

"'Capital Value' is a wiser basis for taxation than 'Annual Value,' not merely more easy to arrive at. For unbuilt-on suburban land, though it has a negligible 'Annual Value,' has a comparatively high 'Capital Value.' This high 'Capital Value' is being maintained and increased by the wise expenditure of the local authority, and constitutes a just source of revenue which cannot be made to contribute by rating upon 'Annual Value.'"

It is of course much easier under present conditions to estimate capital value; and while taxation of land values is very light a tax on capital value may reach a speculative value that would escape under an attempt to determine the annual rental value. But as soon as taxation becomes heavier, the "capitalization of the tax" (or otherwise stated, the reduction in net income of land) decreases its capital or selling value, and to a large extent thus defeats the purpose of the tax by contracting the tax basis.

The wiser basis, therefore, is that of annual rental value, actual or potential. And just as the capital value of land which is not for sale, can be fixed by an assessing official by comparison with other land, so the rental value of unused land could be fixed by comparison with the rent of used land. The ascertainment of either kind of value is not a difficult administrative function. And the sooner the public mind is educated to the fact that the primary form of land value is annual rental value, and that the capital value is merely a price charged for the privilege of collecting that annual rent, the easier it will be to continue the increase of taxation up to the point of absorbing the entire annual rent.

—J. D. M.

#### SIGNIFICANT PARAGRAPHS FROM "PROGRESS AND POVERTY"

(Compiled by Prof. Harry Gunnison Brown, of the University of Missouri).

"These paragraphs," says Prof. Brown in the preface, "have been selected so as to present in brief compass the essentials of Henry George's argument in his own eloquent and inimitable style." The book is intended primarily for schools and colleges, so that students may "have the case for bare-land-value taxation fairly presented to them."

But it is far from being a purely fiscal presentation, nor is it a mere abstract or summary. Prof. Brown has omitted many pages of economic discussion, and has retained a number of eloquent passages which describe the degrading effects of poverty on individuals and the better world—morally and socially—that would evolve from restoring equal rights through the application of the remedy proposed by Henry George.

Prof. John Dewey has rendered a great service to the cause by the splendid tribute to Henry George which is printed as an introduction to this volume of "Selected Paragraphs" (and which is reprinted in full elsewhere in this issue).

This little volume should prove extremely useful for interesting young people in the relation of political economy to real social reform, a subject to which unfortunately much less attention is being given than was the case a generation ago. The Robert Schalkenbach Foundation has sponsored its publication.

Cloth 50 cents per copy. Order of LAND AND FREEDOM.

## CORRESPONDENCE

### THE SACCO VANZETTI CASE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I quite agree with the view of Hubert Lyman Clark of Cambridge, in his letter you published though I do not know the gentleman.

It seems to me that there are too many issues discussed in your magazine, as well as by Single Tax bodies generally, that should be devoted entirely to the things for which they are published and organized, and that tend to crowd the main issue.

The Sacco-Vanzetti case has no more to do with the Single Tax than any other of the multitudinous opinions and theories that seem good to us. Undoubtedly there are many reforms that occur to all of us that would help humanity, but these distractions always throw us off the course. Because a man sees the economic soundness and far reaching influence of the taxation of land values is no reason why he should be drawn into a discussion on Prohibition, Anti-Vivisection, Socialism, or any other of the intersecting subjects that are always being urged by those interested; if he is liberally inclined he most likely will react favorably to most of these burning questions—but then again he may not.

Prohibition was made possible because its advocates devoted all their time and energy to that end—nothing else, and I believe that the abolition of slavery, to a large extent, was accomplished by men and women who were inspired by what I may call, for want of a better word, religious fanaticism and who saw nothing else at the time.

There is such a thing as being so broad in one's attitude toward everything that nothing is accomplished and I am afraid that too many Single Taxers are in that class. The Single Tax will only be advocated by people who think, but its success will be accomplished by those who act as well as think; therefore a large percentage of doers must be enlisted in its cause. The doers in this case, in my opinion, are the men and women that are active in the business life of the country and to whom such a fiscal reform will eventually appeal if it can be shown in its true light.

In your editorial answer you mention the fact that such attitudes of mind as the principals of the Sacco-Vanzetti case held would be eliminated from society with the ideal conditions such as the Single Tax will give. Many people doubt that. I believe this is a question of eugenics and only the most extreme idealists believe that all the troubles of the world will be solved if we have real economic justice. There is no doubt but that these problems will be helped, but it is easy here to get into another controversy, which I want to avoid.

There is another side to this; there are a lot of conservatives who class Single Taxers as Reds, Bolsheviks, Socialists, etc., notwithstanding the fact that the Single Taxers believe in the highest type of individualism; if these people see the economic soundness of the Single Tax, why estrange them? After all, it is no disgrace for a Single Taxer to be "respectable."

Let us not alienate these people by introducing any subject that may result in a disagreement, but stick together on what we all think is the greatest reform, founded on absolute justice for all, that could be instituted in the world today.

Newton, Mass.

—LOUIS FABIAN BACHRACH.

### COMMENDS OUR POSITION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

This is a good opportunity to acknowledge the complimentary references to me that appeared in recent numbers of LAND AND FREEDOM and to tell you how much I appreciated the position which you took on the Sacco-Vanzetti case. I do not know Clark who wrote you the letter of protest from Cambridge but it is very evident that without knowing anything about the case he has accepted the word of Governor Fuller. It seems to me that one does not have to know very much about the case to be able to see that the Fuller report and also the Lowell report were unfair. The evidence of this appears in the reports themselves. I wonder if you have seen in the *New Republic*, John Dewey's analysis of the Lowell report. It is an effective piece of work. Boston, Mass.

—JOHN S. CODMAN.

### ALSO IN AGREEMENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

In your issue of Nov.-Dec., I note that Mr. Hubert Lyman Clark, of Cambridge, Mass., is very much upset because "you have lugged in the Sacco-Vanzetti case on the very front page."