

with Single Tax tendencies, is about the most stupid procedure imaginable; no wonder we lay dormant for forty years. Let our slogan be "Party Action" and there is no doubt as to the result. Don't tickle the Monopolist with a feather; hit Monopoly with a Political Club. Youngstown, Ohio. ARNOLD CAMM.

FROM A VALUED CORRESPONDENT

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Permit me, please, to express my very high appreciation of your editorial, in the May-June number of the SINGLE TAX REVIEW, entitled, "The Single Tax More than a Fiscal Reform." That is right to the point—spiritual morality as the basis of economic reform! It is much the finest word along that line that I have seen in recent years!

In my own addresses, while I announce my topic, "Tax Reform," I lay down the proposition that right is right and wrong is wrong; and that each of us is responsible in conscience for our attitude toward right and wrong.

I put it in this fashion: Land is the common possession of all; those who use it should pay rent for the privilege to the community; for private individuals to absorb the rent of the land is absolutely wrong; therefore, it should cease. That proposition is fundamental to Land Reform; in other words the whole question is a matter of right and wrong. It is not any question of the way the reform affects me, personally—favorably or unfavorably; it is, simply, what is right? As a clergyman, of course, I must take that point of view; and, further, as an economist, I know that whatever is right, is, in the long run, for the good of all concerned.

I have been considering for some time, getting out another of my little cards, similar to the one entitled, "Tax Reform," putting the issue squarely upon the religio-moral foundation; and shall call it "Land Reform." Following is the purposed outline:

Land, created by God alone, is His gift to His children; it is the common possession and necessity of all.

But land cannot be used, advantageously, for the support and benefit of the members of the community upon the communistic principle; therefore, it is parcelled out to private individuals, for each individual to employ his labor and capital upon to the best advantage. For this privilege, however, to use the common property, the individual should pay rent to the common owner, the community. As, however, no individual can be expected to exert his labor and capital upon common land unless secure in his tenure of the land, the community issues fee simple deeds as evidence of permanency of tenure and negotiability of that tenure, and publicly records such deeds. But this permanency of tenure and negotiability of that tenure does not carry with it legitimate right to privately collect the rent of the land; as the individual would have such right did he absolutely own the land, as he owns his labor-values and his capital.

Land Reform, upon the above basis, is a matter of right, not of custom or expediency.

I like what you wrote in reply to W. D. Albright. "Nationalization" would be a reversion to a primitive condition of this question; just as barter trade would be a similar reversion. As a matter of fact, land could not be leased out to the highest bidder without great likelihood of robbing the lease-holder of some of his labor-and-capital-values; to say nothing of what you point out, "spite-bidding," etc. In many an instance, to dispossess a lease-holder to the highest bidder, would entail very serious loss. For example, suppose a breeder of live stock, either in the Valley of Virginia, or the Blue Grass region of Kentucky (regions concerning which I know much, personally) were forced to give up his Blue Grass farm, under the bidding system: it might ruin the strain of livestock that could best be developed in such a region. That would be a loss to the breeder and the community as well. No; just assess the holder of the permanency of tenure of that particular land for its economic rent; then the community would get its due and the holder of the land would not be despoiled. It is, of course, quite conceivable that a rival breeder would do just that thing—spite-bid—in order to get rid of his rival and his valuable strain. It would commonly happen—just plain human nature to do it! Site-value taxation

will put matters upon a perfectly equitable basis for all concerned; just as an honest currency and freedom of trade will make unnecessary a resort to the primitive simplicity of barter.

I know of a bit of a store, just a "cranny in the wall," practically—nearly opposite the Bank of England, where the owner of the lease must do a tremendous business; but I have no doubt that he has taken care to secure his business by a safe leasehold. Were he compelled to run the risk of having to give it up each year, under a rental-bid system, it would knock the enterprise all out of him, probably. So, with a farm, a man brings up his children in a locality dear to generations. Permanency, continuity, generation upon generation, are great terms; and vital to the best and highest human development. "Nationalization" would simply "spill the beans," all around!
Middleborough, Mass. REV. A. W. LITTLEFIELD.

GENERAL GOOD THE OBJECT OF LEGISLATION

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

While browsing around the Archeological Building at Ohio State University recently, I saw reposing there the door-cap of the main entrance to the original Ohio Statehouse which was at Chillicothe, O. On it was engraved these words: "General good, the object of legislation, perfected by a knowledge of man's wants and nature's abounding means, applied by establishing principles opposed to monopoly." In view of our present state of affairs it seems to me we must never have looked at these words again after some wise forefathers wrote and engraved them and placed them there as the rule and guide of our actions. We today do not seem to see or feel the seriousness of our taxing methods in their financial or ethical phases.

Columbus, Ohio.

J. H. KAUFFMAN.

LIKES OUR CRITICISM OF GOMPERS

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

I desire to express my congratulations for the neat and clever work you performed in your treatment of Samuel Gompers. No man has done a neater job than that. You did for Mr. Gompers what Henry George did for Herbert Spencer. Had your article appeared 25 years ago nearly every daily paper in America would have mentioned it. But we have somehow lost our interest in great controversies.
Kansas City, Mo. W. J. FLACY.

LIKES THE REVIEW BEST WHEN IT GETS COMBATIVE

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

Although I think I have expressed the conviction before, it may not be amiss to reassure you as to the merit of the REVIEW as a stimulant. Its appearance seems to synchronize with our needs and prompts us to get up and be on the job when we are troubled with the Devil's inquiry, "What's the use?"

I think the REVIEW pleases me best when it gets combative, because although I am not sanguinary enough to cheer for a war, I do think we ought to "start something" which might put the discussion in the "limelight", thereby providing an audience. Then, if we could "keep the law, in calmness made, and see what we foresaw" perhaps the audience would side with us.

Philadelphia, Pa.

J. B. CHAMBERLAIN.

OUR APPEAL MUST BE MADE TO THE MORAL NATURE OF MEN

EDITOR SINGLE TAX REVIEW:

In response to your circular I sent you my subscription to the REVIEW. You may be interested to know that I got my full dollar's worth and more out of the first copy to reach me—the May-June number. I refer to your article "The Single Tax more than a Fiscal Reform." I doubt if anyone was ever brought into the Single Tax movement through the cold logic of its fiscal adaptability. It's a great argument, of course, and as a "clincher" has no equal, but the prospective convert must first have been attracted to the Single Tax through its moral appeal.

You are dead right in stressing this point. People will try anything,