

Certainly, Ricardo (and we ask leave to include ourselves) did not assume that any two men in this entire teeming world possessed identical abilities. Even if it were possible to find two or any number of men with identical capacities for labor, the Ricardian law would not take such a phenomenon into consideration. To repeat: It is the subjective demand, as expressed in the market, that finally objectifies the various values in the field of political economy, including rent. The market place performs the function (maybe with that fourth dimensional consciousness which Mr. McNally derides) of clarifying whatever may have been originally obscure in the minds of the various and variable individuals who seek to know what things are worth.

Mr. McNally would have us suppose that since a question about the mathematical computation of rent is apparently meaningless, therefore rent itself, or the law of rent, is a logically inadmissible entity. But this is not true. The law of rent explains the distribution of production between landowners and producers. It is merely a basis for calculation.**

Mr. McNally so sincerely believes he has annihilated the Committee with a question he poses (in the third paragraph, page 166), that we feel constrained to give him the benefit of our views. He asks, "What ingenious device would the Committee employ then in this case to determine what part of A's ten bushels is due to the superior qualities of the land?" We do not pretend that the device we are about to offer is ingenious. Whether it is or not, we would merely try the experiment, as Mr. McNally has done with B, of also placing A on the marginal land and measuring his production thereon. Subtracting the latter from his production on the superior land would give the answer desired by Mr. McNally, namely, that part of A's ten bushels due to the superior land. Of course, we think no good purpose has been served by the explanation, but we have only tried to be obliging. We regret we had to fall back on common-sense rather than meet the challenge by recourse to a higher logic.

The truth, as we see it, is, that an "exchange" economy in a world populated by only two persons is a fantastic proposition. As suggested heretofore, our worthy opponent has undertaken with an eye more to logic, than to economics, the thankless task of pointing out the theoretical difficulty of deciphering the effects of three variables in his island of two men, where one had more productive ability than the other. Mr. McNally introduced the A and B economy as the favorite example of the Ricardians. Speaking for ourselves, we do not believe it constitutes a rational argument to limit a demonstration of Ricardo's law to such an A and B economy.

We conclude with a quotation from Henry George (Book III, Chapter II):

"I do not mean to say that the accepted law of rent has never been disputed. In all the nonsense that in the present disjointed condition of the science has been printed as political economy, it would be hard to find anything that has not been disputed. But I mean to say that

** That public improvements make particular land more desirable, which in turn attracts more people, augments their productive power and thus increases rent, is an observable fact, but the cost of such improvements is not the measure of the increase in the value or rent of the land. The rule or law by which the rent may be determined or calculated remains as before—not by the intrinsic value of the land itself, but by its relative capability as compared with the least productive land in use. Any attempt to discredit Ricardo's law of rent is as ridiculous as would be an attempt to upset Newton's law of gravity, because of the fact that water in some places, as in the so-called inverted siphons under the Hudson River, runs uphill. [This is an extract from a contribution to the Ricardian debate sent in by Mr. Walter Fairchild.—Ed.]

it has the sanction of all economic writers who are really to be regarded as authority. As John Stuart Mill says (Book II, Chapter XVI), 'there are few persons who have refused their assent to it, except from not having thoroughly understood it. The loose and inaccurate way in which it is often apprehended by those who affect to refute it is very remarkable.' An observation which has received many later exemplifications."

James F. Morton

TRULY, "the Old Guard passeth!" And one of its latest losses is a very great one. The death on October 7 of James F. Morton took from our ranks a devoted comrade, a fighter always for Truth and Justice. "Jim" Morton, as his old friends called him, was one of those who believed that being a Single Taxer meant doing something for the Single Tax. In and out of season he preached his belief. A man of high culture and of widely diversified interests, he still felt that all learning, all understanding of the higher things of life, were only a road to better understanding of economic philosophy, or still better, of practical economics. He felt that the pleasure of culture, of joy in the more beautiful things of life, was—or should be—open to all. And he understood that it was no particular merit on their part that enabled some to enjoy all this and shut out others from it.

James Morton never ceased to preach against that economic wrong which enables some few to say to the great mass of people, "Get off my land or pay me for using it." Whatever else his full and active life may have held, he was first and foremost a Single Taxer, an ardent disciple and follower of Henry George. His death—such a great loss to our movement—makes us older folk hope that those who come after us—the younger element to whom we must yield in the natural course of things—will have the same joy in the work that we had; and that they will understand, as Jim Morton did, that "A Single Taxer is one who works for the Single Tax."

—GRACE ISABEL COLBRON

The following account of James F. Morton is taken from the *New York Times* of October 8:

James F. Morton, curator of the Paterson (N. J.) Museum and nationally known bibliophile, author and collector of rare minerals, died this morning (October 7). . . .

Mr. Morton came to Paterson in 1925 to take charge of the museum, and since then had had an active part in the city's cultural life.

Born in Littleton, Mass., on October 18, 1870, he was the son of the late James Ferdinand Morton, one-time head of Phillips Academy in Exeter, N. H., and the late Caroline Edwards Smith Morton. He received Bachelor of Arts and Masters degrees at Harvard, from which university he was graduated cum laude in 1892. Two years later he graduated from the School of Expression, and later gained prominence as a lecturer on social and literary topics. For a time he was a reporter on *The Boston Globe* and Pacific Coast papers.

He was a descendant of one of America's oldest families. One of his ancestors, the Rev. Samuel Francis Smith, was the author of "America."

Taking an active interest in the Henry George single-tax program, Mr. Morton wrote two books on the subject, "Single Tax Review" and "The Philosophy of the Single Tax." An ardent champion of Negro rights, he wrote a book entitled "The Curse of Race Prejudice." Recently he had completed a volume having to do with the Ketcham family. He had written many poems.

Mr. Morton was a member of the New York bar.