

numerous mergers and consolidations, represent as truly as landlordism merely a claim on future earnings of workers. Moreover day land ownership by a corporation like the Steel Trust is so tangled up in the whole scheme of corporate ownership that it could hardly be disentangled by a Single Tax. Society creates values for locks in basic enterprises almost as obviously as it creates them for favored landlords. Not all our economic dynasties are based solely or chiefly on land ownership. With the passage of every year it becomes clearer that to deal with this situation requires affirmative social control, not merely a trust in individual initiative and enterprise, if these are freed from the chains of landlordism."

The "hundreds of millions of water which was originally the Steel Trust common stock" mentioned by Mr. Thomas was the basis of a Congressional investigation in the early days of that trust, and the fact that the nominal value of this stock was, as the author says, "out of all proportion to the actual machinery, buildings, etc., which represented the working plant," was one of the main charges brought against the trust in that investigation. Charles M. Schwab, the main witness on behalf of the trust, claimed that the "machinery, buildings, etc.," formed hardly any part, and surely no appreciable part, of the value of the stock; that these could all be entirely discarded and the value of the trust's ownership of lands, mines, rights of way, etc., would more than make up the capitalization represented by the stock then issued, and that indeed these properties would warrant the issuance of additional stock. This testimony was accepted by the Congressional investigators as a complete justification for the stock then on the market.

A consideration of the effect of a Single Tax on the "stock watered" by bankers in numerous mergers and consolidations, "which Mr. Thomas says "represent as truly as landlordism merely a claim on future earnings of workers," will disclose the fact that a Single Tax on Land Values or the taking of the Annual Rent of Land in lieu of all taxes will not merely encourage putting land into use and improving it as Mr. Thomas admits, but that it will *discourage holding land out of use and keeping it unimproved, for a Single Tax on the value of idle land is a penalty for keeping land idle.*

Land put into use, immediately compels the employment of labor. Forcing all valuable land into use creates a demand for labor that cannot permanently be satisfied. As land seeks users and improvers, jobs would seek men. Wages would not merely rise; labor would be given the whip handle of the bargaining situation and wages would represent that the product of labor was worth. Would labor want more? This is the care of the "producers" whose interests Mr. Thomas would convey by "organization." Nor is this all that a Single Tax on Land Values will do. Forcing land into use means the erecting of buildings, growing of food products and the working of mines, quarries and forests, thus creating a greater supply and lowering the prices of all that we need to live and satisfy its wants and desires, and to realize its best hopes and dreams.

Higher wages and lower cost of living! A paradox! Where will it come from? The "water" that Mr. Thomas tells us "bankers pour into their stocks during their numerous mergers and consolidations" have been squeezed out by higher wages and lower prices.

The rent of land that must now be paid to land owners before a pickaxe be struck or a spade turned in the earth (which "the Lord thy God hath thee," and which the landlord permits us to use at a price—price— or withholds from use)—that rent will have been redirected to the exchequer of the government, leaving the sum of all taxes and duties, direct and indirect, to remain in the pockets of the people; and added to these, and far surpassing both, will be the incalculable increase of the production of wealth, all of which will remain with the producers, who, may I respectfully suggest, are also the "consumers" that Mr. Thomas would "organize" for mutual protection.

Thus we see that not only "could land ownership by a corporation like the Steel Trust" be disentangled from its "whole scheme of corporate ownership" by the Single Tax, but inevitably *would* be.

Indeed, there would be nothing left but the actual investments for buildings, machinery, raw materials, rolling stock, tracks and such other actual evidences of labor products that could be translated into paper evidences of wealth. The capitalizing value of land will have gone.

Mr. Thomas says that "with the passage of every year it becomes clearer that to deal with this situation requires affirmative social control, not merely a trust in individual initiative and enterprise, if these are freed from the claims of landlordism."

How does Mr. Thomas feel that individual initiative and enterprise will act if freed from the chains of landlordism?

Food, shelter, a home, wife and children are the first and most compelling motives in the make-up of every man. These secured, quality, though perhaps secondary, is yet quite as compelling an urge that comes with the power to secure, and under the Single Tax the best food, the best shelter, the finest home and the very best there is both materially and spiritually for wife and children will be the rule.

Children will not be sent to work when the wages of the father will make this monstrous custom unnecessary; they will be at schools or in colleges. Men assured of a living will marry, and they will marry young. With children at school and women at their own firesides there will be few, if any, of either left to work in factories, mills, offices, stores or as servants in private homes, which will further tend toward an increased demand for the labor of men, toward the raising of the standard of wages and toward security for all labor. Women as mistresses in their own homes will rid society of another evil, indeed of several evils, that now are accepted as unavoidable (and even necessary) concomitants of "civilization" (?).

Relieved of the consuming and degrading fear of want, crime will disappear. Freed from worry, and given a chance to work and play, to live and laugh, disease will find no place among us. Men having enough, will not covet what is their neighbor's. Men, being free, with the avenues of effort ever open to them everywhere and at all times, will not seek the favor of those in a position to bestow a job upon them or to deprive them of it. Free men will dare to do right. The Single Tax will free men.

That, Mr. Thomas, is how "individual initiative and enterprise will act if freed from the chains of landlordism."

And may I submit for Mr. Thomas' consideration that such action or reaction on the part of individuals to freedom is not entirely, if at all objective; that it is part of man's make-up; that it is "in the scheme of things." Man's nature is an expression of All Nature, is part of All Nature, and is governed by Natural Laws that are as immutable and inexorable as are the laws of physics.

Why not approach these laws as every true scientist approaches Natural Law in his own field—study them, test them, and, having proved them, accommodate ourselves to them? We build bridges and "skyscrapers," and should build philosophies, in accordance with them.

OSCAR H. GEIGER.

CORRESPONDENCE

AN AMBITIOUS PROGRAMME

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I feel that it is time you had another word from me repeating my commendation of your editorship of the current literature of our world-wide movement of regeneration, in the course of which comments I will make a few other observations.

LAND AND FREEDOM is a dignified and worthy organ of a transcendent cause. Though at times it may seem to you like casting pearls before swine, I think I may assure you the work you are doing is all big in constructive force, as all of us, by and large, are also workers—doing something every day for the Single Tax,—and you are handing us good dry ammunition constantly, and not a little inspiration.

I am far from satisfied that in this time, exemplifying as it does, all the worst phases of the phenomena that George saw, studied and solved,

we must seem to look on, and see only absurdities and futilities offered in relief. The situation seems to parallel that of the Irishman and his roof, that could not be mended while it rained, and need not be at other times.

I feel that you should shout something across each page, that our lecturers should shout at the opening of every address, and that we all should be shouting, through letters and conversation, at every socialistic panacea suggested; at every fellow like Willard, Young, Vanderlip, Scripps, Couzens, Ford, who seem intelligent, and make them see that they must join with their natural allies, labor, and cast out monopoly as their no-longer-useful compatriot and build a new capitalism that will not deserve the stigma theirs now bears; and I believe that before going with concentration far in this direction, we would uncover financial cooperation in excess of any we have so far enjoyed.

With a truly dangerous development of the direct consequences of conditions of fundamental monopoly, with the deepest descent in modern times into the depths of despairing depression, poverty and unemployment; with the most perfect opportunity for application of the only possible remedy; with all this plainly obvious to us, we cannot and do not function effectively, in supplying the overwhelming demand for our service.

Everywhere Socialists, Communists, and labor "agitators", and to some extent liberals and progressives, and even an important group of capitalists, bankers and industrialists—all are in varying degrees of confidence and officiousness messing at a potpourri of panacea, mostly socialistic, bureaucratic, futilistic and inane.

And, most disturbing, is no little evidence of discouragement, pessimism and fatalism in our own ranks. This I interpret as evidence that we have not developed leadership nor plan and are not using our available material to best advantage; and that our own "personnel" is becoming more or less mutinous and restive. Had we not better get together and give them so much to do they won't notice some of the small internicene things, in their concentration upon the enemy.

Again, we should be able to marshal the intelligent, socialistically inclined element, including such as Dewey, Holmes, Wise, Floyd, Villard, Thomas, and progressives like Borah, Norris, Nye, Wheeler, et al, into a national political movement with a simple but fundamental programme such as: (a) public ownership of public utilities; (b) free trade; (c) taxation of land values; (d) peace through arbitration. This might constitute the popular and political phase of our movement, which might readily develop into great strength and importance, but upon which we cannot yet depend.

But to accomplish our main objective, I think the first element is a lecture bureau of five or more units, equalling if possible Mr. James R. Brown, and operating on his admirable system, from five points: say Boston, New York, Atlanta, Chicago and Denver. I think this could be established and financed, as I think there are enough well to do Single Taxers, who, if rightly approached with a programme like this, would individually and collectively finance these lecture units at \$5,000 annually.

I know there are capable persons available for this lecture staff; men and women who would welcome the opportunity to so serve the cause on terms that represented self sacrifice.

I believe that by systematically covering (a) colleges and high schools; (b) service clubs; (c) churches, that then we could, in possibly one, and not more than three, decades, indoctrinate the rising and the partly risen generation with our philosophy so that success politically, which could then follow, would not be ephemeral.

I consider that Mr. Brown has proven past all controversy, that publicity in the form of local reprinting of lectures, is to be had, in volume that would multiply by many times the force of the addresses, in many cases delivering his messages to the whole community; only a little extended facility would enable him to stabilize this work and multiply its force, and of course duplicate it with each added speaker.

As an adjunct to the lecture work, there should be the organization in every community of a club or group, more or less standardized in form, name, etc., which would eventually constitute a complete and powerful organization for our movement.

The field presented by existing liberal papers, the cultivation of which would make their columns largely available to us, is very important the necessity for fitting our philosophy to their futilities, is a task of adroitness that some of our best brains must be focused upon.

While there is much rather cynical opinion that socialists are "outside the pale" of reason (which exactly reflects their opinion of us) I am by no means convinced of this and believe it possible to cooperate with and utilize the vast momentum of socialistic enthusiasm.

The idea that we should advance our cause through existing educational channels is generally accepted, and has had a very full demonstration in the work of Mr. Brown, whose audiences are largely in high schools and colleges which have been most receptive and appreciative. Surely, if we can indoctrinate the teachers, that is of first importance and next, just as obviously, is the open mind of youth, for if we cannot do better, we can, in a decade or two, "raise a new generation" that will not be afflicted with the astigmatism of the present one.

Everywhere the evidences multiply that the public is ready for our message:—the open door to our lecturers, the enthusiastic, rapt attention given to them, the urgent return invitations, the letters of commendation; the size and character of audiences, the almost universal acceptance of our copy, by the local papers which reprint lectures in full; the general use of the loosely managed press bureau services, such as Manhattan Single Tax Club, Tax Relief, Inc. (N. J.), and in the past the Fels Fund, Boynton, Danzinger, and Post, and even the small amount of letter writing being done; shows a great "willingness to print" on the part of all papers, up to the biggest ones.

Considering the mechanics of a press bureau service is superfluous as experience already has sufficiently pointed the way; what I have said however of receptivity of press and public, if verified, should make this perhaps the leading feature of our work, as it is capable of indefinite expansion, and relatively at low cost.

The secondary objective of a press service is to obtain revenue with which to carry itself and all other costs of the bureau, and I believe this can be done; and though it may entail some "dilution" of material sent out, for popularity and revenues' sake, it would always carry our message and, through a subdivision of the service, the simple pure philosophy would be given to all papers that will use it; in fact, eventually every paper in the country would be classified as to service acceptable to it.

I believe that in spite of many trials and failures a letter writing bureau can be made successful in a large way, as a division of the press bureau work; and if so the results possible cannot be reached any other way. The willingness of the *New York Times*, for example, to print a 60-line letter, as it has recently done, for Mr. Gladwin Bouton, headed "Taxation of Land Values" must be capitalized. Such a letter is worth hundreds of dollars as an ad for the goods we offer and costs but two cents and some time.

A successful press bureau would comprise the following:—(1) a headquarters with an editor, reader, typewriting and other office facilities; (2) a list of the best possible Single Taxers covering every locality who would (a) mail local papers to headquarters for reading and selection of subjects to "shoot at;" (b) sign and mail letters sent from headquarters to local papers; (c) watch for publication and send copy to headquarters; (d) arrange with papers for press bureau service; (3) a file of papers that print our letters, classified as to "susceptibility;" (4) a file of expertly written paragraphs from which a letter of outstanding force covering any subject could be made up without original work, typewritten and forwarded to local correspondent for signature and mailing to local paper. (5) an editor to write the very best material, the series of paragraphs, which may comprise 25, 50 or 100, suitably numbered and indexed for instant selection; or the material may

ken from many sources, including letters of local correspondents; a correspondent capable of quickly selecting the paragraphs to best set the points of a selected subject; training might enable him to conduct 50 to 100 such letters daily; (7) a typist trained to rapid copying; a reader trained to select subjects for "attack." In the early stages these functions may be combined in one or two persons.

To get some line on the volume and value of free publicity possible from this work, say 50 letters were printed daily averaging 50 lines each, or 2,500 lines, and in papers averaging 10,000 circulation; calling the value 10 cents a line, the bureau would earn \$250 daily, and if four people were required, costing \$25, the result is ten times the cost; and this is conservative.

The capacity of this plan for interesting and employing the rank and file of Single Taxers throughout the country may be its most important benefit. The question of "wherewithall" naturally arises and I do not intend to answer here, except to suggest that we have not extended ourselves any more in the direction of money-getting than in propaganda; and that each or all these activities should be self supporting in the sense that activity and success are breeders of sustention. I should perhaps apologize for my obvious bias in reverting repeatedly to the sales formula. I confess that I cannot see our problem in any other light than that of putting across a sales campaign.

Stoughton, N. J.

CHARLES H. INGERSOLL.

NEED OF COMPELLING LEADERSHIP

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Your issue for March-April again assures me of the value of LAND AND FREEDOM as a "great magazine", however restricted its direct appeal may be.

There is need of your patient but strong combatting of constantly repeated misunderstandings—such as Professor Robinson's and Editor Kipps to the effect that land values taxation is adapted to a passing barbarian age" rather than our urban machine age. It seems incredible that such a reversal of obvious truth can be honestly asserted again and again, but it is.

I wonder if your convincing correction of their misunderstandings gets to such objectors? Or whether, like the elder Pulitzer, they being wholly "committed to it." Your item on page 63 as to Senator Ireland's publicly saying, "I am a Single Taxer," indicates that such a conviction means nothing as to committing him to action radically at least, so long as public opinion lags behind. And there seems no sign of such compelling leadership as to force thinking.

Reading, Pa.

W. G. STEWART

MR. PLATT ASKS FOR BOLDER UTTERANCES

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

Behold I show you a mystery." Here in California, where the "Great Adventure" led by Luke North rallied the disciples of Henry George to the polls in such numbers as to almost carry a constitutional amendment, permitting a Single Tax on land values, now the leading advocates of Henry George doctrines, seem to have set up a taboo against the words "Single Tax" and the name Henry George, right in the state which was his birthplace. There are two publications in California particularly devoted to the advocacy of Single Tax philosophy, The *Ingram Institute News* published at San Diego and *Tax Facts* published in Los Angeles. For some time I have been giving both publications careful reading, and I have yet to come across the name of Henry George, or the words "Single Tax," although they are words which he strongly urged as the best name for the reform which he advocated.

The *Ingram Institute News* advocates "collecting economic rent" and *Tax Facts* is the organ of the Tax Relief Association, concentrating on the advocacy of the repeal of personal property taxation.

I had heard much of Dr. Frederick W. Roman as a Single Taxer and of his Los Angeles forums, and of the remarkable thesis which he wrote when taking an advanced degree at the Sorbonne, and which thesis expounded Single Tax doctrine.

While I was in San Diego Dr. Roman delivered a forum lecture on "Unemployment." "Good" said I to myself. "Now I will have the pleasure of hearing the real cause of unemployment ably expounded, together with the remedy." Imagine my surprise when the address closed without reference being made to the Single Tax or to Henry George or to any doctrines of Mr. George, except that lower tariff taxes were advocated.

Stoughton Cooley changed the location of his publication office in order to get away from an address identified with Single Tax agitation of the Great Adventure type and meetings of a Single Tax club were abandoned because of too much discussion introduced by so called "extremists."

Although I will attempt no explanation of the mystery I have outlined, and although I have been unable to elicit any satisfactory explanation from others, in justice to the *Ingram Institute* I must say that it is in my opinion carrying forward an excellent work, which is soundly grounded on Henry George economics.

At the forum meetings of Dr. Roman quantities of Single Tax literature have been distributed, and at Dr. Roman's business office hundreds if not thousands of copies of Henry George's works have been sold. At the meeting of the forum which I attended last Friday evening among other literature everybody was given a copy of *Tax Facts*.

In a pamphlet by R. E. Chadwick paying high tribute to Dr. Roman and his work I find this paragraph:

"The earth is the common heritage of all. To deny men access to it upon equal terms is to impoverish the many and enrich the few. You have shown the importance of the land question and how it may be settled justly, You have taught that this fundamental wrong is institutional, and that its correction holds no threat for any just man or any equitably acquired wealth."

CHESTER C. PLATT.

DOES CAPTAIN STEWART WANT A NEW YEAR BOOK?

EDITOR LAND AND FREEDOM:

I discussed your letter to me (which referred to the paucity of information regarding American statistics on taxation) with the Finance Committee of the International Union. The opinion was general that your Year Book of 1917 was finely conceived and we had to regret that other issues were not on the stocks. The absence of any comprehensive survey of Georgism today in U. S. A. was deplored, and I do not flatter you in saying that you would be relied upon on this side.

Mauden Vicarage, Bishops Startford, Eng.

M. J. STEWART.

NEWS NOTES AND PERSONALS

A LETTER signed R. E. C. appears in *Labor*, of Washington, D. C., in which the writer calls attention to the fact which advocates of public ownership so frequently overlook, that little benefit would accrue to communities from the ownership of municipal plants where the socially created values of land remain in private hands.

OUR old friend and helpful co-worker, Waldo J. Wernicke, calls our attention to the excellent letter-writing service that is being done by Calvin A. McLemore, R. J. Kitts, J. C. Kipps and Laurie Quinby, and thanks the editors of the *Hollywood News* and *Hollywood Citizen* for the generous space allowed these correspondents. The editors are respectively Mr. Don Long and Mr. Harlan Palmer. S. Byron Welcome frequently appears with letters in the *Los Angeles Express*. Another man who merits the thanks of our friends is Mr. Fred Jackson