Editor *Single Tax Review:*

The Single Tax is usually spoken of as a measure for the abolition of private ownership of land. This makes it seem like confiscation and inclines the average man to oppose it. But is there any such thing as private ownership of land?

A has a house which he lets for a fixed sum to B. B, then, is the tenant and A, to whom the fixed sum is paid, is the owner. Again, A has a vacant lot which he lets for a fixed sum to B. B is again the tenant and A, in this case, too, appears to be the owner.

But since the State exacts from A every year, in the form of a tax, a fixed sum for the use of the lot, under penalty of dispossession if he fails to pay it, the real owner of the lot is the State.

Now every square foot of land in every civilized country is held on just such terms. In other words, every so-called "owner" of land is merely a tenant of the State on a one-year lease.

If this view of the matter were made prominent, and kept so, the idea of confiscation would disappear and the Single Tax would appear to be what it really is, a measure to compel the State to deal impartially with its tenants.

DAVID L. THOMPSON.

PLAINFIELD, N. J.

Editor *Single Tax Review:*

Reading Henry George, Jr.'s interesting article in the Winter Number about Herbert Spencer and his Recantation reminds me that when the book of Spencer's appeared that contains his remarkable argument attempting to show that if the people of England were to resume their title to the land of England they ought first to compensate the landlords for the money that has been paid by the landholding class for poor law relief (some $2,500,000,000), and that this would make the people indebted to the landlords, "The Tribune" of this city published a review or notice of the book in which it quoted this argument at length as though it was considered perfectly valid. Thereupon I wrote to the Editor of the "Tribune" calling his attention to the fact that if the landholding classes of Great Britain had really paid this vast amount for the benefit of the landless it must be evident that it constituted only a very small fraction of the amount that the land owning classes had received from non-land owners in return for the privilege of living, and that the balance, *i. e.*, all that had been received by the land owners less the amount paid by them into the poor fund was by the same token due and payable to the people, and that if the figures for this were examined it would be found that the balance would be tremendous on the other side. The "Tribune" "did not find my communication available," but to my mind this view of the case shows more clearly than any other the utter childishness and puerility of this argument of Spencer's.

FRED J. MILLER.

EAST ORANGE, N. J,

Editor *Single Tax Review:*

Now that fearfully absorbing and intensely interesting mathematical puzzle "How old is Ann?" has been editorially and therefore definitely decided by the editors of the funny picture newspapers, perhaps some of your serious minded readers may think it worth while to scratch their heads over at least a few of the following conundrums which, if not so popular are at least as important to humanity and especially to the city dweller. To wit:

Why is it that rent are the first thing to go up and the last thing to come down?

Why is it that wages are the first thing to come down and the last thing to go up?

Why is it that when ice is cheap, coal is dear and vice versa?

Besides wages mention something that has been reduced by the trusts?

Name one thing (except the ocean and the atmosphere) that is not, at present, owned and controlled by these Christian men to whom God in his infinite wisdom has given control of these United States?

When Jesus said: "The poor ye have with ye always," did he mean. "The poor ye will always have with ye?"

Why are the building trades mechanics so anxious to strike in the Summer when wages are high, while in the Winter they would cheerfully shovel snow from their bosses' stoops to keep themselves and their families from starvation?

Why do the trades unions limit the number of American apprentices (their own children) who are anxious to learn a trade while they cheerfully admit any foreigner into their local assemblies who is willing to put up the initiation fee?

Why does Theodore Roosevelt insist on digging that canal by hook or by crook (especially crook) to facilitate the exchange of foreign commodities while both he and his party foster a prohibitive tariff to exclude them?

Why is it that the industrious builder and farmer who improves his property, gives employment to labor and benefits humanity, is taxed more than the fellow who is just holding his equally desirable location, for a rise. Why, Why?

Why is it that articles manufactured in this country are sold cheaper in Europe than they are here?

Why is it that the men who do useful things for their fellowmen get so little while the fellows who do nothing get so much of the good things of this earth?

If, as the socialists proclaim: "That the capitalists and machine owners are the despoilers of labor," why is it that according

Digitized by Google