What "The Single Tax Review" Stands For

AND is a free gift of nature, like air, like sunshine. Men ought not to be compelled to pay other men for its use. The right to its use is, if you please, a natural right, because arising out of the nature of man, or if you do not like the term, an equal right, equal in that it should be shared alike. This is no new discovery, for it is lamely and imperfectly recognized by primitive man (in the rude forms of early land communism) and lamely and imperfectly by all civilized communities (in laws of "eminent domain" and similar powers exercised by the State over land). All points of view include more or less dimly this conception of the peculiar nature of land as the inheritance of the human race, and not a proper subject for barter and sale.

The principle having been stated, we come now to the method, the Single Tax, the taking of the annual rent of land-what it is worth each year for use-by governmental agency, and the payment out of this fund for those functions which are supported and carried on in common-maintenance of highways, police and fire protection, public lighting, schools, etc. Now if the value of land were like other values this would not be a good method for the end in view. That is, if a man could take a plot of land as he takes a piece of wood, and fashioning it for use as a commodity give it a value by his labor, there would be no special reason for taxing it at a higher rate than other things, or singling it out from other taxable objects. But land, without the effort of the individual, grows in value with the community's growth, and by what the community does in the way of public improvements. This value of land is a value of community advantage, and the price asked for a piece of land by the owner is the price of community advantage. This advantage may be an excess of production over other and poorer land determined by natural fertility (farm land) or nearness to market or more populous avenues for shopping, or proximity to financial mart, shipping or railroad point (business centers), or because of superior fashionable attractiveness (residential centers). But all these advantages are social, communitymade, not a product of labor, and in the price asked for its sale or use, a manifestation of community-made value. Now in a sense the value of everything may be ascribed to the presence of a community, with an important difference. Land differs in this, that neither in itself nor in its value is it the product of labor, for labor cannot produce more land in answer to demand, but can produce more houses and food and clothing, whence it arises that these things cost less where population is great or increasing. and land is the only thing that costs more.

To tax this land at its true value is to equalize all people-made advantages (which in their manifestation as value attach only to land), and thus secure to every man that equal right to land which has been contended for at the outset of this definition.—JOSEPH DANA MILLER. Condensed from SINGLE TAX YEAR BOOK.

SINGLE TAX REVIEW

An International Bi-Monthly Magazine of Single Tax Progress

Edited and Published by JOSEPH DANA MILLER, at 150 Nassau Street, New York

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:—In the United States, Canada and Mexico, \$1.00 per year. Payable in advance.

Entered as Second-class Matter Oct. 2, 1913, at the Post Office, New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

JULY-AUGUST, 1919

Vol. XIX

No. 4. Whole No. 95

INDEX TO CONTENTS

CURRENT COMMENT	99
EDITORIALS	100
FIRST ANNUAL CONVENTION OF THE SINGLE TAX PARTY	110
FROM THE SECRETARY OF THE MASSACHUSETTS SINGLE TAX PARTY	112
FROM THE MAINE STATE CHAIRMAN SINGLE TAX PARTY	112
NEWS FROM MANY STATES	113
DEMANDS OF SOLDIERS AND SAILORS	115
GREAT BRITAIN'S LAND REVOLUTION	116
SINGLE TAXERS ORGANIZE IN LOS ANGELES	119
MEXICO	120
THE PARTY OF THE ONE BIG TAX Editorial Christian	121
BOOK NOTICES—"THE LAND AND THE SOLDIER" by	122
CORRESPONDENCE	123
NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS	126
	2222-092

PUBLISHER'S NOTES

I will interest our readers to know that during the month of July, up to the 25th inst. we received 81 new subscriptions, making 283 since the first of the year. This increase in new subscriptions has been progressive, month by month.

It should now be a matter of earnest consideration with those who make the continued publication of the Review possible as to whether the time has not arrived to make it a monthly.

It should be said that 40 subscriptions were collected by the personal efforts of one individual, Bernard Hartley, of San Francisco, California. This is real work for the cause, and should be an incentive to others. Who will make it another 40?

Help the Review by renewing your subscription promptly.

