

tice. All can unite to attain this end; and when it is attained, then if "interest" continues, we shall know that it is both natural and just; whilst if it disappears, we shall know that it was unnatural and unjust; that it was, in truth, but one of the fruits of privilege and monopoly, of that unjust social system which produced poverty in the midst of plenty, and which conferred advantages and privileges on the few, at the cost to the detriment of their "disinherited" fellow-citizens.

The exposition of value could be clearer. There is an implication at least that "value" is a "ratio" and cannot therefore be increased or decreased as a total. No single which has been so completely demolished by Henry George in the 'Science of Political Economy.' But the book is altogether a good contribution to the growing literature of the single tax.

The historian will some day trace out the development of an established right order of society from such writings as Mr. Berens' and others who have been inspired by the great genius of Henry George.

BENJAMIN DOBLIN.

## COMMUNICATIONS.

Chicago, Ill.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Regarding your request for opinions on the matter of a national organization and a national organ, I would say that I think the organ must precede the organization. It is easier to get people to subscribe for a paper than to contribute to the support of an organization concerning the doings of which they are not being kept regularly informed.

To make the paper attractive enough to draw subscribers for other reasons than merely a sense of duty, I would suggest that all long propaganda articles be barred from its columns. Very few read these articles, so that there is nothing gained by publishing them. Something on the order of the short and sharp comments on current events, by means of which the Appeal to Reason has succeeded in building up an enormous circulation, would be much better. The Appeal to Reason has achieved success because it can be appreciated and enjoyed by non-socialists as well as socialists, and consequently has attracted thousands of the former class to its support.

I think also that, if possible, the various struggling single tax papers, such as *Why*, the *Detroit Commonwealth*, etc., might be induced to consolidate. The combined subscription lists of all these papers may be enough to make one paper self-sustaining.

S. DANZIGER.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I have watched with a great deal of regret the many attempts that have been made in the past to establish and place upon a solid financial foundation a national organ that would be worthy of the cause, for the only question in connection with the building up of a strong organ has been the one of money. I do not consider that my opinion is of any value upon matters of this kind, but I have always felt from the time I was connected with the *Single Tax*, some sixteen years ago, that among the first essentials to the early success of our cause was the establishing of a national organ upon such a scale as would command the respect and attention of intelligent people throughout the world, besides being the means to keep *Single Taxers* informed of what was being done, and of the progress of the movement everywhere. This tends to keep up the enthusiasm, without which success is out of the question, and we have but to go over the past few years in the history of the movement to prove conclusively, I think, the truth of the above assertion. I can truthfully say that the only thing that has ever caused me to feel in the least discouraged in the early success—that is, say, in our lifetime—of the cause is their lack of interest or indifference of *Single Taxers* generally in a national organ. Nor can I understand why it should be so, especially when I see how enthusiastically the Socialists support, not one, but a half dozen or more of party papers, to say nothing of numerous other publications which are daily growing in circulation.

W. W. WILES.

Beaver, Pa., Feb. 5, 1903.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I notice in the last issue of the *Single Tax Review* that Booker Washington denies the published statement of Brother Bailey, that he is a *Single Taxer*. At this I am not surprised. Mr. Washington, in his lectures, reveals a shortsightedness of economic questions that is foreign to single taxers. He no doubt feels kindly toward the single tax movement, and perhaps has a notion that he is a *Single Taxer* himself, but I feel quite certain that he does not realize the full import of the George philosophy. I have a friend quite intelligent and well read who tells me that he believes in the single tax philosophy, not because he understands it himself, but because he believes in the men who are single taxers. Might not this be Mr. Washington's dilemma? And thoughtlessly he pronounces himself a single taxer.

Yours fraternally,

CHARLES R. ECKERT.