

in order that a few lucky pioneers might seize it and charge rental for its use from those who sought access to it. Mr. Mondell, a conservative, had the clearness of perception and the integrity of purpose to stand for equality of opportunity to the health-giving waters of this famous spring."

Two Progressive Professors of Political Economy

THE REVIEW has had its flings at the professors of political economy, and we think they deserved all that was said of them. But we are happy at all times to acknowledge any utterance which seems to redeem them.

Here are a few such quotations which we are glad to note. Prof. H. J. Davenport says in his "Economics of Enterprise," page 527: "The Single Taxer is thus fundamentally right in his declaration that public revenues should be derived so far as is possible from the social estate—from incomes not due to individual effort in the production of social service. Any system of taxation, no matter how scientific, is yet bad which has not first exhausted these sources before taxing any other."

Again he says on page 527 of the same book: "The difficulty is, then, not merely that fifteen billion dollars worth of agricultural land has become private property, on which the millions of disinherited must pay rent and by virtue of which they become 'trespassers in the land of their birth,' not merely, also, that untold millions of dollars in urban sites are now the source of landlord income; not merely that the coal lands belong to the coal barons, the copper to the senators, and the gold and silver mines to the other rich, the water powers to the syndicates; not merely that all sorts of franchises have fallen into private ownership, appropriating gains that should be social, and at the same time imposing monopolistic restrictions of product and exactions of tribute, but also that our tax system is directly adapted to aggravate all of these evils."

Prof. Thomas Nixon Carver, in his "Principles of Political Economy" (page 583) begins the outline of "A Liberalist's programme for the complete abolition of poverty" with

A—For the distribution of unearned wealth:

1. By increased taxation of land values.
2. By a graduated inheritance tax.
3. By control of monopoly prices.

We are glad to single out Professors Davenport and Carver for special commendation. Their treatment of the economic problems may leave something to be desired, but few will read their pages without enlightenment. They are leaders of progressive thought among professional economists; there will be others, and their influence upon the speculations of their fellow teachers will be more and more marked as time goes on.

Certain Disadvantages in Being Too Superior

A RECENT issue of the *Freeman*, of this city, contained an article entitled "The Formula of the Single Tax." It is in nearly all respects admirable. But it has one defect. That defect is the superior, almost supercilious air which characterizes almost all the articles in this otherwise ably edited periodical.

Those who will not see what seems so very obvious to the editors themselves are outside the pale, and are to be dismissed with a pleasant—though not over-pleasant—farewell. They are not even to be reasoned with. The *Freeman's* attitude is that of the artist, Whistler, when he said: "I do not argue with you—I tell you things." That may be a justifiable attitude toward certain individuals—toward the great world itself, it is a tragic-comic pose as regrettable as the state of ignorance regarding economic questions in which the great mass of the people find themselves. And it gets us nowhere.

In a letter to the *Freeman*, Mrs. Grace Donaldson, a member of the Single Tax Party, of New York, neatly punctures the absurdity of this pose in the following paragraphs:

EDITOR OF THE FREEMAN:

Your article, "The Formula of the Single Tax" opens, by its third sentence, with an acknowledgment of the need of Single Tax propaganda (Funk and Wagnall—education). This sentence closes with "—so few seem to know what the Single Tax is." Then you end the article with this, "Why then, even if propaganda were admissible or were anything but sheer absurdity, should one who has anything better to do, take interest in it." If, by your own admission, so few seem to know it, could one have anything better to do than to spread its knowledge?

We cannot dodge this duty by merely sticking the label "Formula" on the Single Tax and then going merrily on our way. The fact that 2 times 2 equalled 4, was of no use in the world until enough people knew it to put it to work. Until enough people know the formula of the Single Tax to put it to work, few can have anything better to do than to spread its knowledge. Anything less than propaganda (which involves WORK) is mere "words, words, words, signifying nothing." GRACE D. DONALDSON.

"A TAX on rent would affect rent only; it would fall wholly on landlords, and could not be shifted. The landlord could not raise his rent."—RICARDO, "Principles of Political Economy and Taxation," Chap. X, Sec. 62.

TAXES on sites check the practice of holding valuable sites unused or inadequately used and therefore tend to lower the prices of sites, thus offering greater opportunities to users. Hence they encourage building operations and improvements and are not passed on to the consumers in the shape of higher rents and prices. Economic authorities support the contention that taxes on site values or site rents cannot be shifted.