

of the word property here and there as it appears the word monopoly, and the chapter becomes coherent and consistent, otherwise it makes for confusion. In place of long quotations, which space forbids, let me invite every reader of the REVIEW to re-read "Progress and Poverty," first saying to his prejudices: "Get thee behind me Satan!" Let him also read with profit Thomas Paine's "Agrarian Justice."

What do we mean when we say that our intention is not to tax land, but only to tax land value? Is it not because of a feeling that the private possession of land, which has no economic value, does not contravene the law of equal freedom? Will there not be, under the Single Tax, what we now call "no rent" land, and if so what harm would follow the private ownership of a thousand such acres until the inception of a rental value, and if rent is paid thereafter as it accrues, is not the situation just as harmless as before? Is not this argument conclusive that private ownership of land, *per se*, is not an evil, but that the evil arises from the monopolization of rent, and is not monopolized rent the exact measure of the dominion over the services of others that inheres in land monopoly? "No rent" land—no land monopoly; private appropriation of rent—land monopoly: common property in rent—the Single Tax. Let the individual render to society a tribute equivalent to advantages socially conferred, and society in turn render to the individual benefits proportionate to the value of his individual contribution to the commonwealth. This is justice.

In closing permit me to remark that if the above does not vindicate my position then the situation is beyond the pale of logic. Seriously speaking, Brother Miller and fellow Single Taxers, it is my firm belief that the future of the cause hinges upon the soundness of our position in regard to this point. Let us, therefore, without prejudice, make the best possible use of the opportunity so generously afforded by the REVIEW, and of that faculty of which Jefferson said, it is the "only oracle that Heaven has vouchsafed to man—his reason: remembering we are not responsible for the rightness of its decisions, but only for their uprightness."

Hyde Park, Mass.

ROBT. B. MARTIN.



From LEONARD TUTTLE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

In the discussion going on in your columns in regard to the question of private property in land, it seems to me that more emphasis should be placed upon the difference between private property in land and private possession of land. The moral object of the Single Tax is to destroy private property and establish common rights in land. This is entirely consistent with private possession, which simply means private and undisturbed occupancy. A tenant leasing land from a landlord, for a year or a hundred years, has private possession during the term of the lease, but not ownership. The landlord still has the ownership while the tenant is in possession, for which he has to pay the landlord.

The whole earth may be held in private possession while common rights to the earth are established and acknowledged in full. To accomplish this it is only necessary that those who hold possession shall pay to the owners—the whole people—the ground rent, which is the value of such possession. The tenant now pays the ground rent to the landlord; the Single Tax would take it in taxation for public use. The landlord now gets the rent because he owns the

land; the Single Tax, by taking rent for public use, would destroy private ownership, and substitute ownership by the whole people.

If land is rightfully the subject of private property, then the value of land is also rightfully the subject of private property. The value of a thing goes with the ownership of that thing. We are all familiar with the argument that the value of land is different from other values in that it is created by the pressure of population, which justifies its appropriation for public use. But all values are created in the same way. Tables, chairs, houses, etc., would have no value but for the presence of population. They would be useful to the solitary owner, but he could not exchange or sell them if there were no people within a thousand miles of him. Antique furniture that may have had little value 100 years ago, is very valuable to-day because of an increased popular demand for it. It may be less useful now because of age and frailty, but it is more valuable, that is, it exchanges or sells for more. Single Taxers would not think of taking the value of antique furniture in taxation, although that value is clearly caused by the demands of the community.

The fact is, there is no moral justification for the Single Tax, save upon the plea of common rights to land. If the land is rightfully private property, as some Boston Single Taxers assert, land values should bear no greater burden of taxation than other kinds of private property, houses, ships, furniture, etc. It would be manifestly unfair to single out one species of private property to bear the whole burden of government expense, while letting all other kinds of private property escape.

We will gain nothing by trying to minimize our position. Henry George did not hesitate to denounce private property in land with all the power at his command. Opponents and friends of the Single Tax will accept Henry George's interpretation as against that of any of his disciples. We should not soften our doctrine in the hope of winning the favor of the landlords or plutocrats whose favor we cannot win. We cannot serve God and Mammon. The success of our cause lies in an appeal to the landless masses, and not to their despoilers. We cannot win the favor of Heaven while smiling on the devil. Like William Lloyd Garrison, let us be "as harsh as justice, and as uncompromising as truth." Appeals to the slave owners were futile, and so will appeals to the landlord and plutocratic class. Of course, we have in our ranks a few men who are landlords and monopolists, but they have been attracted by the logic and justice of the extreme doctrine. We cannot hope to win over any large body of men who live by privilege, as most men are governed by a desire for selfish advantage with very little regard for the injury inflicted on others. The field for our work is among those who are impoverished by present conditions, appealing both to their selfishness and their sense of justice. The growth, vigor and enthusiasm of the socialistic propaganda which is so rapidly creating a socialistic sentiment throughout the country, testifies to the value of an attitude that is honest, unswerving and uncompromising.

LEONARD TUTTLE.



From MR. C. J. BUELL.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I have carefully read the articles on Land Ownership, and feel like adding a word.

I. The right to possess and use land is a natural, inherent right, belonging to each individual regardless of any act of government or society.