

Since the above was written a friend has sent me an apropos quotation from a book by the British economist, Alfred Marshall, as follows: "But it is easier to interpret the classical doctrine that (rent does not enter into the cost of production) in a sense in which it is not true, and to scoff at it, than in the sense in which it was intended and is true. It seems best, therefore, to avoid the phrase."

Boston, Mass.

JOHN S. CODMAN.

#### WANTED—MORE EXACT INFORMATION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

"The Dilemma of Communists" in the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM is a timely antidote for Marxian narcotics now so freely distributed in many places. It leads me to suggest that you might fill a long-felt want by tabulating some statistics concerning the condition of labor in Russia.

Quite a number of publications of communistic origin have reached my desk. They are devoted pretty much to depicting Russia as a militious nation of mirth and song. Red armies and athletic girls in shorts, all ablaze with joy and patriotism, swarming about the Kremlin.

Collective farms, factories, power plants and other achievemants illustrated in approved Standard Oil and General Motors fashion. Comely nomads and factory girls surrounding Stalin, like Father Divine at Krum Elbow.

It strikes me these pictures and fulsome praise are not so much to the point in proving the success of communism or failure of "capitalism." One might gather up any amount of such pictures in the illustrated papers and magazines of all "capitalist" countries.

What seems to me so strangely lacking in this Russian propaganda, is data concerning the compensation meted out to these proletariats for the work they do. Following Chodorov's contribution, will you be kind enough to publish some information regarding wages and modes of living in this Russian Eldorado.

Digging the Volga Canal ranks as a great achievement. Can you tell us the class of labor that performed the work and wages received? Do they observe the Marxian rule: "From each according to his ability, to each according to his needs?"

There is no desire on my part of be captious, but a suspicion that the literature coming to my desk does not show more than one side of the shield. Communism has been in full swing in Russia for twenty years with its planned economy. Wages should be far in advance of what they are in capitalist countries, but are they? Please tell us.

Seattle, Washington.

OLIVER T. ERICKSON.

#### SOME THOUGHTS ON CONCENTRATION ON A SINGLE STATE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

An excellent circular letter has been received from the Henry George Constitutional "Committee On Organization And Action." The letter "talks turkey" and, in the parlance of the proletariat, it puts every Single Taxer "on the spot." The letter concludes by requesting each recipient to answer one way or another—"count me in or count me out."

Perhaps some of we Single Taxers are too diffident about getting into action—too lackadaisical about centralization of time, energy, finances and location, but there may be some who yet believe that the most logical plan for action has not been advanced. With due respect for the Committee's selection of Michigan as the scene of action, we arise to ask what determined this selection? Does this state offer the line of least resistance? Is it the most representative state?

Our curiosity leads us to learn that the following five States and District present the following situation as of the last federal survey:

State	Urban Pop.	Rural Pop.	Farm and Bldgs. values
District of Columbia.....	100%	0.0%	\$ 0,000,000,
Rhode Island .....	92.4	7.6	34,508,000

Massachusetts .....	90.2	9.8	773,663,000
Michigan .....	68.2	31.8	341,000,000
North Dakota.....	16.6	83.4	951,000,000

U. S. Totals.....	56.2	43.8	\$47,879,838,000
-------------------	------	------	------------------

In selecting a state for taxational action, we believe that the prime question is, shall the state be dominantly urban or rural? In other words, which are more vulnerable to taxation talks and legislative action, farmers or flat dwellers? Which class is the immediate victim of ground-rent exactions?

The next question is which state presents the least number of constitutional obstructions to the inauguration, or wider application, of site-value taxation? Personally, I do not know the constitutional limitations set up in any of the five foregoing localities except those of Massachusetts. In the Bay State an old Act of the legislature provides that a "betterment tax" may be levied upon land values which result from public service—an old Act which has been on the books since the early days when the first publicly-constructed turnpike was financed by assessing the value of land resulting from this public service. This Act has passed the Supreme Court's scrutiny as to its constitutionality, and long has been in use in a desultory, incomplete and unpublicized manner. Our Constitution also follows the national custom of requiring the taxing of personal property except in certain exemptions.

The Massachusetts picture thus is shown to be one where half the usual tax battle may be avoided by authority of the "betterment tax" statute. The personal-property-tax obstacle may be coped with by a non-discriminatory reduction in personal-property valuations down to a very nominal amount—an amount which meets with the constitutional requirement to tax this class of wealth—a reduction which would impose the least load upon labor and capital.

Perhaps Michigan offers an equally inviting prospect as to legal limitations. We do not know. Whether or not, Massachusetts' population presents a far greater percentage of immediate victims of ground-rent exploitation than does Michigan; 90.2 per cent in the Bay State as against 68.2 per cent in the Wolverine State. In answer to this comparison it may be argued that such mode of procedure appeals to the tenant's pocket-book rather than to his understanding, but we have to "be shown" that the altruism of Michigan muddlists ranks higher than that of the canned culture of our state of mind.

Many of we Single Taxers cannot afford to attend a Single Tax congress and substitute action for words in a centralized campaign which, in principle, we heartily endorse; nor can we afford immediately to dispatch a devalued dollar to each individual, or nucleus, which advises us of its determination to go over the top pronto, because these number more than a few—a number which at once defeats the centralization principle.

Personally we believe that the Henry George Congress is the most appropriate body about which to centralize for organization and action, because it appears to be the largest representation of all the Single Tax factions. It appears to be the only faction acting in parliamentary-congressional manner periodically at divers points.

This communication is not to be construed as an ultimatum to the effect that if you do not fight in my backyard I won't fight at all. It is offered merely to suggest and to learn about the selection of a state for campaign action. There may be a better battle ground than either Michigan or Massachusetts. In other words, has the Committee on Organization and Action a better campaign outline than any other Single Tax nucleus or free lance?

If LAND AND FREEDOM is in a position to act as a clearing-house, perhaps many Single Taxers would like to learn campaign specifications of each Single Tax group which evidently prefers its own methods. Perhaps each group would inform us why "less than 10,000" of all the Single Taxers in this nation failed to sign up with Secretary Rule on the dotted line (not meaning that Mr. Rule is on the dotted line). Perhaps the great army of silent Single Taxers will inform us why Secretary Rule cannot count them either in or out.