

onstrable that rent will rise as a totality. Taxes on improvements tend to depress land values. With all taxes removed we enter upon a period where all industry is released and the result will surely be reflected in increased land values. Oscar Geiger, in his illuminating lectures, so held and illustrated it with diagrams amounting to a practical demonstration.

Nor do we agree with the author that resort to the immediate collection of the full economic rent would occasion any greater shock to existing institutions than the depression begun in 1929 through which we are now passing. For it must be remembered that with the resumption of man's right to the use of the earth something will have occurred that has marked no other financial shock or depression by immediately abolishing all obstacles that now cause wide-spread unemployment. For with the immediate declaration of a free earth all or nearly all land that has any value would almost at once pass into use. While we need not expect that this great change can be accomplished without certain losses to individuals, such losses would not approximate to the wholesale depression and consequent deprivation to which nearly all classes have been subject in the years 1929-1934.

We do not like the chapters on money, not only because we wholly disagree with them, but additionally because of the abusive terms he uses against the advocates of a metallic basis. His own suggestion for a monetary system, the issuance of certificates based on public improvements, has never had anything but a limited sanction in history and is "void for uncertainty." Knowing the fury of the inflationist when aroused we dread what might happen when a supposed scarcity of money would lead to an expanding programme to provide additional "scrip." We prefer to see the economic fundamentals settled first, leaving the problem of money—if it is a problem—to a generation free to consider it without bias and with a clearer apprehension of natural laws.

This work is written to set Georgists right. But Mr. Green has wholly misrepresented George's position on the question of interest. The work will do no good and may do a deal of harm.—J. D. M.

A FRENCH RENDERING OF CONDITION OF LABOR

Recently, through the enterprise of M. Sam Meyer, leader of the French followers of Henry George, there has been published a fine French translation of Henry George's "Condition of Labor," comprising the famous letter to Pope Leo XIII. The translator was M. Paul Passy who is head of the Christian Socialists of France, but who has taken great interest in urging upon his followers a reading of the books of Henry George. A limited issue of this excellent French translation of a famous book (paper cover—78pp.), is offered for sale in the United States by the Robert Schalkenbach Foundation, at the price of 25 cents per copy, postage paid.

Correspondence

IDA TARBELL ON HENRY GEORGE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The otherwise excellent article by Ida M. Tarbell in the current *Forum* is marred by coupling the name Henry George, a political economist, with Edward Bellamy, a novelist. The former possessed a scientific, self-trained mind, capable of reasoning from cause to effect. With the precision of an engineer he attacked every economic problem.

The latter lacked these qualities. To associate these two personalities, simply because both dealt with the same subject matter, economic reform, is pointless. There might have been some justification for *contrasting* them.

Likewise, Miss Tarbell is most unfortunate in referring to Father McGlynn as the Father Coughlin of his day. In truth, Father

McGlynn was everything but that. Both, to be sure, were adherents of the Catholic faith and presumed to discuss economic questions. But there the likeness ends.

New York City.

BENJ. W. BURGER.

DR. JORDAN MISSES THE POINT

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Dr. Virgil Jordan made an address over WJZ tonight on the topic "National Wealth and Income." It was very cleverly arranged to convey the idea to the listening public that depressions are but natural phenomena in a world in which the distribution of wealth is both just and proper. Such statements by men or women who are entitled to the term Doctor carry so much weight with those mortals of lesser degree of scholastic learning that the need of such institutions of Truth as the Henry George School of Social Science is apparent.

Dr. Jordan began by pointing out that many persons, even government officials, use government statistics to prove the necessity for the New Deal. He was particularly emphatic that the statement that two per cent of the population receive eighty per cent of the income is a fallacy. He then started to define the term National Wealth and included land as wealth. No Single Taxer could find fault with his statement that money, stocks, bonds, checks, etc., are not wealth but mere tickets giving the holders a claim upon the stock of wealth. Not so fortunate was he when he defined wealth as that which enables man to produce an income, showing that he confuses all wealth with a portion of it known as capital.

He blamed government officials and all agitators outside of the government for speaking of the need of a new method of distribution, but the only method he mentioned as possible other than the present one is one of equal sharing by all workers in the products of labor. If he knows that there is such a suggestion as an equitable distribution of income, the full product of his labor to the laborer, the full product of the use of capital to capital, and the economic rent of the land to the whole people, he did not betray himself. In fact rent did not enter into his talk at all and we learned that labor gets so much of the return that capital gets but a trifle. Many businesses have been paying interest and dividends out of their savings of the fat years so that workmen may draw good wages according to the Doctor, all of which may or may not be true, but if true it is because of something that so far as Dr. Jordan's address goes is non-existent.

Dr. Jordan decries the talk about the profit system and seeks to explain that it is a profit and loss system, in bad times the workers taking the profits and the employers the losses. In fact one can hardly be blamed for getting the impression that Dr. Jordan both believes and does not believe in the existence of a depression. He calls the New Deal a New Steal in one breath, and then tells us that we own half the National Wealth and receive more than sixty-six and two-thirds per cent of the income; how else are we to take his statement that of about 27 billions produced in 1933 over 20 billions were paid out as wages, and the rest as salaries, interests, and dividends.

But Dr. Jordan in objecting to the use of statistics to prove what he calls a fallacy is illogical because his own use of statistics is to prove untrue statements since he left rent of land out of the reckoning. Also he states that in a certain year about forty per cent of the population owned their own homes and forty per cent of the farmers owned their farms. This is not true since a large part of these properties were and are mortgaged and are not truly the property of the holders until such mortgages are paid. Furthermore, he speaks of the large amount of insurance on the lives of millions of the population as potential wealth but he does not state that this wealth is partly present existing wealth produced by labor out of land with or without the assistance of capital, and as such it