

CONFIRMS THOROLD ROGERS.

EDITOR OF SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Houston S. Chamberlain in his brilliant work, "The Foundations of the Nineteenth Century," lately published by John Lane, London and New York, shows the workman of the thirteenth, fourteenth and fifteenth centuries was better off than today, that "the agriculturist over nearly the whole of Europe was a freer man, with a more assured existence, than he is today; copyhold was the rule, so that England, for example—today a seat of landlordism—was even in the fifteenth century almost entirely in the hands of hundreds of thousands of farmers who were not only legal owners of their land, but possessed in addition far-reaching free rights to common pastures and woodlands. Since then, all these farmers have been robbed, simply robbed, of their property. Any means of achieving this was good enough. If war did not afford an opportunity for driving them away, existing laws were falsified and new laws were issued by those in authority, to confiscate the estates of the small holders in favor of the great. But not only the farmers, the small landlords had also to be destroyed: that was achieved by a roundabout method: they were ruined by the competition of the greater landlords, and then their estates were bought up."

See detailed account in vol. ii., p. 354. The whole book is most interesting and nearly every page has some arresting thought and eloquent passage, and the number of old-fashioned generally accepted theories or beliefs he shows to be false and untenable are legion.—A. K. VENNING. LOS ANGELES, CAL.

THOSE who eat without perspiration staining their bodies are always ready to cry "confiscation" and "disaster" when the workers and sweaters propose any measure to secure more of the results of toil to the toilers.

The Jeffersonian, of Los Angeles, Cal., has an article on the Single Tax by G. W. Slocomb.

ANOTHER CORRESPONDENT TAKES ISSUE WITH MR. WHITE.

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Mr. George White thinks high city rents do not depend upon "difference of potentiality" of sites.* There seems to be but one law of rent. Owners of city sites reap all the benefits of cooperation in production and distribution. A natural advantage leads people to cooperate on a certain site, and the advantages of cooperation are added to the original advantage. The competition of vacant sites, thrown upon the market by a land value tax, might not reduce the rent in cities as it would in rural districts, but other factors would reduce city rents. City laborers would go to the country where they could secure land at small rent or no rent. This would raise wages in the city, which must be at the expense of rent. More buyers in the country, with higher purchasing power, must stimulate distribution at rural points, also at the expense of city trade. Parcels post will stimulate mail order business, which requires less expensive sites. The oldest mail order house in Chicago recently left their Michigan Avenue site for a much cheaper site on the North Branch, before used chiefly for factories. But the site is just as good for getting mail and filling orders. We will learn that freedom of trade, and freedom to use the best methods of production and exchange, will equalize site values; raising the rent line, thereby raising wages and interest at the expense of site rent. While rent cannot enter into price, under any given condition, the lowering of rent, via Single Tax, must lower prices, as the following will prove:

Wheat is worth \$1 per bushel, raised	
on 30 bushel land.....	\$30.00
If raised on 25 bushel land.....	25.00
On 20 bushel land.....	20.00

The price is fixed by the cost on 20 bushel land. Now suppose the 25 bushel land is all held out of use, but is set free by the Single Tax and produces wheat; the cost of wheat is reduced 20 per cent. or to 80 cents, and the rent on the 30

*Mr. White did not say that.—Editor SINGLE TAX REVIEW.