

me to come soon again to have an open debate with the Socialists.

In the first part of my lecture I spoke of George's theory (for many good arguments I am greatly indebted to Mr. Post's really admirable tract, *The Single Tax*) and in the second I compared two different counties of Hungary: the first where nearly all common land was recently subdivided and then bought by land speculators: the other where people are still using common land for common purposes. In the second county about 70 per cent. of all land is property of the village communities, and there are no large proprietors at all, but there are no paupers either; they practice the most intensive agriculture with ampler use of modern improvements than in any other part of Hungary, proving that common property in land is not at all incompatible with the highest development of agriculture. They have the most instructed clergy and the best schools in Hungary—they can afford it—and consequently the fewest criminals.

I hope to go a few months hence to the capital for an open debate with the Socialists, and I am sorry that I cannot do more for the Single Tax, being so far from the capital, and having no means to publish my translations of George's works.

ROBERT BRAUN.

MAVOS-VASAVHELY, Hungary.

PROSPECTS GOOD IN OREGON.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

You ask for suggestions in the event that the Fels offer is met by other Single Taxers. I am too poor to be a financial contributor at present, but may be before the five years are up. At any rate I trust that others have been more fortunate than I, and will respond to the sanest call ever issued by a man of means in our movement, for any amount of fireworks by any man, however able or successful, in any one spot, can not serve as a substitute for a general propaganda movement; for the simple reason that the economic disease is not local but constitutional, and must be so treated.

Yet I believe there are points of least resistance even with the remedy for a con-

stitutional disease, and whether the proposition of Mr. Fels is met or not I wish to call attention of men of means like him to the opportunity in Oregon. I am glad to know that other States have swung into line for direct legislation lately, but they are children yet in reform, and they may be obliged to go through court proceedings. But not so in Oregon, which is ten years ahead of any State in the Union.

Direct legislation is no longer a novelty there, and the people have turned their attention to economic reform. They will doubtless start to cutting the branches of the tree first. The danger is that socialistic policies will be inaugurated and discredit reform, and as the Nation will look to Oregon as an experiment, we can not afford to allow it to get a set back. I understand our friends next move may be for local option in Taxation, and the Socialists are starting out for State ownership of every thing except land. It may be possible to secure local option in taxation in the next two years.

Should local option succeed, Portland, which voted for local option last Spring, would doubtless be the first city in the Union to adopt the Single Tax. Portland being an important sea port and growing city, the illustration would be superb. At any rate, every effort should be made to see to it that our friends, the enemy, do not place the socialistic stamp on Democratic Oregon.

J. R. HERMANN.

ORAL, So. Dakota.

NEWSPAPERS HOSPITABLE TO DISCUSSION.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Within the past week there have appeared in the Nashville *Tennessean* Single Tax letters from Geo. W. Knight, San Marcos, Texas, W. H. T. Wakefield, Mound City, Kansas, and Joseph Fels, London, England, the latter a lengthy article on Land Values Taxation in Britain.

Good mediums for Single Tax communications in this State are the *Tennessean*, Nashville, The *News-Scimitar*, Memphis and The *Smith County News*, Carthage.

NASHVILLE, Tenn. A. FREELAND.

TO CLEAR UP A CONFUSION.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

Rent cannot enter into nor come out of price, nor cost. A. C. Pleydell is right, but perhaps an illustration might help Mr. Cowern. A. and B. sell hats:

	per day	cost	price	profit
A on Broadway sells	100	\$1.50	\$2.00	\$50.00
B in Yonkers sells	10	\$1.50	\$2.50	\$10.00

A less price yields A a fund five times that of B for his wages and rent. If the reward for labor of distributing, or profit, be called wages, than the rent comes out of wages. It will be seen that what seems "too plain for argument" is really a superficial view. If B's rent comes out of his price of \$2.50, how can a greater rent, paid by A, come out of a less price, \$2.00? The fact that prices are lowest where rent is highest suggests a flaw in the argument that rent MUST come from price. Read *Progress and Poverty*, Book VIII, chap. III.

C. F. HUNT.

CHICAGO. Ill.

FROM A. WANGEMANN.

Editor *Single Tax Review*:

I always find ample stimulation in the REVIEW. Most of us need it, for the natural bent of the reformer's mind is to run in a rut.

Bolton Hall's definition of "What is the Single Tax" is the most lucid yet. But I want to give the REVIEW readers some thoughts on A. J. Wolf's letter who asks for action. Who comprise the "thinking public" which Mr. Wolf desires to interest? Habitually we still apply the term to the learned professions—the higher type of politicians—parsons—petticoats, and that conventional aggregation best described as the impotent middle class, fast being ground pulpy under our modern industrial system of capitalized land monopoly. This is the "thinking public" we address.

We press writers have addressed said T. P., lo! these many years, each in his own way reciting $2 \times 2 = 4$, and I reckon we will keep at it.

But, Mr. Editor, the world moves and new party alignments are being formed on

economic lines: Aristocracy and Privilege entrenched versus Democracy and the Golden Rule aspirations. These are slowly crystallizing, as any mind not hidebound in partisan bigotry and conventionalism can see.

Brother Wolf asks for action. Well, is it necessary to point out that organized labor has taken the second step in cooperation—has gone into political action—not as an affiliation move with a political party, but as an economic body. Here then we have a deliberate political activity based on economic grounds exclusively—a phenomenon worth our close sympathetic attention.

As you will surmise readily these organized wealth producers still lack even a kindergarten knowledge of sociology and political economy. They need that knowledge. They will get it either from the Single Taxers or from the State Socialists in America. The Churches can not furnish it to labor unprivileged. The Churches lay stress on the moral factor. The Socialists concern themselves with the materialistic factor of economic environment. The Single Taxers consider both the economic environment and the factor of moral responsibility. Labor once fully informed in economics will then be in intelligent position to abolish private land monopoly. Here then is a big field for action.

The next move then is to get about it. How and by what method shall we act? Mr. Editor, being slightly modest, as we Chicagoans all are, I will not encumber the pages of the REVIEW with advice. Let your readers do their own pondering. As for me, my method is to mix with the leaders and rank and file of workers—get to know their ideology, methods of logic, prejudices, and approach their minds accordingly. Strip off the tenaciously clinging veneer of conventional habits of thought and speech which so often prevent us from being of real service to our fellows.

A. WANGEMANN.

CHICAGO, Edgewater, Ill.

FOR some months past Gavin D. High has been assistant financial editor of the *Evening Sun*, and in the absence of his chief practically in charge of the financial department.