

to sell their flocks; the clothing manufacturers, who are worrying why their suits of clothing remain on their shelves, etc., etc.

No, it is not overproduction but underconsumption from which we are suffering.

In an hour's ride from the center of New York I will take Professor Brown to New Jersey, or out on Long Island or Staten Island, and show him tens of thousands of acres of land standing idle, badly in need of human hands to work them. What is true of New York is true of Chicago, Philadelphia and every other large city, not only in the United States but all over the world.

Not even China is overpopulated. The fear of overpopulation is therefore academic, like the college student's fear of what would happen when the coal supply of our planet would be exhausted.

Professor Brown writes (page 371):

"Nothing is so important as to establish the principle that those who bring children into the world must provide these children with a childhood not wholly devoid of opportunity and of happiness, and therefore, by implication, that they must not have more children than can be so provided."

This statement is hardly in keeping with the sound thinking of the rest of the book. In the first place, in our present economic disorder, no parent knows, when he brings even one child into the world, whether or not he will be able to provide for him. Given the responsibility to support a new life, every normal man and woman gladly assumes the burden. All a normal father asks is *opportunity to work*, to support his child, and with the arrival of each additional child every normal father is stimulated to greater and greater activity. Our present lack of system denies him this opportunity.

Professor Brown believes that the reason why large classes of population cannot enjoy life is because their wages are low and because their families are large (page 372). Wages are low for reasons which the Professor clearly shows only five pages further on, where he speaks of the system—

"under which the majority must pay tribute to a minority for the privilege of living and working on those parts of the surface of the earth where labor is especially productive."

Professor Brown, throughout his work, clearly shows the fallacies of the socialists' arguments. The arguments in chapter six against the tariff are simply devastating.

"The tariff is a general grab, in which, so to speak, each citizen attempts to pick the pocket of others and has his own picked at the same time."

In a bitter passage, pages 50-51, Professor Brown shows the difficulties the trained student of economics encounters when he seeks to overcome the fallacies of the politician. Every word he writes is true, but it seems to me this discussion is hardly in place in a book on economics.

In calling attention to these few points in respect to which I differ with Professor Brown it is not my desire to give the impression that I do not endorse his book.

On the contrary, I consider it a most excellent piece of work, of which the professor may well be proud.

I recommend it highly to all who sincerely desire to learn what ails us, economically speaking. But I warn them that they must possess a mind capable of clear thinking and a determination to follow the truth wherever it leads, else they will get little or nothing from Professor Brown's work.

B. W. BURGER.

CORRESPONDENCE

APPROVES RALSTON'S PLAN

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I wish to take this opportunity to express my deep appreciation of LAND AND FREEDOM. I have been looking over again the last number, and feel how much we need just such a publication, more particularly

for the purpose of keeping us together, as well as for passing the magazine along to those not informed.

Mr. Jackson H. Ralston's plan to have carefully prepared constitutional amendments in states where such an idea seems feasible especially in Massachusetts, which will be submitted to the vote of the people for the purpose of bringing about tax reform, seems to me most practical. In connection with our publishing lecture and radio activity, this should impress people with the fact that we are determined to do something, and help to crystalize public opinion generally.

I particularly hope we can have a real get-together this fall, and put over some constructive plans.

Cambridge, Mass.

LOUIS F. WESTON.

FROM THE AUTHOR OF "WHAT'S WRONG WITH TAXATION"
EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I want to thank you for the very excellent review in the last number of LAND AND FREEDOM. Making all due and proper allowances for differences of opinion on matters collateral to the main argument, I feel more than pleased with the endorsement of What's Wrong with Taxation?

In the writing of this book I am trying to reach a public which so far has been cold to our presentations. We have so often become so impassioned as to be fairly inarticulate, and this has detracted from the efficacy of our work, at least in my opinion. If we would make progress it will prove necessary to revise our own usual attitude.

I shall watch with a certain confidence the reaction to the article urging Massachusetts to come forward. There are men and women enough in the state to start a valuable movement.

Palo Alto, Calif.

JACKSON H. RALSTON.

CAUSE AND CONSEQUENCE

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Enclosed please find my check for \$2.00 in payment of bill dated the 15th inst. just received for my subscription ending July—August 1931.

Will you please discontinue my subscription. I have given up hope and don't care a damn whether the world is reformed or not.

P. S.: I voted for Hoover.

Kansas City, Mo.

SAM L. CASEY.

A CORRECTION

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Progress is unjustly pilloried in the *Commonweal*, March 21, p. (94) "The Truth About Java." It states

"In the January-February issue of LAND AND FREEDOM a paragraph appears about the island of Java. This same paragraph previously appeared in the *Fairhope Courier*, another American publication, which in turn, attributes its formation to *Progress*, an Australian journal. It runs as follows:—

"Java, a little island about as large as England, supports a population of 37,400,000, and has no unemployment menace. How do they do it? High tariff? Prohibition? Gold standard? Private operation of public utilities? Not a bit of it. Land speculation is forbidden. Land is treated as Government property, and is let on hereditary lease, or communal holdings."

"It is true (adds the 'C') that Java is almost exactly the same size as England, and that it has numerically an almost identical population. It is true also that there is very little unemployment in Java, *except amongst Europeans*. It is not, however, correct to say that the communal right to the land is established in Java, or that its economic rent is collected and used for communal purposes in place of taxation."

It then recounts quite a number of taxes.

From the foregoing your readers would conclude that *Progress* claimed the C. L. P. principles were operating in Java. No such misleading statement was made or implied by the writer. He was quite aware that Java had tariffs and other taxes.

The *Progress* article (Nov 1, 1930), in its reference to Java contained these words only:

"No room!" Those who say that shamefully disparage Australia. Why, our tiny neighbor—Java—about the size of England, but of

two-thirds the area of our little State of Victoria, easily carries, with no unemployed, her population of 37,400,000. Land speculation is forbidden in Java, and, except in the west, land is treated as Government property, and is let on hereditary lease or in communal holdings."

The *Commonweal* writer states "It is true there is very little unemployment in Java *except among the Europeans*. (Italics are the C's.)

The Europeans chiefly live "in the west," referred to by *Progress* i. e. in Batavia, Buitenzorg, etc.) where much valuable land is not treated as Government property. They total only 170,000 out of an approaching thirty-seven and a half million population. The "very little unemployment" elsewhere occurs on the company land referred to later.

Confirming the general statement that "land is treated as Government property and is let on hereditary leases or in communal holdings," the following details are given in "A Manual of Netherlands India, (Dutch West Indies). Printed by His Majesty's Stationery Office, London, page 208, "Land Tenure." The ultimate ownership of most of the land of Netherlands West Indies? is nominally vested in the State. Part of this land is State-administered as well as State-owned. In a further considerable proportion of land the natives enjoy possessory rights of usufruct, individual or communal, while in addition it is possible for them to acquire (on 75 year leases) a proprietary title which under the name of "agrarian ownership" was created by the agrarian law of 1870. Much land is held by a heritable leasehold title which practically ensures security and perpetuity of tenure to the landholder, while much is let on long or short leases of a terminable nature. A third category is found by the so-called particular lands which are held by individual companies in full proprietorship as the result of former sales by the Government. In the principalities of Jokyakarta and Surakarta the native princes are still the sovereign lords of the land and pay their officials with land grants or "appanages" which carry with them certain fiscal and public rights. There are also "official lands", survivals from the days of custom law. An elaborate and extensive system of leasehold tenure has been gradually superimposed on these proprietary and possessory rights."

The writer of the *Progress* article was informed by a Government official at Buitenzorg that "Land speculation is forbidden in Java." The foregoing "Manual" states, "The leasing of land by natives and Europeans is hedged about with legal restrictions designed to safeguard the native landed interest." The writer in 1924 travelled by motor in Java for 700 miles and did not see one notice board "This land for sale," a sight so common in U. S. A., England and Australia.

The object of the *Progress* article was not to give a detailed account of the land system of Java but to show there was no excuse for Australia, nearly 60 times its size to shut out immigrants on the plea of "overpopulation." He greatly regrets that *Commonweal* readers would certainly conclude he claimed that in Java the "economic rent is collected and used for communal purposes in place of taxation."

F. T. Hodgkiss, Editor *Progress*.

Melbourne, Aus.

JAMES R. BROWN IN WARREN COUNTY

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

James R. Brown again brought the message of the Single Tax to Warren County, New York State, during the week of June 22nd. On the evening of the 22nd he spoke at Luzerne on "Civic Righteousness" at the annual commencement of the Luzerne High School. On Wednesday he addressed the Lions' Club at Newark, N. Y., returning Thursday to Glens Falls where he appeared for the fifth time before the Rotary Club. On Thursday evening Mr. Brown addressed the members of Luzerne Grange and on the following evening the members of all the nearby Granges at Mohican Grange near Glens Falls. On Monday evening he was heard at Salem, Washington County, where he spoke before the Lions' Club.

Mr. Brown was everywhere received with enthusiasm. His humorous allusions to and illustrations of the absurdities of our present tax system never failed to elicit from his hearers the laugh of appreciation

and understanding. His appeal went over big to the farmers in the Grange meetings especially.

Next fall when the Pomona Grange holds its meetings in Warren and Washington Counties, Mr. Brown will be sure to receive a hearty invitation to speak to larger groups of farmers and members of local Granges.

The message of the Single Tax only needs to be presented clearly (and genial James R. is a master hand at this) to be understood and acted upon by the Grange of this State. If the farmers themselves become "tax-conscious" and can learn what they really want by way of a just system of taxation, their united will, if expressed, is bound to produce results. The field, it seems, is ripe for the harvest and we welcome the workers.

L. F. PERKINS,

Dist. Supt. of Schools.

Luzerne, Warren Co., N. Y.

WE LEAVE DR. HALE TO THE MERCY OF OUR READERS EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

The paragraphs on page 36, March-April issue of your paper, referring to the common belief, as shown by Professor Hamilton, that the land question is largely an agricultural problem discuss a phase of Georgian propaganda that was once a deep puzzle to me. The following is offered as an explanation of the fact and suggests a presentation of theory that may overcome the difficulty.

A person is not conscious of using land when aboard ship at sea. Yet the sea has a land bottom.

Nor on an airplane does one realize that he is using land; yet the air is held up by land.

Likewise on a railroad train, but the track is built on land.

In drawing water from a faucet of a water distribution system one does not remember that the water fell from the sky on land and conveyed over land through pipes made from a product of land.

When one turns a key and has available electric light or power, he forgets that the light or power was generated by fuel that came out of the ground or by water that fell on land, was conveyed over land to a generator and the current again conveyed overland to the user.

Nor does a person who spends his life in a building either at work or play realize that all the time he is using land.

In fact, the one who works land is the only one who is fully conscious of using land, and one who wants to work land is the only one fully conscious of being denied access to land. Is it not then to be expected that the land question will seem to be an agricultural problem to almost every one?

The following presentation of our argument has won assent from every one of the small number of people so far appealed to:

The *ownership* of the land upon which it is conducted is not an essential part of any industry.

Then the giving to any person for owning land any part of the earnings of any industry is a gift for which the receiver makes no return.

More than half the current production of wealth in the United States is given to part of the people for owning land and a greater proportion in most other countries.

Can any improvement in social conditions be hoped for as long as this practice continues?

The easiest way to abolish this practice would be to have all titles to land revert to the State on the death of the present owner (in the case of husband and wife the survivor of them). This could hurt no one, as it would apply in no case until the person was dead, and a dead person could not be hurt.

In the case of a corporation, if such proportion of holding of stock of a deceased stockholder as the land value in the capitalization bears to the total capitalization were taken as an inheritance tax instead of a sum of money, a means would be provided for the acquisition of a majority of the stock all public utilities and a means of control of all other corporations by the people through their holdings of capital in each corporation.

For the purpose of flood control large areas of land must be reforested