rent. But as a rule Single Taxers pay little heed to this phase of the subject and usually talk glibly about taxing land values.

At a public meeting in Philadelphia a few years ago I asked John Z. White how he would go about putting the Single Tax into operation; and his reply was that he would continue to increase the tax on land values until we took 100% of the selling value. So far as I have been able to ascertain, this typifies the idea of many Single Taxers as to the practical method of collecting the Single Tax.

The following figures are theoretically correct from the standpoint of a progressive increase in the tax rate upon the selling value of land, assuming of course the correctness of the theory that the selling value of land is the net rent of land capitalized at the current rate of interest.

Assume that we begin with the Selling Value of $20,000 which returns 5 %and is not taxed and progressively increase:

0	0	1000	1000	20,000.
½	100	1000	900	18,000.
1	180	1000	820	16,400.
1½	246	1000	754	15,080.
2	301.60	1000	698.40	13,968.
2½	349.20	1000	650.80	13,016.
3	390.48	1000	609.52	12,190.40
3½	426.66	1000	573.34	11,466.80
4	458.67	1000	541.33	10,826.60
4½	487.20	1000	512.80	10,246.00
5	512.30	1000	486.70	9,734.00
6	584.04	1000	415.96	8,319.20
7	582.34	1000	417.66	8,353.20
8	668.25	1000	331.75	6,635.00
9	597.15	1000	402.85	8,057.00
10	805.70	1000	194.30	3,886.00
11	427.46	1000	572.54	11,450.80
12	1,374.09	1000	net loss 374.09	0.

In each instance the tax rate is calculated on the previous year's valuation.

Some peculiar results will be noticed after a tax rate of six per cent. (6%) is reached. 7% will produce less tax on the previous year's valuation than will 6%, and consequently will raise the selling value (assuming of course that the net return is capitalized at 5%). 8% will greatly increase the tax over 6% but 9% will give only a trifle more taxes than will 6%, and will raise the selling value nearly to what it was when the tax was 6%. On the other hand, 10%will take more than one-quarter of the gross rental and reduce the selling value nearly one-half, but 11% will take only one-half as much as 10% and will raise the value higher than when the tax was only 4%; and at 12%, on a selling value capitalized at 5% when the taxes are 11%, it will raise the tax to almost $400 more than the gross rent, which would then wipe out the selling value entirely.

There is an important fallacy in this reasoning, and that is, that no one would be fool enough to purchase land on a basis of capitalization at the current rate of interest, when he knows that the policy of the government is to progressively increase the tax until it eventually takes all of the net rent upon which any selling value might be capitalized. But the importance of this matter lies in the fact that when this fallacy is discovered it leaves no scientific basis upon which the Single Tax can be imposed.

If when it is known that the Single Tax is to be applied and land values immediately being to disapoear, the Single Taxer will be left with nothing but the rent of land to tax. But this is just what Henry George proposed, and the sooner Single Taxers revise their theories of the method by which the Single Tax is to be imposed, the sooner will they come to an understanding of the problem before them.

The question of assessing or appraising or determining the annual rent of land will not be an easy matter and is worthy of the most serious consideration of the ablest minds in the Single Tax movement.

Our friends in England have missed a grand opportunity to start with correct principles. As most of the land there is leased on ground rents it would be quite easy for them to impose a tax upon the rent, but instead they prefer to capitalize the rent and levy the tax upon this capital value. I fear the ultimate effect will be to cease increasing the tax on land values when they have reached the point we have attained inAmerica; but if not, and they go on, they will meet the difficulties pointed out above.

William Ryan.

The Women's Henry George League of this city will hold Monday afternoon readings and discussions from three to five o'clock at the Women's Trade Union League Building, 43 East 22nd Street.
