for the price is never regulated by the manufacturer or retailer except where there is a monopoly.

The way to raise prices is not by legislative edicts, nor by increasing the number of dollars in circulation, but by employing labor so that wages may be earned and exchanged for goods.

Since the professors of political economy have to have an excuse when too indifferent to make an examination of the causes, they blame it on the dollar.

Starting the printing presses or reducing the gold content of the dollar will materially reduce the savings of the people, and will only benefit those who have gold. Labor would be worse off than ever, for it would receive wages in dollars which would have only half the gold content of the present dollar. Since he would have to pay higher prices, even though he had a job, he would receive none of the benefits which these wise gentlemen undertake to provide for him.

New York City. JOSEPH H. FINK.

DISAGREES WITH MR. PLATT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Concerning Mr. Platt's contention: I have been rather attentive to happenings in the Georgean cause the last thirty-five years. I have noticed this; That when a Single Taxer, who was also a government ownership advocate, got up to speak at any of our meetings he always spoke for government ownership, not for Single Tax. The same is true of the Single Taxer who has a theory of his own about money. With him the burning issue is the money issue. A prominent advocate who gives all his time to Proportional Representation proclaimed himself several times in my presence a Single Taxer, but at Single Tax meetings he never speaks of anything but Proportional Representation.

At our Henry George Club meetings one attendant always brings in the income tax. He wants Single Tax, he says, but as an emergency measure he insists on the income tax. This is somewhat of a joke, the emergency part of it. The "Liberals" campaigned for thirty years for the income tax, they got it and it was declared unconstitutional. Then they campaigned for years for a constitutional amendment so they could have it. Now they have it. Conditions are worse than ever, partly due to the income tax. Fifty years of strife for an emergency measure that has made things worse, and now they want a larger dose as an emergency measure!

Another speaker thought our proposition seemed to have merit but as an emergency measure he wanted a federal law to prevent selling stock short.

If our Henry George movement is to give space, time and encouragement to all these side issues because they are advocated by men who profess themselves in sympathy with our aim we might as well forget our own issue and jump in and help them all put over their own little paliatives.

In my time I have attended a great many meetings called for these issues enumerated above and many others that I will not take space to mention. I can not recall a single instance where a Single Taxer injected himself or Single Tax to the elimination of the issue the meeting was called for.

If we are to forever tolerate this kind of interuption we will get nowhere, for these side issues are as numerous as the days in the year. The latest here is the city manager issue.

The time is thirty years overdue when we should notify all these proponents that if they wish to take part in a conference called to promote Single Tax they should come prepared to advance that cause and not to propagate for anything else. H. W. NOREN.

Pittsburgh, Pa.

AGREES WITH MR. PLATT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Permit me to express my entire concurrence in the views set forth by Mr. Chester Platt at the Memphis Conference. I find difficulty in understanding any other position when taken by any one believing in the doctrines represented under the name of Single Tax.

The fundamental idea behind these doctrines is the use for community purposes of the values created by the community. At the present time a large portion of these values is represented by the special and particular use made by the public utilities corporation of not alone the land occupied by their structures, but also our streets and highways, coupled with the exercise of the governmental power of eminent domain. Only public utilities among all privately-owned corporations are granted this exclusive power. To repossess these landed privileges as well as the power spoken of is to advantageously turn to public benefit what is in its nature public.

There is nothing else for us as Single Taxers to do about this particular question. Taxation is not the method of dealing with that which is in its nature monopolistic. After allowing a fair return to the investor any taxation upon the monopoly is at once paid back in the shape of added charges to be met by some one other than the owner of the monopoly. This undoubtedly Henry George clearly saw, and therefore he favored public ownership of such properties as a part of the programme for securing to all the benefits of the creation for all. Is there any sufficient reason at the present time for us to be "more royalist than the king, more Catholic than the Pope?"

But we are told that the taking of this kind of property will raise the value of the land not taken, and that *all* the benefits will result to the owners of the remaining land. This has been assumed by some, but never proven, and in my judgment never will be, even though a large part of such benefits will accrue to the landholder. Is there one among us who will not prefer to live in a community where good schools, well-paved streets, property well protected against loss, and the other improvements of modern civilization exist, rather than in neighborhoods of the opposite character; and this even after the landlords' toll is taken? This single consideration will serve to show that other than landlords gain something—tangible or otherwise—from any step toward general diffusion of comfort, as they must from greater equality of opportunity.

Of course, unconsciously the argument of these opponents of any step toward public ownership of public utilities goes much further. It would be equally good or equally baseless against any advance of whatever nature. To be consistent they must seek—even though they cannot find—a neighborhood free from any service of government, lest they contribute to the landlord. But are we under any obligation to be reactionary and retrogressive in everything except the Single Tax, and must the term be given its narrowest and least effective interpretation? I think not.

Judson King is teaching that a certain part of the public property should be restored to the public. We have but to add that certain other values should also go to the public. He addresses himself to a part of a great problem. To attack him or depreciate his work is simply to enfeeble our own efforts upon a larger field. Let him fight out his battle without our interference. More than any other class of adventures in reform we should help him. JACKSON H. RALSTON.

Palo Alto, Calif.

TEXAS SHOWS SYMPTOMS OF RETURNING SANITY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Our legislature promised to run wild for a sales tax or an income tax to make up its deficit and also to substitute for an ad valorem tax. They are getting toned down, and a good many of them are wondering if they are not on the wrong tack. I had great fun with them a week ago at a public meeting of the Committee on Revenue and Taxation on the sales tax. It was an evening session held in the House Hall with some 200 or more present. I made no specific argument against the sales tax but spoke on the text that it was "the very nature of evil to be self-destructive," and that all taxes on production and distribution were evil, and showed them from actual figures that they are self-de-