

thus pass away, but continues to increase for all time as population grows; the one value is capable of diminution by inventions, while no possible invention has ever reduced the other.

But the climax to all this investigation was clear and overwhelming when I saw the relationships that must result in society in dealing with these values. We have allowed individuals to appropriate as their private property the value which the community causes to the land. Consequently one portion of society has grown to immense fortune simply by placing industry under a greater and greater tribute. The two extremes of society have grown further and further apart and the gulf is continually widening. Let this continue and the result on society must be disastrous. But on the other hand, when two men produce utilities and then exchange their products, there are all the indications of equity and beneficence. It is to the existence of this exchange of product for product that all the blessings of civilization are due. Let any one once get a proper apprehension of the difference of these two relationships and the question of taxation can for him have but one solution. Where should the taxes be placed? Should it be so as to harass and hinder the production or exchange of those products on which man depends for his existence and his comfort, or should they be placed so as to prevent that relationship, which begets the lord and the serf, which inevitably divides humanity into producers enriching and extortionists impoverishing?

This gave me a new vision of political economy and led me to enlist in the crusade for the emancipation of humanity.

W. A. DOUGLAS.

COMMUNICATIONS.

Reading, Pa.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

My experience indicates that it would be a great benefit to the Single Tax cause if prominent Single Tax writers would more frequently present and emphasize the real conservatism of the proposed remedy in such a way as to appeal to reasonable conservatives who are now generally repelled by the air of radicalism that has naturally but unfortunately gathered around it. It is radical in the sense that it is fundamental, not superficial; but it is commonly put in the same class with Anarchism and Socialism, and is greatly discredited by the association. If its conservatism be shown by impressing its real relation to these opposite extremes of radicalism, it will more easily attract the favorable consideration of men of standing who otherwise shy at the mention of it.

W. G. STEWART.

College Hill, Ohio.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Many Single Taxers are in the habit of

using an expression which I think is an unfortunate kink in their terminology. It is the phrase, "Wealth produced by the community as a whole."

When used to designate the sum of individual productions it is not objectionable, but this is not the meaning which Single Taxers attach to it. "Give to the individual what he produces and to the community what it produces," is an expression frequently heard, which shows that those who use it have in mind a kind or form of wealth which is over and above and distinct from that produced by individuals.

This is unscientific and a weakness. It is inconsistent with the Single Tax premise that wealth is produced by labor; for the reason that if each individual worker is given or retains the produce of his or her labor *nothing remains*.

Looked at in this way the wealth produced by the community as a whole is seen to be a myth.

What Single Taxers propose is that the community take economic rent, but there is no need to pretend that individuals will not be called on to part with a portion of the wealth produced by their labor. True, it will be that part which measures the natural advantage under which they work, but this does not change the facts, and for the good of the cause I think the use of the aforesaid expression should be discontinued.

JAMES BANN.

Los Angeles, Cal.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

As to the proposed Single Tax Conference at Fairhope, Ala., next February, I am inclined to regard it favorably. It would be impossible for many Single Taxers of California to attend it. But that is no reason why hundreds of others, who live nearer Fairhope than we do, should not be there, and get up a rousing revival that would echo around the world.

RALPH HOYT.

Toronto, Canada.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Fairhope is so far from Canada that I fear we could not send a special representative. Mrs. Graham intends taking up her permanent residence in the Single Tax Mecca shortly and Mr. Robert Tyson talks of paying a visit to Cuba. There is a possibility that both could be present at the proposed gathering. Railway fares are so high and Single Taxers are so busy that it would be well to know that a sufficient number could attend before declaring the gathering a general conference.

A. W. ROEBUCK.

Mt. Pleasant, Tenn.

Editor *Single Tax Review* :

Regarding a Single Tax conference, while a better attended and more widely repre-