

is to be attained. On this the Single Taxers and the Socialists will be in unison.

Public ownership of public utilities is now looming large on the horizon, prematurely it seems to me, but there it is. On that issue the Single Taxers and the Socialists will be found in the same camp.

Public utilities exist for public service. Just what constitutes public service in a co-operative commonwealth? When a man takes charge and direction of a group of other men's labor, or otherwise serves the public, does he not become a public servant, rightfully subject to such rules and regulations as public safety and welfare may require, especially for those that work under his direction? If an important industry in private hands refuses to function satisfactorily to the public, may not the commonwealth take it over to be directed by its responsible servants. Does not that seem the inevitable course of economic evolution? Talk about your "right to run the business to suit yourself;" Who gave that right in a complex co-operating society? Liberty is fine in the academy and the wilderness, and was always the watchword of thieves and freebooters; but in the practical life of the people, rights and duties take precedence. Such is nature's Law.

The reason for the confusion of professional economists and the disagreement between Single Taxers and Socialists appears to be that the transformation of individualistic production into a co-operative organic system has come about by a process of natural evolution, unheralded, without human plan or purpose. Everybody played his part in it unconsciously, and nobody noticed the essential nature of what was taking place. But few seem yet aware of it until their attention is purposely directed to it. Its rapid and luxurious growth is still in the anarchistic stage, without intelligent and orderly direction to definite purpose. It is time it be studied, understood and put into such order as to serve the common welfare. Humanity's fate hangs thereon.

There are principles to be applied, sincere and earnest work to be done by both Single Taxers and Socialists. It will be time enough for them to split when the aims they have in common have been accomplished.

Fisk, Mo.

S. TIDEMAN.

### A STRANGE STATEMENT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Those good disciples of Henry George who were on the Resolutions Committee of the recent Henry George Congress in San Francisco, make a strange statement in their "Resolutions on Agriculture." They say, in their first Whereas, that "the increasing mechanization of agriculture has thrown many farmers out of employment."

The only way to throw farmers out of work is to take their farms from them; and farm machinery never did that. Who ever saw a farmer out of work while he had a farm? A farmer with a farm always has access to land—always has natural opportunities—always has plenty of work and usually very small pay for doing it.

"The trouble with the farmers" is not unemployment; it is robbery—legalized robbery—a robbery to which the farmer himself is a *particeps criminis*. And it is not machinery, but ground rent made private property that cuts down the "dirt farmer's" share of production and keeps him in poverty—ground rent which in justice is public property and should be used for public purposes—speculative ground rent, which drives him from the markets of civilization into the wilderness—capitalized ground rent, which extorts from him a price for a bit of God's land—land even at the verge of cultivation—and mortgages years of his labor to pay for it—periodical ground rent, which takes a part of every crop he raises and gives no return for it. It is taxation which gives ground rent to "the farmers who farm farmers"—It is taxation which not only gives public property to private persons, but also takes private property for public purposes; it is taxation which "protects" great landed estates from their share of public expenses, plunders the people and forces the farmer to sell low and buy high;

it is taxation which makes low wages and small profits—creates disemployment and destroys purchasing power—robs toiling producers and hungry consumers—all to enrich grasping landlords and gambling speculators.

No student of "Progress and Poverty" ought ever to admit that machinery produces unemployment. Neither should he admit that man, "the only animal that is never satisfied," can ever be unemployed for lack of work to do. The word *unemployment*, like the word *protection*, is a lying misnomer. There is no "problem of the unemployed." What is glibly called so is in fact the problem of disemployment—the problem of "enforced idleness." That problem Henry George solved fifty years ago—and discovered not only "The Cause," but also "The Remedy."

And—to digress a little—any disciple of our beloved teacher who calls those great discoveries "the theories of Henry George," ought immediately to give more study to the book and become wiser and more accurate in the use of terms.

Warren, Pa.

ASHER GEO. BEECHER.

### PLEASED WITH MR. BROWN'S RECEPTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

It was cheering to read in your last number that James R. Brown has been receiving such cordial response to his talks in the East. The East seems to be better for Single Tax speakers than Kansas is. The last time that John Z. White was here he spoke in the rooms of the Chamber of Commerce and there were only about twenty persons in the audience and only one of those was a member of the Chamber.

Mr. Brown said, the field is ripe unto the harvest but few be the reapers therein. Mr. Brown apparently has the happy faculty of making his hearers laugh while injecting his points. Would that we had more of his kind!

All honor to you for conducting for so many years through thick and thin—mostly thin—a dignified, well poised, long sustained campaign through the medium of THE SINGLE TAX REVIEW and LAND AND FREEDOM.

Wichita, Kas.

E. E. SODERSTROM.

### A SUGGESTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wonder if we are not letting a propaganda chance slip by in the present depression. Especially does this seem to apply to what we might be telling the Democratic congressman and senators. In his message of 1916 President Wilson approved Louis F. Post's proposal—technically it was the official proposal of the Department of Labor—to put the unemployed in touch with unused land. Congressman Crosser, you may remember, introduced a bill to put it into effect. But Wilson's approval was merely perfunctory; he made no such effort to have it put over as he did with many measures of much less importance, and it never got out of committee. Now these Democratic congressmen, if they did not lack brains, could be raising a hullabaloo about how alert a Democratic Secretary of Labor and a Democratic President had been in regard to unemployment, how they urged preparations for such depressions as the present and how this policy shines by comparison with the do-nothing and know-nothing policy of Department of Labor since Wilson and Post left and the befuddled policy of Hoover. I wrote to Senator Wagner along this line some time ago but had no reply. He seems to prefer the bills he introduced which he must have gotten out of the libretto of some comic opera.

Baltimore, Md.

SAMUEL DANZIGER.

### A WELCOME NEW YEAR'S GREETING

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

At this time I want to express to you my earnest best wishes for a happy and prosperous New Year and to tell you how much I personally